

By Mr. LUCKING: Petition of citizens of the First Congressional district of Michigan, favoring a constitutional amendment prohibiting polygamy—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NEEDHAM: Petition of citizens of Watsonville, Cal., against tariff reduction on sugar from the Philippines—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PORTER: Petition of the Sheridan Woman's Christian Temperance Union, favoring the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Mrs. E. P. Martin, against repeal of bill H. R. 4072—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Mrs. E. P. Martin, against repeal of the canteen law—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Bellevue, against repeal of the canteen law—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, L. S. Brown Division, No. 370, of Pittsburg, Pa., favoring bill H. R. 7041—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Mrs. M. A. Irwin et al., favoring bill H. R. 4072—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana: Petition of A. H. Perfect & Co., of Fort Wayne, Ind., favoring the Quarles-Cooper bill—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of A. L. Kuhlman, of Auburn, Ind., favoring bill H. R. 1656—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SULLIVAN of Massachusetts: Petition of the executive council of the Massachusetts State Board of Trade, indorsing the Lovering customs-drawback bill and favoring its passage by the present Congress—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TAWNEY: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Orton D. Ford—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WEBBER: Petition of J. H. Houghton et al., of Oberlin, Ohio, favoring bill H. R. 4072—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WEISSE: Joint resolution of the legislature of Wisconsin, favoring such legislation relative to the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission as shall comply in letter and spirit with the recommendations in the President's message—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, February 2, 1905.

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

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

MEAT SUPPLY FOR ARMY IN THE PHILIPPINES.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, transmitting, in response to the resolution of the 28th ultimo, a letter from General Weston, Commissary-General, giving facts in regard to the meat supply of the army in the Philippine Islands; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. C. R. MCKENNEY, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 14710) authorizing the use of earth, stone, and timber on the public lands and forest reserves of the United States in the construction of works under the national irrigation law.

The message also announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 213) for appointment of a member of Board of Managers of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House insists upon its amendment to the bill (S. 6351) granting an increase of pension to Martin T. Cross, disagreed to by the Senate; agrees to the conference asked for by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. CALDERHEAD, Mr. FULLER, and Mr. MIERS of Indiana managers at the conference on the part of the House.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 16560) to authorize the registration of trade-marks used in commerce with foreign nations or among the several States or with Indian tribes, and to protect the same, asks a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and

had appointed Mr. CURRIER, Mr. BONYNGE, and Mr. WEBB managers at the conference on the part of the House.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on certain amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 17094) making appropriations for fortifications and other works of defense, for the armament thereof, for the procurement of heavy ordnance for trial and service, and for other purposes, insists upon its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, asks a further conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. LITTAUER, Mr. MARSH, and Mr. TAYLOR managers at the further conference on the part of the House.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills and joint resolution; and they were thereupon signed by the President pro tempore:

H. R. 3619. An act for the relief of David V. Howell;

H. R. 7607. An act granting a pension to Joel W. Nye;

H. R. 15895. An act making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1906, and for other purposes;

H. R. 17646. An act to extend certain provisions of the Revised Statutes of the United States to the Philippine Islands;

H. R. 17784. An act to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Arkansas River at or near Vanburen, Ark.; and

S. R. 96. Joint resolution authorizing temporary use of certain vacant houses in square 686 in the city of Washington, and for other purposes.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. PENROSE presented petitions of Washington Camp, No. 93, Patriotic Order Sons of America, of Philadelphia; of Washington Camp, No. 435, Patriotic Order Sons of America, of Philadelphia; of Washington Camp, No. 136, Patriotic Order Sons of America, of Sinnamahoning; of sundry citizens of Davidsburg and of Washington Camp, No. 85, Patriotic Order Sons of America, of Weishample, all in the State of Pennsylvania, praying for the enactment of legislation providing more stringent laws and regulations governing immigration; which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. PERKINS presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of San Diego, Cal., praying for the enactment of legislation to enlarge the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the Humboldt Chamber of Commerce, of Eureka, Cal., praying for the passage of the so-called "good-roads bill;" which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the Sequoia Division, No. 412, Order of Railway Conductors, of Fresno, Cal., praying for the passage of the so-called "employers' liability bill;" which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented memorials of sundry growers of sugar beets in Gilroy, Sargent, and San Juan, all in the State of California, remonstrating against any reduction of the duty on sugar imported from the Philippine Islands; which was referred to the Committee on the Philippines.

He also presented a memorial of the Humboldt Chamber of Commerce, of Eureka, Cal., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to divest the State of California of its title to the Yosemite Valley and Mariposa Big Tree Grove Reservation, in that State; which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. MARTIN presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Albemarle County, Va., relative to an investigation into the conditions existing in the Kongo Free State; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. KITTREDGE presented the petition of Belle L. Pettigrew and 10 other members of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Sioux Falls, S. Dak., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors to Indians in the Indian Territory when admitted to statehood; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. FULTON presented a petition of sundry citizens of Russellville and Quinton, Ind. T., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors to Indians in the Indian Territory according to the treaties made with the Five Civilized Tribes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. BEVERIDGE presented a memorial of Local Union No. 215, Cigar Makers' International Union of America, of Logansport, Ind., remonstrating against any reduction of the duty on tobacco imported from the Philippine Islands; which was referred to the Committee on the Philippines.

He also presented petitions of the Packard Company, of Fort

Wayne; of the Melrose Milling Company, of Evansville; of the Indiana Hardwood Lumbermen's Association, of Indianapolis, and of S. Bash & Co., of Fort Wayne, all in the State of Indiana, praying for the enactment of legislation to enlarge the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission; which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the Indiana State legislative board, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, of Indianapolis, Ind., and a petition of H. C. Boughton Lodge, No. 33, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, of Peru, Ind., praying for the passage of the so-called "employers' liability bill;" which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. DOLLIVER presented a petition of the Iowa State Manufacturers' Association, of Des Moines, Iowa, and a petition of the National Retail Grocers' Association, of Cincinnati, Ohio, praying for the enactment of legislation to enlarge the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission; which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Overton, Nebr., praying for the enactment of legislation to regulate the interstate transportation of intoxicating liquors; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the Iowa Park and Forestry Association, of Ames, Iowa, praying for the repeal of the so-called "timber and stone act" and for the enactment of a substitute authorizing the sale of timber growing on public lands; for the exchange of lands within the forest reserves for lands of equivalent value; for the planting and transplanting of shade trees along the public highways of the United States; for the establishment of a national forest reserve in the southern Appalachian Mountains and in the White Mountains in New Hampshire; for the reconveyance of the Yosemite Valley Park to the National Government; for the adoption of an amendment to the public-land laws, and for all work on forestry to be consolidated under the Department of Agriculture, and remonstrating against any reduction in the area of the Minnesota forest reserves; which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. HALE presented the petition of L. B. Conner and 27 other citizens of Maine, praying for the passage of the so-called "parcels-post bill;" which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. KEAN presented the petition of John Kimple, jr., of Jersey City, N. J., praying for the enactment of legislation to amend the patent laws relating to medicinal preparations; which was referred to the Committee on Patents.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of Rahway, Princeton, Clifton, Mercer County, East Orange, and Dunellen; of Mickleton Grange, No. 111, Patrons of Husbandry, of Mickleton, and of the Political Study Club of Orange, all in the State of New Jersey, remonstrating against the repeal of the present anticanteen law; which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. GALLINGER presented a petition of sundry citizens of Nashua, N. H., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the protection of Indians against the liquor traffic in the new States to be formed; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented the petition of P. H. Bristow, of Washington, D. C., praying for the enactment of legislation to establish public playgrounds in that city; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

COURTS IN ARIZONA TERRITORY.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. I present a memorial of the legislative assembly of the Territory of Arizona, in favor of the appointment of an additional associate justice of the supreme court of that Territory, together with statistics showing the amount of court work that is done in the Territory by the present judges. I move that the memorial be printed as a document and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The motion was agreed to.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. BALL, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 16668) granting an increase of pension to Emile H. Brie, alias Amede Brea, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. GAMBLE, from the Committee on Public Lands, to whom was referred the bill (S. 6017) for the relief of certain homestead settlers in the State of Alabama, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to whom was referred the bill (S. 3598) for the relief of holders and owners of certain District of Columbia special-tax scrip,

submitted an adverse report thereon, which was agreed to; and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

Mr. BLACKBURN, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 6094) authorizing the appointment and retirement of Charles Chaillé-Long with the rank of colonel, United States Army, reported adversely thereon; and the bill was indefinitely postponed.

Mr. FOSTER of Louisiana, from the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the amendment submitted by Mr. ELKINS on the 25th ultimo, proposing to appropriate \$90,000 for Ambrose channel light-vessel, New York; \$125,000 for Ambrose channel light-house, New York, and \$15,000 for Ambrose channel tank light-vessel, New York, intended to be proposed to the sundry civil appropriation bill, reported favorably thereon, and moved that it be printed, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Appropriations; which was agreed to.

Mr. FULTON, from the Committee on Public Lands, to whom was referred the bill (S. 6340) to aid in quieting title to certain lands within the Klamath Indian Reservation, in the State of Oregon, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. McCUMBER, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 5264) establishing an additional recording district in Indian Territory, and for other purposes, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 17117) granting an increase of pension to George H. Brusstar, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. ALGER, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2277) to correct the military record of George A. Winslow, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. CLAY, from the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 16799) making Texas City, Tex., a sub-port of entry in the customs collection district of Galveston, reported it without amendment.

Mr. CULLOM, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, to whom was referred the amendment submitted by Mr. GALLINGER on the 1st instant, proposing to increase the salary of the consul at Nantes, France, from \$1,500 to \$2,000 per annum, intended to be proposed to the diplomatic and consular appropriation bill, reported favorably thereon, and moved that it be referred to the Committee on Appropriations and printed; which was agreed to.

Mr. GALLINGER, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 18523) making an appropriation for fuel for the public schools of the District of Columbia, asked to be discharged from its further consideration, and that it be referred to the Committee on Appropriations; which was agreed to.

Mr. HEYBURN, from the Committee on Manufactures, to whom was referred the amendment submitted by Mr. STEWART on the 17th ultimo, relative to the adulteration of foods, drinks, condiments, etc., intended to be proposed to the agricultural appropriation bill, reported an amendment in the nature of a substitute, submitted a report thereon, and moved that it lie on the table and be printed; which was agreed to.

REPORT ON VENEZUELAN CASES.

Mr. PLATT of New York, from the Committee on Printing, to whom was referred the concurrent resolution submitted by Mr. CULLOM on the 31st ultimo, reported it without amendment; and it was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring therein), That there be printed and bound 1,100 copies of the report of the agent of the United States in the arbitration of the Venezuelan cases before The Hague tribunal, with accompanying appendixes, referred to in the message of the President to the Senate and House of Representatives, dated January 23, 1905, 200 for the use of the Senate, 400 for the use of the House of Representatives, and 500 for use of the Department of State.

GULL RIVER LUMBER COMPANY.

Mr. NELSON. I am directed by the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 14351) for the relief of the Gull River Lumber Company, its assigns or successors in interest, to report it favorably without amendment, and I ask for its present consideration.

The Secretary read the bill; and by unanimous consent the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration. It directs the Secretary of War to execute, acknowledge, and deliver, in the name of the United States of America, to the Gull River Lumber Company, its assigns or successors in interest, a deed of quitclaim and release, quitclaiming and releasing all the right, title, and interest of the United States of America in and to the following real property,

lying and being in the county of Cass, in the State of Minnesota, and described as follows: Lots 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 of section 20 in township 135 north of range 29 west.

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

KEOKUK AND HAMILTON WATER POWER COMPANY.

Mr. HOPKINS. From the Committee on Commerce, I report back favorably without amendment the bill (H. R. 15284) granting to the Keokuk and Hamilton Water Power Company rights to construct and maintain, for the improvement of navigation and development of water power, a dam across the Mississippi River, and I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill.

The Secretary read the bill; and by unanimous consent the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration. It gives the assent of Congress to the Keokuk and Hamilton Water Power Company, a corporation created and organized under the laws of the State of Illinois, its successors and assigns, to erect, construct, operate, and maintain a dam, with its crest at an elevation of from 30 to 35 feet above standard low water, across the Mississippi River at or near the foot of the Des Moines Rapids, from Keokuk, Iowa, to Hamilton, Ill., and to construct, operate, and maintain power stations on or in connection with the said dam, with suitable accessories for the development of water power, and the generation, use, and transmission therefrom of electric energy and power to be derived from the Des Moines Rapids on the Mississippi River.

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

ELIZABETH C. HILLS.

Mr. KEAN. I am directed by the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to whom was referred the resolution submitted by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER] on the 27th ultimo, to report it with an amendment, and I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

By unanimous consent, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

The amendment of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate was, in line 4, to strike out the words "one year's" and insert "six months'"; so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to pay to Elizabeth C. Hills, daughter of Edwin A. Hills, deceased, late a messenger in the Senate of the United States, a sum equal to six months' salary at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his demise, said sum to be considered as including funeral expenses and all other allowances.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED.

Mr. MORGAN introduced a bill (S. 7019) granting an increase of pension to Annie T. Seaman; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. MARTIN introduced a bill (S. 7020) for the relief of the heirs of John D. Mathews; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. McCUMBER introduced a bill (S. 7021) granting an increase of pension to Catharine R. Reynolds; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

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

A bill (S. 7022) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Stoddard (with accompanying paper); and

A bill (S. 7023) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Bramel.

Mr. HOPKINS (by request) introduced a bill (S. 7024) to extend the time for the completion of the Alaska Central Railway, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Territories.

Mr. DILLINGHAM introduced a bill (S. 7025) to amend section 3 of an act entitled "An act to regulate the immigration of aliens into the United States," approved March 3, 1903; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also introduced a bill (S. 7026) to authorize the Washington Railway and Electric Company to operate automobile lines within the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. BAILEY (by request) introduced a bill (S. 7027) establishing a United States court at Sulphur, Ind. T.; which was

read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also (by request) introduced a bill (S. 7028) for the relief of Lafayette D. Settle, administrator of Marcus Settle, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Claims.

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

A bill (S. 7029) for the relief of the estate of Bennett Robertson, deceased;

A bill (S. 7030) for the relief of the estate of William Fenn, deceased;

A bill (S. 7031) for the relief of the estate of James Johnson, deceased;

A bill (S. 7032) for the relief of Nancy Griggs and the estate of A. P. Griggs, deceased; and

A bill (S. 7033) for the relief of the estate of John M. Nace, deceased.

Mr. HALE introduced a bill (S. 7034) granting an increase of pension to John Q. A. Foss; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut introduced a bill (S. 7035) appointing Brig. Gen. Joseph R. Hawley, United States Volunteers, a brigadier-general on the retired list of the United States Army; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

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

A bill (S. 7036) to regulate certain criminal procedure in the Indian Territory; and

A bill (S. 7037) to prevent the fraudulent naturalization of aliens.

Mr. GALLINGER introduced a bill (S. 7038) to amend "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, as amended by the acts approved January 31 and June 30, 1902; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also introduced a bill (S. 7039) to amend section 1141 of the "Act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, as amended by the act approved June 30, 1902; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. MCOMAS introduced a bill (S. 7040) to incorporate the American Medical Association; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. BERRY introduced a bill (S. 7041) for the relief of the First Baptist Church of Helena, Ark.; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. BALL introduced a bill (S. 7042) authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to accept the torpedo boat Stringham; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. WARREN introduced a bill (S. 7043) to ratify and amend an agreement with the Indians residing on the Shoshone or Wind River Indian Reservation, in the State of Wyoming, and to make appropriations for carrying the same into effect; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. GALLINGER introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 104) extending the time during which the Washington and Gettysburg Railway Company, of Maryland, may extend its lines into and within the District of Columbia; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

AMENDMENTS TO APPROPRIATION BILLS.

Mr. PLATT of New York submitted an amendment authorizing the appointment of William Woolsey Johnson as professor of mathematics in the Navy on the retired list with the rank of commander, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the naval appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. PENROSE submitted an amendment relative to the suppression of train robbery, intended to be proposed by him to the post-office appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads, and ordered to be printed.

He also submitted an amendment relative to the retirement of officers of the Navy, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the naval appropriation bill; which was ordered to be printed, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. BURROWS submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$1,000 to pay George M. Buck for preparing the third edition of Senate Election Cases, intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. PERKINS submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$5,000 for salary of consul-general at Tientsin, China, intended to be proposed by him to the diplomatic and consular appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. KITTREDGE submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$8,650 for the purchase of additional lands and water supply for the Indian school at Rapid City, S. Dak., intended to be proposed by him to the Indian appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. GALLINGER submitted an amendment proposing to increase the salary of the electrician at the navy-yard, Washington, D. C., from \$1,400 to \$1,800, intended to be proposed by him to the naval appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. TELLER submitted an amendment appropriating \$155,976.88 for payment of the claim of the Kaw or Kansas Indians, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the Indian appropriation bill; which was ordered to be printed, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

ALASKA GOVERNMENT BOARD.

Mr. DIETRICH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 6383) to provide for an Alaska government board, and for other purposes; which was referred to the Committee on Territories, and ordered to be printed.

AMENDMENT TO COPYRIGHT LAW.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 6487) to amend section 4952 of the Revised Statutes; which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

PROCEEDS OF PUBLIC LANDS IN CALIFORNIA.

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

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, requested and directed to transmit to the Senate as soon as the same can be prepared, a statement of the amount of the 5 per cent of the net proceeds of the cash sales of public lands in the State of California since the admission of said State into the Union (September 9, 1850) to December 31, 1904, inclusive.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED.

H. J. Res. 213. Joint resolution for appointment of a member of Board of Managers of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

FORTIFICATIONS APPROPRIATION BILL.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives still further insisting on its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate, numbered 3, to the bill (H. R. 17094) making appropriations for fortifications and other works of defense, for the armament thereof, for the procurement of heavy ordnance for trial and service, and for other purposes, and requesting a further conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. PERKINS. I move that the Senate still further insist upon its amendment and accede to the request of the House of Representatives for a further conference.

The motion was agreed to.

By unanimous consent, the President pro tempore was authorized to appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate at the further conference; and Mr. PERKINS, Mr. WARREN, and Mr. DANIEL were appointed.

PREVENTION OF CARRIAGE OF OBSCENE LITERATURE, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the bill (S. 3431) to amend the act of February 8, 1897, entitled "An act to prevent the carrying of obscene literature and articles designed for indecent and immoral use from one State or Territory into another State or Territory," returned from the House of Representatives, in compliance with the request of the Senate.

Mr. CLAPP. I move to reconsider the votes by which the bill was ordered to a third reading and passed.

The motion to reconsider was agreed to.

Mr. CLAPP. I move that the bill be indefinitely postponed.

The motion was agreed to.

REGISTRATION OF TRADE-MARKS.

The President pro tempore laid before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives, disagreeing to the amendments

of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 16560) to authorize the registration of trade-marks used in commerce with foreign nations or among the several States or with the Indian tribes, and to protect the same, requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. KITTREDGE. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments and accede to the request of the House for a conference.

The motion was agreed to.

By unanimous consent, the President pro tempore was authorized to appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate; and Mr. KITTREDGE, Mr. McCOMAS, and Mr. MALLORY were appointed.

AGRICULTURAL AND MECHANICAL COLLEGE OF OKLAHOMA.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. Yesterday I asked unanimous consent to consider the bill (H. R. 17769) to grant certain lands to the Agricultural and Mechanical College of Oklahoma for college, farm, and experiment-station purposes, and some objection was entered. I think that objection has been withdrawn, and I ask that the bill may be now considered.

The Secretary read the bill by title.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. The bill was read in full yesterday.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill was read yesterday. Is there objection to its present consideration?

Mr. SPOONER. Will the Senator from North Dakota state in a word what is the object of the bill and the necessity for it?

Mr. HANSBROUGH. The bill provides for the donation of 640 acres of land to the Agricultural College of Oklahoma. That is the substance of it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Maine is not heard by the reporters.

Mr. HALE. I was, in a private manner, calling the attention of the Senator who has charge of the bill to the fact that some, it seemed to me, pertinent suggestions were raised yesterday by the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. BEVERIDGE], whom I do not see here. The Senator informs me that the objections have been withdrawn.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. The Senator from Indiana asked me to allow the bill to go over so that he and I might have a personal conference about the matter, which we had; and my understanding is that the Senator from Indiana has no further objection to the consideration of the bill.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I call the attention of the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. CULLOM] to this matter, he being at the time the bill was brought up yesterday somewhat interested. This is the bill relating to the appropriation of a section of land to the Agricultural College of Oklahoma, which the Senator from North Dakota reported yesterday from the Committee on Public Lands. It was at once called to my attention, and when explained it excited my curiosity, and that of the Senator from Illinois, and other Senators.

I do not think I am going to object, I will say to the Senator from North Dakota, but I merely want to make a statement, and then I will be through as far as I am concerned. On account of the conversation which occurred between the Senator from North Dakota and myself when the matter came up yesterday—

Mr. CULLOM. Will the Senator from Indiana allow me a word?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Certainly.

Mr. CULLOM. The fact occurred to me, when the debate was going on yesterday, that we are giving much more land and money to these Territories than we have been in the habit of doing with reference to others. I do not know whether that is the case or not, but it seemed to me that there was enough evidence indicating it to justify a halt until we saw how much each of these Territories is getting.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. If the Senator will allow me to make a statement, I have here the House report on this subject. In that report it appears that the college is situated at Stillwater, in Oklahoma, and now has for college farm and experiment-station purposes 360 acres of land, 200 of which were donated by the city of Stillwater and the remaining 160 acres recently purchased by the college with the Territorial funds. The section proposed to be donated by this bill lies immediately contiguous to the present college farm and experiment station, and the report goes on to show the absolute necessity of having this additional land in order to carry on the particular business of the agricultural college.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Now—

Mr. HANSBROUGH. I will have all the report read if the Senator desires.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. No, I do not ask for that. Besides, with the statement I am about to make I shall be through. I wish to ask the Senator, first, does he know how much other endowment or resources this institution has at present?

Mr. HANSBROUGH. I do not think that would make any difference with respect to this case. This is merely giving them additional land for the immediate purposes of their buildings for experimental purposes.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I know, but it makes this difference: I do not know what endowment of land or money this institution at present enjoys, but it is provided in the statehood bill, upon which we are to vote next Tuesday, that it shall have 250,000 acres of land. A bill passed the House and came to the Senate immediately before the bill the Senator presents was reported, authorizing the Territorial legislature of Oklahoma, which is now sitting, to make an appropriation of cash to this same institution. Now comes this bill and makes an appropriation of land to the same institution. That is the reason why I ask the Senator what other resources, either in land or money, the institution now has. It is merely a matter of inquiry. If the Senator thinks that this is the thing to do, I do not know that I shall object.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. The Senator has himself stated that he does not know the amount of land or money.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. No, I do not.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. After the Senator has studied these Territorial questions so thoroughly, when he does not know, I do not think it is quite fair for him to expect me, I not being a member of the Committee on Territories, to know about it.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I am not advocating the Senator's bill, nor am I on the Senator's Committee on Public Lands, which reported the bill.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. Furthermore, Mr. President, I do not think—

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I do not myself object if the Senator thinks it should be done.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. I do not think this measure has anything to do with the contributions of land or money to which the Senator refers. This is simply to make additional room for building and experimental opportunities on the part of the college.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I shall myself make no further objection, and what I have said now has been in the spirit of inquiry to the Senator. I do not think that such bills ought generally to pass without some little investigation.

Mr. CULLOM. This seems to be a special appropriation of land for this particular college. I understand it has no reference to the general allotment of lands to the Territory.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. None whatever; nor to the Territorial fund.

Mr. TELLER. This is an exceedingly small matter, and it is the only way that the institution can get the land. It seems to me that we had better not spend much time over it, but give it to them. They will not get any too much if we admit them as a State.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is before the Senate as in Committee of the Whole. If there be no amendment, it will be reported to the Senate.

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

B. JACKMAN.

Mr. BURNHAM. I desire to call up the bill (S. 3790) for the relief of B. Jackman.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Claims with amendments.

The first amendment was, in line 4, after the word "pay," to strike out the words "out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was to add a new section at the end of the bill, as follows:

Sec. 2. That there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, \$1,678.88, for the purposes specified in this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SPOONER. I should be glad to have the body of the bill read again.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be read as amended.

The Secretary read the bill as amended, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay to B. Jackman, agent of the Maine Central Railroad Company, Vanceboro, Me., the sum of \$1,678.88, for refund of duties paid on 1,499 cases of condensed milk erroneously entered for consumption and shipped in transit through the United States to Dawson, Yukon territory.

Sec. 2. That there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, \$1,678.88, for the purposes specified in this act.

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

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

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. PROCTOR. I ask unanimous consent to call up House bill 18329, the bill making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 18329) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1906, which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry with amendments.

Mr. PROCTOR. I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill may be dispensed with, and that it be read for action on the committee amendments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Vermont asks unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it shall be read for amendments, and that the committee amendments shall first receive action. The Chair hears no objection, and the order is made. The Secretary will read the bill.

The Secretary proceeded to read the bill. The first amendment of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was, under the head of "Department of Agriculture," office of the Secretary, on page 1, line 12, after the word "one," to strike out "law clerk" and insert "solicitor;" so as to read:

Office of the Secretary: Secretary of Agriculture, \$8,000; Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, \$4,500; chief clerk, \$2,500; one solicitor, \$2,500, etc.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the clause of "Office of the Secretary," on page 2, line 16, after the word "dollars," to insert "one clerk, \$900;" in line 17, after the word "clerks," to insert "(now laborers);" on page 3, line 5, after the word "watchmen," to insert "(now laborers);" and in line 12, before the word "dollars," strike out "seventy-three thousand nine hundred" and insert "eighty-four thousand six hundred and sixty;" so as to read:

One clerk, \$900; one clerk, \$840; six clerks (now laborers), at \$720 each, \$4,320; one chief engineer, who shall be captain of the watch, \$1,600; one fireman, who shall be a steam fitter, \$900; three assistant firemen, at \$720 each, \$2,160; one assistant fireman, \$600; one carpenter, \$1,000; one electrician, \$1,000; one painter, \$900; one plumber, \$900; one blacksmith, \$840; thirteen night watchmen, at \$720 each, \$9,360; two day watchmen (now laborers), at \$720 each, \$1,440; one mechanic, \$1,100; seven messengers, at \$840 each, \$5,880; one assistant messenger, \$720; in all, \$84,660.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, line 16, after the word "laborer," to insert "(now laborer);" in line 18, after the word "laborers," to insert "(now laborers);" in line 19, before the word "laborer," to insert "skilled;" in line 20, before the word "four," to insert "(now laborer);" in line 22, after the word "messengers," to insert "(now laborers);" in line 23, after the word "messenger," to insert "(now laborer);" in line 25, after the word "painter," to insert "(now laborer);" and on page 4, line 6, after the word "dollars," to insert "in all, \$25,660;" so as to make the clause read:

Office of the Secretary: Laborers and charwomen: One assistant messenger, \$720; one skilled laborer, \$840; one skilled laborer (now laborer), \$720; one skilled laborer, \$660; three skilled laborers (now laborers), at \$600 each, \$1,800; one skilled laborer (now laborer), \$480; one assistant messenger or laborer, \$600; two assistant messengers (now laborers), at \$600 each, \$1,200; one assistant messenger (now laborer), \$480; one laborer, \$600; one painter (now laborer), \$540; eleven laborers or charwomen, at \$480 each, \$5,280; one charwoman, \$540; five charwomen, at \$240 each, \$1,200; for extra laborers, emergency employments, and pay of rents, \$10,000; in all, \$25,660.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, line 8, to increase the total appropriation for the office of the Secretary of Agriculture from \$109,420 to \$110,320.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Weather Bureau," on page 5, line 3, after the word "dollars," to insert "one clerk (now laborer), \$600."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the clause "Salaries, office of the Chief of Weather Bureau," on page 5, line 20, after the word "dollars," to insert "one carpenter (now laborer), \$720;" in line 22, before the word "messengers," to strike out "five" and insert "two;" in the same line, after the word "messengers," to strike out "or laborers;" in line 24, before the word "dollars," to strike out "three thousand six hundred" and insert "one thousand four hundred and forty;" and in the same line, after the word "dollars," to insert "two messengers (now laborers), at \$720 each, \$1,440;" so as to read:

One carpenter (now laborer), \$720; two messengers, at \$720 each, \$1,440; two messengers (now laborers), at \$720 each, \$1,440.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, line 8, before the word "messengers," to strike out "six" and insert "five;" in line 11, before the word "dollars," to strike out "three thousand nine hundred and sixty" and insert "three thousand three hundred;" in the same line, after the word "dollars," to insert "one messenger (now laborer), six hundred and sixty dollars;" in line 12, before the word "messengers," to strike out "thirteen" and insert "twelve;" and in line 14, before the word "hundred," to strike out "eight" and insert "two;" so as to read:

Three folders and feeders, at \$630 each, \$1,890; five messengers or laborers, at \$660 each, \$3,300; one messenger (now laborer), \$660; twelve messengers, messenger boys, or laborers, at \$600 each, \$7,200.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 9, line 17, after the words "District of Columbia," to insert:

And provided further, That a portion of the Federal building site at Springfield, Ill., fronting 90 feet on Monroe street and extending back at that width 160 feet along Seventh street to paved alley, may be used as a site for one of the five buildings proposed above, and is hereby transferred to the Department of Agriculture for that purpose.

And in line 24, before the word "thousand," to strike out "forty-eight" and insert "fifty-eight;" so as to make the clause read:

Buildings, Weather Bureau: For the purchase of sites and the erection of not less than five buildings for use as Weather Bureau observatories, and for all necessary labor, materials, and expenses, plans and specifications to be prepared and approved by the Secretary of agriculture, and work done under the supervision of the Chief of the Weather Bureau, including the purchase of instruments, furniture, supplies, flag-staffs, and storm-warning towers to properly equip these stations: *Provided,* That if any of the money for these several buildings remains unexpended for the special purposes for which it is appropriated, so much of it as is necessary may be expended for the repair, improvement, and equipment of any other buildings or grounds owned by the Government and occupied by the Weather Bureau, outside of the District of Columbia: *And provided further,* That a portion of the Federal building site at Springfield, Ill., fronting 90 feet on Monroe street and extending back at that width 160 feet along Seventh street to paved alley, may be used as a site for one of the five buildings proposed above, and is hereby transferred to the Department of Agriculture for that purpose, \$58,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was continued to the end of the following clause on page 10, from line 6 to line 23:

PENALTY FOR COUNTERFEITING FORECASTS.

Any person who shall knowingly issue or publish any counterfeit weather forecasts or warnings of weather conditions, falsely representing such forecasts or warnings to have been issued or published by the Weather Bureau, or other branch of the Government service, or shall use any flag or symbol, or illustrations of any flag or symbol copied or modeled after those adopted and used by the Weather Bureau, or other branch of the Government service, for the purpose of publishing any weather forecasts or warnings of weather conditions not issued by the Weather Bureau, or shall molest or interfere with any weather or storm flag or weather map or bulletin displayed or issued by the United States Weather Bureau, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and on conviction thereof, for each offense, be fined in a sum not exceeding \$500, or be imprisoned not to exceed ninety days, or be both fined and imprisoned, in the discretion of the court.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, it seems to me that we have too many strongly penal provisions which we are passing here for comparatively unimportant offenses. It is a very grave matter for any technical breach of a law or regulation that the offender shall be punished by \$500 fine or ninety days' imprisonment, or both. Provisions of that kind, containing such extreme penalties, ought not to be favored, I think, by the Senate.

Here is a clause which—and if any grievance has arisen it must have been more accidental than designed—provides that anybody who publishes or issues any bulletin, or any part of a bulletin, of the Weather Bureau—which most of us consider public property and use pretty freely—shall be punished by a fine of not exceeding \$500, or imprisonment not to exceed ninety days, or both. Now, I should be glad to have the Senator in charge of this bill tell the Senate what is the occasion or what is the need of this severe provision for punishment, which may by some mischievous person be prosecuted, and a man who had no intention of doing wrong because he had accidentally infringed is liable to this severe punishment. I represent a part of the country interested in these bulletins—sometimes very critically interested in them—and I have never known any deliberate counterfeiting or improper using of Government bulletins; but I can understand that, under the language of this provision, constituents of mine, or of any other Senator, might before they knew it have accidentally violated the provision and be haled before some United States commissioner and be subjected, not only to fine and imprisonment, one or both, but what is almost a greater nuisance, taken hundreds of miles away from home and subjected to trial.

There is too much disposition on the part of certain special officers to find nominal technical infringements of United States statutes, to arrest men, and, as I have said, hale them before a commissioner who lives hundreds of miles away. In looking

over these bills I acknowledge that, having known some of the evil effects of such things, I am rather sharp in finding out and seeing such provisions as this, which are apt to go nem. con.

I wish the Senator from Vermont would tell us what need there is of these elaborate provisions and the imposition of this heavy penalty? Is it needed for the good of the service? Is this service being undermined by a system of counterfeiting, or is it only occasional and of slight importance, and not deserving of such penalizing provisions as the other House has incorporated in this bill? If the necessity for the provision is not explained I shall move to strike it out.

Mr. PROCTOR. Mr. President, this measure, as the Senator has suggested, did not originate with the Senate committee. I do not think there would be any danger of this penal provision, if it should become a law, being invoked in any case of accidental or slight technical violations of it. The explanation that was made before the committee of the reason for this provision was that there had been a willful counterfeiting of weather forecasts and warnings and weather conditions for purposes of profit or of influencing the market in the interests of corners and trusts on cotton, wheat, corn, and other crops. As it is our business to guard against the wicked operation of all trusts and combines, it seemed, I suppose, to the authors of the bill very necessary that there should be some provision of this kind contained in it.

I remember to have several times seen in the newspapers within the last two or three years statements that reports about the condition of the crops, which affect the market very much, had been counterfeited and that it was important to have enacted some provision of this kind. I myself believe that it is wise to guard against any counterfeit or false reports pretending to emanate from the Weather Bureau in regard to the condition of the crops of the country. Other Senators who are, perhaps, more familiar with the cotton, wheat, and corn interests and who know more about this matter than I do, will be able to speak more authoritatively upon the subject, but that was the representation that was made to me as the reason for this provision.

Mr. BACON. I should like to make a suggestion to the Senator from Vermont before he leaves the floor, and that is that there may be very much more importance in the provisions of one part of this clause than in the other. So far as concerns the prescribing of a penalty against one who shall publish a false forecast, intending thereby to deceive the public, I can appreciate the fact that that may be a matter of considerable gravity, and I can appreciate the fact that it may be utilized for the purpose suggested by the Senator as that which was given the committee as the reason for its insertion. But when it comes to the matter about which the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] more particularly spoke, I can not see in what way there can be any great danger to the public or to private interests by reason of counterfeiting symbols. There is where there can be more opportunity for injustice or oppression to the private citizen who, for some trivial offense, may be dragged hundreds of miles to a Federal court.

I would say to the Senator that, while it is entirely practicable for a newspaper or a circular publication, for instance, to mislead the public by the publication of a false report, representing it to be a true report of the Agricultural Department, I can not exactly understand how any false or counterfeit symbols can be used in that way to any appreciable degree, for this reason: Those symbols are not put in places that are accessible to everybody. They are generally displayed from the signal stations, from the tops of public buildings, etc., to which boys who would be given to mischief could have no access, and from which even malicious persons would be excluded. Therefore, it does seem to me that the suggestion of the Senator from Maine is one of very considerable gravity—that we are providing, so far as that branch of the clause of the proposed legislation is concerned, a very grave penalty for what may be a very trivial act, and one for the perpetration of which there is little or no opportunity, from the fact I have just mentioned, that those symbols are displayed from signal stations to which the public have not access.

So far as the first part of the provision is concerned, I recognize the gravity of it. If it be true that there has been published in the newspapers or in other ways—in circular letters, perhaps, or circulars otherwise distributed—reports as to weather conditions or weather forecasts represented to be emanations from the Agricultural Department, whereas, in fact, they were not, and that has been done for the purpose of influencing the markets, I can understand why that should be an offense which we should attempt to correct. Such an act as that could not be too severely punished by the penalty which is prescribed here.

I think, so far as the latter part of the clause is concerned,

which relates to the matter of counterfeiting a symbol, the penalty would not only be too severe, but the probabilities of the commission of that offense are so remote as to make that part of it altogether unnecessary.

That is the way in which the matter suggests itself to my mind. I confess my attention had not been before attracted to it, but I think it might be well, if that view of the matter is correct, to so modify the clause as to confine it to the case of the false publication of weather forecasts or predictions.

Mr. HALE. Retain the language in reference to the false publication or using of forecasts and eliminate the last part of the provision.

Mr. BACON. Yes.

Mr. HALE. That is what struck me as the part of the provision which was very trivial and not likely to be a matter of much importance. If the Senator will allow me, I will move to strike out, in line 11, page 10, after the word "service," down to and including the words "Weather Bureau," in line 16.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PERKINS in the chair). The amendment proposed by the Senator from Maine will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 10, line 11, after the word "service," it is proposed to strike out:

Or shall use any flag or symbol, or illustrations of any flag or symbol, copied or modeled after those adopted and used by the Weather Bureau, or other branch of the Government service, for the purpose of publishing any weather forecasts or warnings of weather conditions not issued by the Weather Bureau.

Mr. PROCTOR. Mr. President, I do not think there would be any real danger of the Government prosecuting individuals for inadvertent or trivial violations of this provision when there was no intent of fraud or of deceiving the public for any purpose of gain. In regard to the penalty prescribed, there is no minimum, and it rests in the discretion of the court to make the punishment nominal or to inflict the maximum provided by the bill.

I am not set about this matter, but the amendment of the Senator does not properly come up until after the committee amendments are considered. If, however, the Senator moving the amendment wishes to have it considered now, I have no objection to that course being taken.

Mr. HALE. The Senator is quite right on that point. Under the rule of proceeding the amendment does not come up until after the committee amendments have been disposed of. Therefore I will withhold the amendment for the present and offer it at the proper time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The proposed amendment will lie on the table until the committee amendments shall have been disposed of.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Perhaps this may be as good a place as any to make an inquiry of the chairman of the committee reporting this bill. I had been of the impression that the Agricultural Department submitted pretty liberal estimates for their requirements. I had not supposed that that Department had overlooked anything that it possibly needed in the matter of appropriations, but I find from the report of the committee that the estimates submitted by that Department have been exceeded by something like \$350,000. I want to inquire of the chairman of the committee, first, how it is possible that the Secretary of Agriculture overlooked anything in submitting his estimates for the expenditures of his Department, and, second, if it is really necessary to increase these appropriations some \$350,000 over the estimates submitted by the Department?

Mr. HALE. By amendments to this bill.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Yes; by amendments. The House added \$160,620 to the estimates submitted by the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Senate committee now proposes to add \$206,000 more.

I am one, Mr. President, who would not be illiberal with the Department of Agriculture, but I have thought that they understood pretty well what they needed and were not any too modest about submitting estimates for what they wanted. If that impression is true, I should like to have explained how it is that it is necessary for Congress to add to the estimates of the Department some three or four hundred thousand dollars or thereabouts?

Mr. PROCTOR. Mr. President, I think the Secretary of the Department of Agriculture has been very conservative in his recommendations. We do not by this bill propose to raise a single salary. There are many alterations, because by the action of the House the salaries of certain clerks are taken from the lump-sum appropriations and made statutory. The increase to which the Senator refers comes from the transfer of the Forest Reserve Division from the Interior Department to the Department of Agriculture. That transfer renders

necessary an additional appropriation of nearly \$400,000, which more than accounts for the increase recommended by the Senate committee. That increase is only \$206,000. So far as the Department of Agriculture as it stands to-day is concerned, the bill does not carry the amount called for by the estimates.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. I find that in the office of the Secretary there is an increase over the amount appropriated by the House bill of \$900. That is trivial. In the Weather Bureau there is an increase of \$10,000; in the Bureau of Animal Industry, \$71,540; in the Bureau of Plant Industry, \$45,000; in the Bureau of Forest Service, \$27,260; in the Bureau of Chemistry, \$10,000; in the Bureau of Public Roads, \$10,000. There is a trivial decrease of \$600 in the appropriation for experiment stations. I am glad the committee found that a decrease of \$600 could be made, even if it was in the experiment stations.

Mr. SPOONER. If the Senator will allow me, what is meant by "public roads?"

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. I do not know; but if the increases to which I have referred, taking them from the report furnished by the committee, are in excess of the estimates of the Department I suppose every one of them would be subject to a point of order. I am not going to interfere seriously with this bill.

Mr. SPOONER. What is the total amount of increase recommended by the Senate committee?

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. The amount of the estimates for 1906 was \$6,419,810. The amount carried by the bill as it passed the House was \$6,580,430, which was an increase of about \$160,000. The increase recommended by the Senate committee is \$206,740, and the amount carried by the bill as reported to the Senate is \$6,787,170, which, in round numbers, is \$360,000 more than the estimates of the Department. It is concerning that which I am inquiring. I desire to know why the increase is necessary.

Mr. PROCTOR. That, Mr. President, is more than accounted for by the transfer of forest reserves from the Interior Department to the Department of Agriculture, which was made by an act passed by the present Congress and has already taken effect.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Then, do I understand that these increases reported by the Senate committee over the bill as it came from the House are deductions or decreases from the amounts recommended by the Secretary in respect to those different bureaus?

Mr. PROCTOR. They are in every case, I believe. I am sure we have not gone above the estimate in any case.

Mr. GORMAN. I should like to ask the Senator from Vermont in charge of this bill whether the amount for the compensation of employees of this Bureau which has been transferred to the Agricultural Department was not included in the legislative bill?

That bill has passed since the act transferring this division to the Agricultural Department, as I understand, was passed. Is it not all provided for in the bill which we passed heretofore?

Mr. PROCTOR. No; it is not, I am very sure, because we had the Secretary before us on that point and the Chief of the Forestry Bureau. The House also had full consideration of that matter. There is no double appropriation.

Mr. GORMAN. There is not?

Mr. SPOONER. Was the transfer of the Bureau made before the passage of the legislative bill?

Mr. PROCTOR. Yes; before the legislative bill became a law. It was made immediately on the signing of the bill transferring the Bureau.

The reading of the bill was resumed. The next amendment of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was, on page 11, line 1, to increase the total appropriation for maintenance of the Weather Bureau from \$1,387,990 to \$1,397,990.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Bureau of Animal Industry," on page 11, line 7, after the word "dollars," to strike out "one assistant chief, \$2,500;" in line 10, after the word "dollars," to strike out "one editorial clerk, \$1,400;" in line 12, after the word "dollars," to strike out "twelve" and insert "thirteen;" in line 14, before the word "dollars," to strike out "six thousand eight hundred" and insert "eighteen thousand two hundred;" in line 17, after the word "dollars," to strike out "one clerk" and insert "two clerks, at;" in line 18, after the word "dollars," to insert "each, \$1,680;" in line 19, before the word "clerks," to strike out "two" and insert "three;" in the same line, after the word "clerks," to insert "(now laborers);" in line 22, before the word "dollars," to strike out "one thousand four hundred and forty" and insert

"two thousand one hundred and sixty," and in the same line, after the word "clerks," to insert "(now laborers)"; on page 12, line 2, before the word "messengers," to strike out "four" and insert "three;" in line 4, before the word "dollars," to strike out "two thousand eight hundred and eighty" and insert "two thousand one hundred and sixty;" in the same line, after the word "dollars," to insert "one messenger (now laborer), \$720;" in line 7, after the word "laborers," to insert "(now laborers)"; in line 9, after the word "laborers," to insert "(now laborers)"; in line 11, after the word "laborers," to insert "(now laborers)"; in line 13, after the word "fireman," to insert "(now laborer)"; and in line 17, before the word "dollars," to strike out "eighty-four thousand four hundred and twenty" and insert "eighty-three thousand four hundred and eighty;" so as to make the paragraph read:

Salaries, Bureau of Animal Industry: One chief of Bureau, \$4,500, and for additional compensation while the office is held by the present incumbent, \$500; one chief clerk, \$2,000; two clerks of class 4, \$3,600; one editor, \$2,000; five clerks of class 3, \$8,000; thirteen clerks of class 2, \$18,200; thirteen clerks of class 1, \$15,600; eight clerks, at \$1,000 each, \$8,000; two clerks, at \$900 each, \$1,800; two clerks, at \$840 each, \$1,680; three clerks (now laborers), at \$720 each, \$2,160; two clerks (now laborers), at \$600 each, \$1,200; one mechanic, \$1,200; one messenger and custodian, \$1,000; one carpenter, \$1,100; one messenger, \$840; three messengers, at \$720 each, \$2,160; one messenger (now laborer), \$720; one skilled laborer, \$840; two skilled laborers (now laborers), at \$720 each, \$1,440; two skilled laborers (now laborers), at \$600 each, \$1,200; one skilled laborer, \$660; two skilled laborers (now laborers), at \$480 each, \$960; one fireman (now laborer), at \$720; one illustrator, at \$1,400; in all, \$83,480.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the clause for "General expenses, Bureau of Animal Industry," on page 13, line 20, before the word "dollars," to strike out "one million four hundred and thirty-one thousand five hundred and twenty" and insert "one million five hundred and four thousand;" so as to make the proviso read:

Provided further, That the Secretary of Agriculture may, in his discretion, waive the requirement of a certificate with beef and other products which are exported to countries that do not require such inspection, \$1,504,000, etc.

Mr. CLAY. I desire to call the attention of the Senator from Vermont, chairman of the committee, to a feature of the bill beginning on page 13, line 20. There is there appropriated \$1,504,000—

and the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized to use any part of this sum he may deem necessary or expedient, in such manner as he may think best, in the collection of information concerning live stock, dairy, and other animal products, and to prevent the spread of pleuro-pneumonia, blackleg, tuberculosis, sheep scab, glanders or farcy, hog cholera, and other diseases of animals, etc.

I go a little further, and from page 14, line 15, I read:

And the Secretary of Agriculture may use so much of this sum as he deems necessary for promoting the extension and development of foreign markets for dairy and other farm products of the United States and for suitable transportation of the same; and such products may be bought in open market and disposed of at the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture, and he is authorized to apply the moneys received from the sales of such products toward the continuation and repetition of such experimental exports.

I desire to ask the Senator whether this provision does not really invest the Secretary of Agriculture with the power to take \$1,504,000 and engage in merchandising, to buy certain products and ship them abroad, and to take the proceeds coming from the sale of those products and buy other products, and to engage indefinitely in mercantile business. Is not that a business in which the Government ought not to engage? The Secretary ought to be permitted to get all the information he can to improve agriculture, but is not the mercantile business something which should be left to our people themselves to do? The Secretary is authorized to take \$1,504,000 and engage in the export business indefinitely until the next appropriation bill shall be made, and he is authorized to use this money as he sees fit and proper.

I have no reflection upon the Secretary. He might use it wisely, and probably would, but I do not believe that the Government ought to engage in any such business. The Government ought to leave private business to the people themselves to transact, and not engage in paternalism. We are going a step further every year in engaging in paternalism, transacting business that the people themselves ought to transact. I ask the Senator does he think such power should be given to the Secretary of Agriculture?

Mr. PROCTOR. Mr. President, the duties of the Agricultural Department are multifarious and include a great many items. Under the head "General expenses, Bureau of Animal Industry," are a great number of items.

It is very true that by the terms of the provision the Secretary, if he was entirely unmindful of proper administration, might devote the whole sum, perhaps, to any one item and neglect all the others, but that is a very improbable supposition.

The provision amounts really to this: It gives him authority,

and this is as far as he has ever done or is likely to do, to purchase samples of our products and send them to agents abroad who are trying to introduce those articles in foreign countries. There is nothing of the mercantile character about it at all. It does not interfere with trade. It is for the purpose of encouraging trade. He purchases small samples, single packages of different kinds of products, and puts them into the hands of the agents of the Department abroad, who present them to the proper departments of the foreign governments, or to private associations in those countries, for the purpose of building up trade in American products.

Mr. CLAY. The Secretary can engage in this business indefinitely. He can invest in meats and dairy products. He can ship them abroad to-day. He can get the proceeds. He can buy and sell again. He is allowed to carry on an export business, provided he does not use more than \$1,504,000.

Mr. PROCTOR. I do not think the Senator really apprehends any serious danger from this authority, or that any Secretary would be so false to his duties as an official as to engage in anything of the kind. He would, of course, be brought up with a round turn the minute he undertook it.

I have stated the purpose of the provision, and I am very sure there is not the least danger of its being abused. It has been, I know, a useful provision. Various restrictions that had been put upon our products by foreign countries have been removed by this very means.

Mr. CLAY. It may be true, and probably is, that the Secretary would not abuse it, but it is a broad power to say the least of it.

The Secretary of Agriculture may use so much of this sum—

That is, so much of the \$1,504,000—

as he deems necessary for promoting the extension and development of foreign markets for dairy and other farm products of the United States.

There is one thing certain: He could use the whole of that sum for that purpose if he desired to do so.

I believe, however, that at this time it is not proper to offer an amendment in regard to the matter, as the bill is simply being read for the purpose of passing on amendments reported by the committee.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I wish to make a suggestion to the Senator from Georgia. I think we all agree that it is a good thing to have the Secretary of Agriculture take steps for the promotion and development of our markets for dairy and other products. My attention has not been called to this matter before, but what strikes me is the explicit authorization in lines 22, 23, and 24 that he may go on turning this sum of money over and over and over.

Mr. CLAY. That is true.

Mr. LODGE. It gives it an entirely different complexion from what is in the first part.

The Secretary of Agriculture may use so much of this sum as he deems necessary for promoting the extension and development of foreign markets for dairy and other farm products of the United States, and for suitable transportation of the same.

Why do we need more than that?

Mr. CLAY. The Senator calls special attention to lines 20, 21, 22, and 23, I believe.

Mr. LODGE. Yes; why is that sentence necessary?

Mr. CLAY. I do not think the Government ought to engage in that business.

Mr. LODGE. The first part is very proper, because the purpose is defined:

For promoting the extension and development of foreign markets.

Then the bill goes on and gives him power to do a business in dairy products. It does not seem to me that that is needed.

Mr. CLAY. That would appear to be the scope of the provision the Senator has just read, that he is especially authorized to engage in business of that kind and to continue it indefinitely from day to day.

Mr. LODGE. That is what the second sentence is, in fact. It seems to me the first one covers every necessity we could wish to reach—the promotion and extension of foreign markets.

Mr. CLAY. It would not be proper at this time to offer an amendment to the bill, as the bill is simply being read for action on the amendments reported by the committee.

Mr. LODGE. That is correct.

Mr. PROCTOR. Mr. President, a word in reply to what was said by the Senator from Massachusetts. It is necessary for the Secretary, in order to foster our trade, to have authority to purchase samples and to show to foreign countries the methods of putting up various farm products, the methods of labeling, the methods of inspection. This provision is just the same as the one in the last bill. It has never been abused, and is a very useful provision.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agree-

ing to the amendment reported by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed. The next amendment of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was, on page 15, line 2, after the word "used," to strike out "as a" and insert "for office;" and in the same line, before the word "storage," to strike out "for;" so as to read:

And the Secretary is hereby authorized to rent suitable buildings in the District of Columbia, at an annual rental of not exceeding \$2,500, to be used for office, laboratory, and storage purposes for said Bureau of Animal Industry, etc.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 16, line 1, to increase the total appropriation for maintenance of the Bureau of Animal Industry from \$1,540,940 to \$1,612,480.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Bureau of Plant Industry," on page 16, line 14, before the word "clerks," to strike out "twenty-eight" and insert "twenty-seven;" in line 15, before the word "dollars," to strike out "thirty-three thousand six hundred" and insert "thirty-two thousand four hundred;" in the same line, after the word "dollars," to insert "one seed clerk and superintendent, \$1,200;" in line 18, before the word "clerks," to strike out "thirteen" and insert "fourteen;" in line 19, before the word "thousand," to strike out "thirteen" and insert "fourteen;" in line 22, after the word "dollars," to insert "one clerk, \$720;" in line 24, before the word "clerks," to strike out "eleven" and insert "ten;" in the same line, after the word "clerks," to insert "(now laborers);" on page 17, line 1, before the word "dollars," to strike out "seven thousand nine hundred and twenty" and insert "seven thousand two hundred;" in line 1, after the word "clerks," to insert "(now laborers);" in line 3, after the word "clerks," to insert "(now laborers);" in line 4, after the word "clerk," to insert "(now laborer);" in line 6, after the word "clerk," to insert "(now laborer);" in line 9, after the word "carpenter," to insert "(now laborer);" in line 17, after the word "gardener," to insert "(now laborer);" in line 18, after the word "gardeners," to insert "(now laborers);" in line 19, after the word "dollars," to insert "one gardener, \$660;" in line 22, after the word "plumbers," to insert "(now laborers);" in line 24, after the word "fireman," to insert "(now laborer);" on page 18, line 1, after the word "firemen," to insert "(now laborers);" in line 3, after the word "dollars," to insert "one skilled laborer, \$720;" in line 5, before the word "skilled," to strike out "three" and insert "two;" in the same line, after the word "laborers," to insert "(now laborers);" in line 7, before the word "dollars," to strike out "two thousand one hundred and sixty" and insert "one thousand four hundred and forty;" in line 7, after the word "laborers," to insert "(now laborers);" in line 9, before the word "skilled," to strike out "six" and insert "five;" in line 10, after the word "laborers," to insert "(now laborers);" in line 11, before the word "dollars," to strike out "six hundred;" in the same line, after the word "laborer," to insert "(now laborer);" in line 13, after the word "messenger," to insert "(now laborer);" in line 14, after the word "messengers," to insert "(now laborers);" in line 16, after the word "messenger," to insert "(now laborer);" in line 17, after the word "watchmen," to insert "(now laborers);" in line 19, after the word "watchmen," to insert "(now laborers);" and on page 19, line 2, before the word "dollars," to strike out "one hundred and fifty-six thousand eight hundred" and insert "one hundred and fifty-seven thousand eight hundred and sixty;" so as to read:

Salaries, Bureau of Plant Industry: One plant physiologist and pathologist, who shall be Chief of Bureau, \$4,500; one chief clerk, \$2,000; one superintendent, gardens and grounds, \$1,800; five clerks, class 4, \$9,000; seven clerks, class 3, \$11,200; twelve clerks, class 2, \$10,800; twenty-seven clerks, class 1, \$32,400; one seed clerk and superintendent, \$1,200; one clerk or artist, \$1,200; one artist, \$840; fourteen clerks, at \$1,000 each, \$14,000; six clerks, at \$900 each, \$5,400; eight clerks, at \$840 each, \$6,720; one clerk, \$720; ten clerks (now laborers), at \$720 each, \$7,200; four clerks (now laborers), at \$660 each, \$2,640; two clerks (now laborers), at \$600 each, \$1,200; one clerk (now laborer), \$480; one photographer or clerk (now laborer), \$720; one assistant photographer, \$600; one illustrator, \$720; one carpenter, \$840; one carpenter (now laborer), \$720; one gardener or assistant, \$1,000; four gardeners, at \$900 each, \$3,600; two gardeners, at \$840 each, \$1,680; three gardeners, at \$780 each, \$2,340; one gardener, \$600; one gardener (now laborer), \$720; two gardeners (now laborers), at \$660 each, \$1,320; one gardener, \$660; one skilled laborer, \$900; one painter, \$840; two plumbers (now laborers), at \$720 each, \$1,440; one fireman (now laborer), \$720; two firemen (now laborers), at \$600 each, \$1,200; one clerk or messenger, \$840; one skilled laborer, \$720; two skilled laborers (now laborers), at \$720 each, \$1,440; three skilled laborers (now laborers), at \$660 each, \$1,980; five skilled laborers (now laborers), at \$600 each, \$3,000; one skilled laborer (now laborer), \$480; one messenger, \$660; one messenger (now laborer), \$720; three messengers (now laborers), at \$600 each, \$1,800; one messenger (now laborer), \$480; two watchmen (now laborers), at \$720 each, \$1,440; three watchmen (now laborers), at \$600 each, \$1,800; two skilled laborers,

or messengers, at \$480 each, \$960; two messenger boys, at \$360 each, \$720; three messenger boys, at \$300 each, \$900; in all, \$157,860.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "General expenses, Bureau of Plant Industry," on page 20, line 8, after the word "staple," to strike out "and" and insert a semicolon; and in line 10, after the word "export," to insert "and varieties of tobacco of uniform type and of better quality;" so as to read:

Varieties of wheat and other cereals more resistant to rust and smut and better suited to the various sections of this country; varieties of rice more resistant to "rice blight," and for experiments for the substitution of other products on rice lands; varieties of cotton more resistant to disease and of longer and better staple; varieties of pears and apples more resistant to blight and better adapted for export, and varieties of tobacco of uniform type and of better quality; to investigate the causes of decay in forest timber and timber used for construction purposes, and to devise means for preventing the decay of the same.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 21, line 8, to increase the total appropriation for vegetable pathological and physiological investigations from \$36,640 to \$55,640.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 21, line 9, after the word "dollars," to insert:

Provided, That \$10,000, or so much thereof as the Secretary of Agriculture shall direct, may be used for the breeding of tobacco: *Provided further*, That \$10,000, or so much thereof as the Secretary of Agriculture shall direct, may be used for the investigation of rice diseases, especially "blast," and the substitution of other crops on abandoned rice lands.

And in line 16, after the word "available," to strike out:

five thousand dollars of which sum shall be immediately available for the investigation of "rice blight," and the substitution of other crops on rice lands.

So as to make the proviso read:

Provided, That \$10,000, or so much thereof as the Secretary of Agriculture shall direct, may be used for the breeding of tobacco: *Provided further*, That \$10,000, or so much thereof as the Secretary of Agriculture shall direct, may be used for the investigation of rice diseases, especially "blast," and the substitution of other crops on abandoned rice lands, of which sum \$10,000 shall be immediately available.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 21, after line 19, to insert:

For all expenses, including the employment of labor in Washington or elsewhere, to enable the Secretary of Agriculture, through the Bureau of Plant Industry, to carry on special investigations, in cooperation with the State experiment stations, of the conditions of grain production in the United States and of the means of improving the same; to develop varieties suited to semiarid districts and high altitudes; to determine the best methods of cultivation of grain for different districts; to make possible a further extension northward of winter grains by increasing their hardiness; to determine the cause of the deterioration of grain from the milling standpoint, in cooperation with the Bureau of Chemistry; to investigate the conditions affecting the quality of stored grain and grain in transit, \$25,000; in all, \$180,840.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. I find in the amendment the following clause:

To determine the cause of the deterioration of grain from the milling standpoint, in cooperation with the Bureau of Chemistry; to investigate the conditions affecting the quality of stored grain and grain in transit, \$25,000.

I find, on page 25, line 12, what seems to me to be the same authority:

To investigate, in cooperation with the Bureau of Chemistry, the cause of deterioration of export grain, particularly in oceanic transit, and devise means for preventing losses from those causes.

So we have two appropriations for the same thing, apparently, in the bill, if this amendment passes.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. I think that, while apparently if we follow the language cited by the Senator there is a repetition, at the same time the intent of the amendment in the bill is to give the Secretary of Agriculture authority to examine grain in bulk in the interior, and the purpose of the last clause read by the Senator is to give him authority to examine grain on shipboard or at the ports from whence large quantities of grain are transported. The one is a House provision and the other a Senate committee amendment. I do not think there is sufficient conflict to justify a change in the language of the two.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed. The next amendment was, in the clause "Pomological investigations," on page 23, line 22, after the word "shipments," to insert "and such moneys shall be available until used;" so as to read:

For the purpose of increasing the exportation of American fruits and vegetables, and for all necessary expenses connected with the practical work of the same, and such fruits, vegetables, packages, and packing material as are needed for those investigations and experimental shipments may be bought in open market and disposed of at the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture, and he is authorized to apply the moneys received from the sales of such fruits and vegetables toward the continuation and repetition of these investigations and experimental shipments, and such moneys shall be available until used; to investigate, map, and report upon the commercial fruit districts of the United States.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the clause "Grass and forage plant investigations," on page 26, line 16, before the word "dollars," to insert "five hundred;" so as to read:

Rent and repairs of a building not to exceed \$2,500 per annum; to prepare drawings and illustrations for circulars, reports, and bulletins, etc.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 27, line 5, to reduce the appropriation for "Grass and forage plant investigations," from \$39,720 to \$39,660.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading was continued to line 3, on page 29, the last paragraph read being an appropriation of \$20,000 for the Arlington experimental farm.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. I do not know that I ought to seek for any information with regard to anything which is in this bill, or which the Department thinks is necessary or wise, but I should like to make a simple inquiry about the experimental farm at Arlington.

I observe that there are about 400 acres of it, and that last year we appropriated \$20,000 for its improvement and working. This year we appropriate \$20,000 more for the improvement and working of the farm. I should like to know exactly what has been accomplished with the \$20,000 which we appropriated last year; and as this is an annual appropriation evidently, to go on year after year, and in the course of ten years will amount to some \$200,000 for the working of the farm, I should also like to know whether the Government is to realize anything from the farming operation carried on there, or whether they are simply to be for the benefit of the scientific development of farming.

I think it is really a question which the Senate ought to have some light upon. Probably, if I had read the reports of the Secretary of Agriculture, as I ought to have done, I might have known just what is going on; but I am sure the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry can explain it without any difficulty.

While the chairman is looking it up, I will say that I myself know a little something about farming. I was born on a farm and lived on and worked a farm until I was 21 years old; and from that standpoint, where we did not have any too much money to expend in working the farm and where we tried to make everything raised count, \$20,000 seems like quite a liberal sum annually for farming purposes.

Mr. GORMAN. I should like to call the attention of the Senator from Connecticut, if he will permit me, for a moment. The Senator made an inquiry a moment ago.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, House bill 14749, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. A bill (H. R. 14749) 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.

Mr. NELSON. I ask that the unfinished business be laid temporarily aside in order to continue the consideration of the appropriation bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Minnesota asks unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside.

Mr. HALE. Upon that I wish to say that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BEVERIDGE] who has charge of the statehood bill will be here in a few minutes, and if the request is agreed to I hope it will not be considered as in any way interfering with what he may desire with the statehood bill when he comes in. It is to be laid aside only temporarily.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It will be laid aside temporarily until the Senator in charge of the bill is present.

Mr. HALE. Yes.

Mr. PROCTOR. Very well.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair hears no objection.

Mr. GORMAN. The Senator from Connecticut called attention a moment since to a matter to which I wish to refer. He asked some explanation of the Senator in charge of the bill as to why it is that the appropriations made in the bill as reported to the Senate from the committee amount to about \$360,000 more than the estimates of the Department. It is a very extraordinary condition for an appropriation bill of this or any other kind.

I understood the Senator in charge of the bill, the distinguished Senator from Vermont, to say that it was accounted for by the fact that there were over \$400,000 included in this

bill for the Forestry Division, which has been recently transferred to the Agricultural Department.

Upon an examination of the Book of Estimates I find that the whole amount estimated for the Forestry Division has been included in the Book of Estimates and, therefore, I desire to call the attention of the Senator from Vermont to the fact that this increase of over \$400,000 above the estimates is not accounted for, in my judgment, by that item. It must be accounted for elsewhere, by appropriations that exceed the estimates of the Department.

The Senator will find upon page 100 of the Book of Estimates that for the officers, the forester and assistants, the estimate is \$37,140, and for experiments, incidental expenses, and so on, \$388,000, making \$425,140 for that Department. There must be some other explanation of this very large increase of \$400,000 over the estimates, and I should like to have some statement from the Senator as to what items in the bill exceed the estimate of the Department itself.

Mr. PROCTOR. Mr. President, I do not think there is a single item in the bill where our report makes a greater appropriation than the estimate. The addition by the transfer of the forest reserves is, as was stated before the committee, \$375,000. That will account, I think, for all the increase in any case above the estimate. We made other increases, as the report shows, of a limited amount, but not going above the estimate.

Mr. GORMAN. Mr. President, I call the Senator's attention to page 110 of the Book of Estimates. There he will find that the whole estimate of the Department as sent to Congress is \$6,419,810, and to make up that amount the whole appropriation for the Forestry Division is included. The Senator will find that on page 100 of the Book of Estimates, making \$425,140, and it is embraced in the estimates. So the increases must be upon items other than that.

Mr. President, while I am on my feet, as this matter has come up, I wish to call the attention of the Senate again, and I can do it properly, for I am not a member of the Committee on Agriculture, but as a Senator, to the fact that these appropriation bills having been distributed to the various committees of the body, with no central committee to scrutinize the estimates and to help to revise the bills after they are formed, it leads necessarily to great extravagance and to frequent duplication. I think it would be a safe estimate to say that \$50,000,000 ought to be saved and would be saved if these bills could meet as they ought to meet, and as until within a few years they have met, with the final scrutiny of one body of men in the two Houses, who would take into consideration all the estimates of appropriations as well as the revenues of the Government. You have or have had on the Appropriation Committees the most skilled men in the Government, who have grown up here and become familiar with every item, and who prevent duplication and extravagance.

I trust that now, when we are approaching a period where we will of necessity be compelled to scrutinize carefully, and much more carefully than in the past, the amounts placed in the hands of the various officers of the Government, the Senate may be brought back again to the former method, not in this Congress, but I trust in the coming Congress, so that every appropriation bill (save the one from the Committee on Commerce, which has always been considered there and could not be considered properly by any other committee) may have the final scrutiny of the Committee on Appropriations.

I think, sir, it is safe to say that no appropriation bill embraces so many new items which may be necessary and so much new legislation as the bill we are now considering, and when it comes before us in a form which carries on its face hundreds of thousands of dollars more than is estimated by the Department, which is presided over by a very distinguished and a very able man, who has performed a great work, and who has been also liberal enough with his Department, who has secured a sufficient amount to employ 2,000 or 3,000 scientists to investigate every subject on the face of the earth looking to the promotion of agriculture, we ought not at least to give him more than he asks.

I do not find from the statement of the Senator from Vermont a sufficient explanation for this increase.

Mr. PROCTOR. Mr. President, if the Senator will add the amount of the appropriation for the forest reserves—\$375,000—he will see that the bill carries less than the estimate of the Department. Now, in regard to what the Senator from Connecticut—

Mr. GORMAN. Right there, before the Senator leaves that point, for that is the crucial point, the Senator asks me to deduct the amount for the Forestry Division. But I call his attention to the Book of Estimates. On page 100 he will find that the Forestry Division of the Agricultural Department is

estimated for in detail—that is to say, for one forester who shall be chief of the Bureau, and assistants and clerks in his immediate department, \$37,140, and for the expenses of that division \$463,000, making \$500,140, and that \$500,140 is included in the total of \$6,419,810. Yet this bill carries on the face of it \$6,787,170.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Will the Senator permit me, Mr. President?

Mr. GORMAN. Certainly.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Do I understand that the expense of the forest reserves is estimated by the Secretary of Agriculture?

Mr. GORMAN. Yes. The Senator will find it in detail on page 100 of the Book of Estimates for the year ending June 30, 1906. As I have just stated to the Senator from Vermont, the whole amount for the Forestry Division is \$500,140, and that is included in the gross estimate of \$6,419,810. And yet this bill carries \$6,787,170. So that item does not account for the increase. I suggest to the Senator that there ought to be a statement—it does not appear in this report—showing what items have been increased beyond the estimates.

Mr. PROCTOR. As I have the figures, the estimate of the Department, without the estimate for the forest reserves, is \$6,419,810. Adding the \$375,000 that we have included in the forest reserves makes \$6,794,810, and that is slightly in excess of the amount carried by the bill.

Now, in response to the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PLATT], he will find on page 128 of the report of the Department of Agriculture some account of the work done on the Arlington experimental farm. He will also find on page 150 the plans of the Department for the future use of that farm.

Mr. SPOONER obtained the floor.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Will the Senator permit me to make an observation before he proceeds?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. SPOONER. Certainly.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. I am obliged to the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry for directing my attention to page 128 of the Annual Report of the Department of Agriculture. I there find that—

Investigations have been conducted at the Arlington farm by the office of the Agrostologist during the past season as follows: By Mr. C. R. Ball—tests of cowpeas, sorghums, pearl millets, phaseolus mungo, and silage crops.

Then it goes on to state what those tests were; but I am sure it does not require \$20,000 for that purpose. Perhaps if I had the opportunity to go more fully into this matter I might be able to find how the \$20,000 was expended, or, what seems to me a more pertinent inquiry perhaps, how are we ever going to derive any cash benefit from it to reimburse the Government for this \$20,000 a year spent on this farm?

Mr. President, I call attention once more to the fact that from the standpoint of a New England farmer \$20,000 seems to be a pretty liberal annual allowance for working a farm. I should like to be informed whether there are ever to be any returns from this farm to the Treasury of the United States, or whether it is to be all outgo at the rate of \$20,000 a year and no return whatever. I think that we ought to have some information on that subject. I find from this report that—

The work of amelioration and preparation of the soil at the Arlington farm has progressed sufficiently to admit of devoting extensive areas to the more important work of special crop studies; and from now on it will be the aim in the management of the farm to so arrange the work as to solve a number of the important problems connected with plant cultivation, plant propagation, and plant nutrition. In connection with the work of the truck growers and florists, it is intended to install suitable glass area and to arrange sufficient areas covered with canvas and cloth shade to study the influence of shade and protection upon the growth and development of such vegetable crops as lettuce, celery, radishes, beans, etc., which, when grown out of season, return large revenue from a small area.

Now, I want to know whether this lettuce and celery and these radishes and beans cultivated out of season are really to be sold in the markets of Washington or elsewhere and the money to be turned into the Treasury. I want to know what will become of that money, or whether those vegetables will be furnished to the tables of the Secretary of Agriculture and the other scientific gentlemen who are engaged in this work. I really think we ought to have some information on the subject. This report continues:

It is to be hoped that the facilities of the office may be so increased during the coming year—

This is what the \$20,000 is for, I suppose—

as to permit taking up some of the important problems of the truck growers and florists—

We have got a flower farm it seems. I wonder if they are to have a distributing store for flowers in the city of Washington,

or what they are to do with the flowers from the Agricultural Department—

which up to the present time the Department has been unable to touch upon because of lack of funds and facilities for the work.

Even with the \$20,000 they have, they say they can not go into the truck-growing business and the florist business for the lack of funds.

In view of the pressing necessity and demand for information in regard to the management of truck crops and the development of the trucking interests of the country, it is recommended that an appropriation of at least \$8,000 be granted to enable the Secretary to inaugurate investigations of the truck-crop interests of the United States.

The floricultural interests of the country are so widely distributed that no single State experiment station has felt justified in expending any considerable percentage of its limited income in solving the problems of the florist. The floricultural interests, too, are of such a nature that local soil and climatic conditions do not limit them as they do many other crop problems. The constant demand at this office for information in regard to the cultivation, propagation, and management of greenhouse crops renders it almost imperative that facilities be provided for investigating the many problems connected with the propagation, care, and management of greenhouse and forcing crops, as well as the construction and control of forcing structures. There is great necessity for improvement in the methods of heating and ventilating greenhouses.

I think, too, that the agriculturists, who are represented here by my friend from North Dakota [Mr. HANSBROUGH], who I see is very much interested in this bill, and is a member of the committee, will take kindly to the idea that they ought to be furnished with this information with regard to growing flowers and "the construction and control of forcing structures."

Mr. HANSBROUGH. They will be delighted.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. The report of the Secretary of Agriculture continues:

The coal strike of the year forced many growers to close their houses, while if suitable appliances were available for burning any one of the several cheap by-products of the oil refinery this condition might have been averted.

Because of the variety and the peculiar nature of the problems of the florists it is recommended that at least \$10,000 be appropriated to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to inaugurate investigations upon the propagation, growth, management, and improvement of florists' and forcing crops, and to erect, equip, and maintain such greenhouses or other structures as may be necessary in studying such problems, and to employ such experts, assistants, and laborers as may be required in carrying on such investigations. The more specialized character of work which each year becomes necessary in the management of the Arlington Farm demands a greater expenditure per acre under cultivation, as new and urgent problems are continually presented for solution; and in order that the work now in progress may be completed and that a few of the many new difficulties presented may each year be brought under consideration, it is respectfully recommended that at least \$25,000 be set aside for use at the Arlington farm.

I observe, and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. GORMAN] will be glad to observe, that this bill only appropriates \$20,000 for the Arlington farm, while the Secretary of Agriculture has asked for \$25,000. But the point that I rose to inquire about was, what is to become of all that is raised on this magnificent farm, for the running of which \$20,000 is to be expended each year? Is the United States to receive anything back for what is raised there?

Mr. TELLER. Experience.

Mr. SPOONER. Mr. President, do not the people of the United States receive in return information as to the results of experiments—information of value? We can not test the value to the people of an agricultural experiment farm by the financial results evidenced by the sale of its products in the market. In connection with the agricultural college of Wisconsin there is maintained a large and rather expensive experimental farm. They make there all manner of experiments. They try to raise by different methods various crops to see whether or not they can be raised in that latitude. Often it is demonstrated from their experiments that a given product can not be raised there, and in their bulletins they make that clear to the farmers of the State. That knowledge is worth something to the agriculturists of the State. The knowledge resulting from the scientific experiments given to the agriculturists of a region by bulletins is worth sometimes a vast amount of money, for it prevents mistakes by farmers and shows them what are the best crops to raise. It teaches them to do what, without such experiments made by scientific men, they could not do.

But I think my friend from Connecticut [Mr. PLATT] belittles the Arlington farm, underestimates its value, and misconceives somewhat its purpose—if I may say that, as I do, with the utmost deference—if he attempts to test its value by purely financial results. I do not know what is done on this farm, called the Arlington farm. I know nothing about its experiments or their scope or the value of their results; but I want to say one thing, Mr. President, and that has naught to do with this item or with any other item of this bill.

I wish to express my entire concurrence with the observations of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. GORMAN]—and they are of more practical importance to the people of the United States at large than anything contained in this bill—as to the unwisdom

of taking from the Appropriations Committee a considerable number of appropriation bills and distributing them among different committees of this body. When I say that, Mr. President, I do not in the slightest degree disparage the fidelity or the ability of the chairmen and members of the several committees which, by the action of the Senate a few years ago, acquired jurisdiction of a number of appropriation bills. There were members of the Appropriations Committee, including its chairman, men who had served many years on that committee, who had become familiar with every expenditure of the Government.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON] has devoted his legislative life largely to matters of appropriation, and his knowledge and experience thus acquired is of infinite value to the people of this country in the formulation of wise economies and with due regard not simply to this Department or that, but to the whole field of appropriations, to the end that the expenditures of the Government may be made with some regard to the receipts of the Government, but he sat silent when this distribution was made. Because of a sense of delicacy he did not feel at liberty to object.

I believe, in the general public interests, that distribution was a mistake. I believe experience has demonstrated it to have been a mistake. I agree with the Senator from Maryland, who has been long a member of this body, who served long on the Committee on Appropriations, and who has been accustomed with great care, as were the other members of that committee, including my friend from Colorado, who sits before me [Mr. TELLER], to look not simply to the demands of one Department, but to look to the demands of that Department with reference to the demands of other branches of the public service, and, looking the whole field over, they were able to give to each what, with due regard to the receipts of the Government, could properly be given without producing a deficit.

The tendency of the distribution of the appropriation bills has been to exaggerate and aggrandize, if I may use that word, the appropriations given each Department, because the committee would have to do only with the appropriation for one Department. They would take, of course, the estimates and analyze them. They would proceed with reference to the estimates, and then there would come down upon them from the Departments and from other directions demands for special appropriations, for an enlargement of this item, or that item, or the other item, which seemed meritorious enough in itself, but which ought not to be granted in its relation to the general aggregate expenditures of the Government.

The people are not niggardly; they wish the expenditures of the Government to be adequate; they are not in favor of parsimony, nor are they in favor of profligacy, nor are they in favor of making appropriations which the revenues of the Government are not adequate to meet. It was a mistake, in my opinion, to distribute the appropriation bills; and I believe the Senate could not do a greater service to the people at large than to enlarge the Committee on Appropriations, if it be necessary, so that there may be an adequate number of members to make a strong working subcommittee on each appropriation bill, and after the bills are drafted having them reviewed by the whole committee with reference not simply to the wishes but to the needs of each Department in its relation to the general annual expenditures of the Government.

It is the tendency of the Departments to seek new fields to conquer. The present Secretary of Agriculture is a great Secretary. We once had a great Secretary of Agriculture from my State—General Rusk, who is now dead. The present Secretary has had no superior, and, I venture to say, he will never have a superior; but there has been a constant tendency on the part of that Department—and I do not criticise him for it—to reach out and reach out and take to itself new subjects of jurisdiction, and, if the Senate yielded, I do not know what subjects within the next few years would not be within the jurisdiction of the Agricultural Department. They take in charge the investigation of food products of every description, the analysis of drugs, and the Lord only knows what else.

It is a conviction with me that the best interests of the Government would be served by putting these appropriation bills back into the hands of the general Appropriations Committee, enlarging it, as I have suggested, or if that be not done, to have the appropriation bills, when the various committees having them in charge shall have passed upon them, referred to the Committee on Appropriations that that committee may look them over with reference to a decision as to whether they do not in the aggregate exceed the revenues of the Government; but I am pretty well aware that that will not be done.

Mr. ELKINS. May I interrupt the Senator?

Mr. SPOONER. Yes.

Mr. ELKINS. Can not the various chairmen of these com-

mittees and the various committees now charged with these duties have regard to the receipts of the Government, as well as the Appropriations Committee?

Mr. SPOONER. Yes; they might.

Mr. ELKINS. Why do they not? Why can they not do so?

Mr. SPOONER. Do they?

Mr. ELKINS. I think they do.

Mr. SPOONER. I think they give special attention, and it is quite natural that they should, to the wants and needs of the particular Department with which the committee deals. I think the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry naturally would give great heed to the wants and needs and wishes of the Department of Agriculture. That is natural. I think it is not very natural that they should give due heed to the appropriations asked for by that Department in their relation to the revenues of the Government and to the annual appropriations carried in bills reported by other committees. I believe the tendency has been, and the result has been, to largely increase the appropriations of the Government each year.

Mr. ELKINS. Let me ask the Senator if it is the fact that since the appropriation bills have been distributed to the various committees the expenditures, outside of the ordinary increase that would come from an increase in business, have been increased? Is that a determined fact?

Mr. SPOONER. I understand it to be a fact.

Mr. ELKINS. I do not know that it has been ascertained. It is a very serious question. I think that it is open to debate, but the proposition to distribute the appropriation bills was determined here in the Senate.

Mr. SPOONER. I know it was, and the Senator was one of those who favored the distribution.

Mr. ELKINS. The various committees, I think, are intelligent. They are made up of men who have regard, and ought to have regard, to the receipts of the Government as the limitation upon expenditures. I think they can look carefully into these expenditures and give more time to the question than the general committee—the great Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. SPOONER. I think the Senator from West Virginia will find that since the distribution of the appropriation bills the tendency has been to increase the appropriations in each bill. Does the Senator say that I am wrong about that?

Mr. CLAY. I will ask the Senator, with his permission, is it not true that the Appropriations Committee now has charge of six or seven appropriation bills? I will ask further if the Senator has investigated the appropriations and can state whether or not any more economy has been observed in drafting appropriation bills by the Committee on Appropriations—and we know it is a great committee—than by the other committees having charge of the respective appropriation bills?

Mr. SPOONER. I think the general Appropriations Committee has been, since this distribution, as it always was before the distribution, exceedingly careful to keep the appropriations within the receipts of the Government. I think it is almost impossible to bring about such a result in the aggregate with these appropriation bills in the hands of half a dozen different committees. I think it would be a good thing—I may be wrong, and I am not reflecting upon committees or upon committeemen—if these appropriation bills were, before action by the Senate, submitted to the general Appropriations Committee with reference to the relation of the aggregate expenditures to the aggregate receipts of the Government.

Mr. CLAY. I will ask the Senator, then, if he knows of any instance, with the exception of one or two, since this division has been made, where a single appropriation bill has exceeded the estimates made by the Department?

Mr. SPOONER. I think there have been more than one or two such instances.

Mr. CLAY. I think, on investigation, the Senator will find he is incorrect.

Mr. SPOONER. I think not.

Mr. CLAY. I am sure he will.

Mr. SPOONER. Mr. President, I have only expressed my belief, which is in entire accord with the statement of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. GORMAN], and I will take the trouble to repeat that I do not expect to see the Senate send these bills back to the Committee on Appropriations, though I think it would be better for the people if that were done.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. Just a word, Mr. President, in regard to the bill—

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I have no desire to interfere,

but I just rise to inquire, as a matter of parliamentary practice, whether after one Senator has been recognized it is competent for the Chair to then recognize another Senator?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair had agreed to recognize the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. HANSBROUGH] to reply to the argument which has just been made, and the Chair will recognize the Senator from Virginia [Mr. MARTIN] immediately after.

Mr. MARTIN. It is perfectly agreeable to me, Mr. President. I desire to say that the Senator from North Dakota should be recognized at this time.

Mr. BAILEY. I assumed that it was entirely agreeable to the Senator from Virginia from the alacrity with which he resumed his seat, but I wanted to understand the procedure.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The reason the Chair recognized the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. HANSBROUGH] was that he had agreed to do so in order that that Senator might reply to a statement made by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. SPOONER].

Mr. HANSBROUGH. Mr. President, I do not know that I care to enter into an argument in reply to what the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. SPOONER] has said, although I am frank to say that I disagree with him totally and entirely.

I desire to say a few words in regard to the matter which we were discussing before this extraneous question came in. I refer to the remarks made by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PLATT] with respect to the distribution of the results attained by the Secretary of Agriculture at the experimental stations, particularly at the Arlington Experimental Farm. I do not know much about the Arlington farm, except that it is, in a general way, supposed to be an experimental station here near Washington under the direct supervision of the Secretary of Agriculture, where his officers and scientists may come directly in contact with growing things.

As I understand, the benefits coming from the agricultural experimental station at Arlington are largely in the form of bulletins and information derived as a result of the investigations and experimentations of the Agricultural Department. This information is distributed and disseminated among the farmers throughout the United States without respect to any particular locality or section, and I think it is conceded on all hands that this work has been beneficial to the great agricultural interests.

The Senator from Connecticut, in a facetious sort of way perhaps, said that the farmers of North Dakota, for instance, would not be much interested in the results of the investigations with respect to the growth of flowers on the Arlington Farm. Mr. President, I do not know that I ever saw a well-conducted farm anywhere, even in the State of Connecticut, where they did not have a flower garden and where the housewife was not interested in all kinds and all growths of flowers. So that I do not think the Senator from Connecticut can insist upon the position he took here that the farmers of North Dakota, or any other State, have not some artistic taste and a love for flowers.

Mr. President, while I am on my feet I wish to say a few words in regard to what the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. SPOONER] has said in respect of the distribution of appropriation bills. There are quite a number of Senators about me who will recall the quiet struggle many of us engaged in to bring about a distribution of the appropriation bills. Many of us were accustomed to sit here week after week and month after month waiting for the great Committee on Appropriations to bring in these bills. We had no voice in the matter. If we desired to amend an appropriation bill on the floor, a point of order would be raised against the amendment. Somehow the Senate rules—I do not say it has been done designedly—are in such condition that it is almost impossible to get anything new or unusual on an appropriation bill on the floor of the Senate. Since the appropriation bills have been distributed to the various committees having jurisdiction of the subjects to which the bills pertain, I find it is much easier to secure needed legislation by having amendments put on the bills in the committees.

So I do not think any harm has been done by the distribution of the appropriation bills. On the contrary, I think a great deal of good has been done. It has placed responsibility upon individual Senators, and that is what we came here for. We did not come here to sit in our places in this body and wait for two or three Senators—and I do not speak disparagingly or disrespectfully of them—to bring in the appropriation bills—these great measures carrying millions and millions of money in which we are all interested and in which the country is interested. We did not come here to wait for two or three men to do this work. We came here to assume our share of the responsibility. If we fail, then we are accountable to our constituents for that failure.

I think we have made great progress since the distribution of these bills, and I do not believe the volume of expenditure

in the country has been any greater since the distribution of the bills than before in proportion to the growth of the country and the demands of business generally.

I do not know that I care to say anything more in response to what the Senator said, except to say that so strong is the conviction here that we did the right thing that I very much doubt whether any attempt to put the bills back into the hands of one committee would succeed. If the Senator from Wisconsin were present, I would ask him how he would propose to regulate this matter in the House of Representatives.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President—
The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Maine?

Mr. HANSBROUGH. I will in a moment.
There all the appropriation bills originate, and there they are increased before they reach this body. I observe that the larger part of the growth in the volume of expenditures under these bills takes place in the House of Representatives. I think an examination of the record will justify that statement. So I would be glad to have the Senator from Wisconsin explain at some future time how he proposes to regulate that feature of the case by putting all the money bills in the hands of one committee.

Now I yield to the Senator from Maine.
Mr. HALE. I did not hear all that the Senator from North Dakota said, having been temporarily absent from the Chamber.

This discussion and these suggestions, whatever pertinence they may have, do not come from the Committee on Appropriations. That committee at present is a very busy committee in dealing with the subjects which remain with it—the large general bills, the deficiency bill, and the other bills that it considers; and I think I may say for the committee that it does not seek to change or interfere in the programme that was adopted some years ago.

I should say that probably an ideal committee, made large enough to act by subcommittees, to take charge of all the appropriations and to have in view the revenue, and to prune according to the resources of the Government, would bring about a more typically satisfactory result than to distribute the appropriation bills, if we could deal with them in an ideal way. But I do not think that is practicable, and I am bound to say that while these departmental committees have increased appropriations, the bills that they report to the Senate are not so largely increased as I supposed at one time they would be when those committees, instead of the Committee on Appropriations, considered the bills.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. I am very glad to hear the Senator make that statement.

Mr. HALE. I think they have given faithful attention to the subject, and while undoubtedly there is a tendency always to aggrandize the appropriations of the particular Department that it represents, I think that tendency has been kept down in a very considerable degree. I think the appropriations have undoubtedly been increased because of the subdivision, but not nearly to the extent that at one time I believed they would be. I think in that regard I have learned something from observation; and I do not think there is the slightest chance or likelihood that the Senate will change the rule that it then adopted, whatever truth there may be to some extent in the suggestion of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. GORMAN] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. SPOONER].

Mr. HANSBROUGH. I have been very much interested in what the Senator from Maine has said on this subject, because he speaks with a knowledge of the question that few of us have.

At the time the distribution was inaugurated we heard all sorts of dire predictions as to what the result would be; that we would bankrupt the Government and loot the Treasury. I think the word "loot" was used in the debate on this floor at the time.

I am very glad to hear the Senator from Maine state, as he has stated, that nothing of the kind has transpired, and I agree with him that there will be no change. On the contrary, so far as I am concerned, I should be glad to see others of the bills now in the hands of the Committee on Appropriations distributed to the committees having jurisdiction of particular questions. I do not know that that is going to be done. It will not be done very soon, I am quite sure.

But we all know that the Committee on Appropriations is, as the Senator from Maine has just said, a very hard-worked body, and that if the old system had gone on it would have been utterly impossible for the committee in its present size to deal with all the great appropriation bills.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I hardly suppose the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PLATT] expected the Senate to take seriously the inquiry he made as to what profits the Government

was realizing from its farming operations at the experimental farm on the Arlington estate. I have had the idea that agriculture formed a very small part of the industrial life of the State of Connecticut. I may have been mistaken in that, but I can not be mistaken in the idea that farming has certainly occupied a very small place in the life of the distinguished Senator from Connecticut.

He says that he is a practical farmer, but I am very sure if he had ever given any considerable thought to the subject of agriculture or had devoted any considerable part of his life to the consideration of that calling he would not have criticised this appropriation of \$20,000, a very small appropriation, for the maintenance of a great scientific agricultural station and experimental farm.

I will ask the Secretary to read section 2 and so much of section 3 as I have marked of the act of Congress which was approved on the 18th day of April, 1900, establishing this experimental farm and agricultural station on the Arlington estate, in order that the purposes for which this money is to be expended may be fully understood.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there is no objection the Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

SEC. 2. That the declared purpose of this act is to set apart said tract of land as a general experimental farm in its broadest sense, where all that pertains to agriculture in its several and different branches, including animal industry and horticulture, may be fostered and encouraged, and the practice and science of farming in the United States advanced, promoted, and practically illustrated.

SEC. 3. That the Secretary of Agriculture will take immediate and absolute control of said property described in section 1, and by clearing, underdraining, grassing, laying out proper roads and driveways, constructing proper bridges and buildings, and in other ways as his judgment may dictate bring said property as rapidly as possible into the proper condition to answer the purposes for which it is set apart.

Mr. MARTIN. The purposes indicated in that statute are very comprehensive, and the Secretary of Agriculture will be able to carry out the contemplated purposes only to a very limited extent when the appropriation made from year to year are as small as they have been and as small as is the one provided in this bill.

The object is to have a scientific experimental station, the results of those experiments to inure to the benefit of agriculture throughout this country. The bulletins which are periodically issued from the Department of Agriculture communicate to the country the result of these experiments, and those bulletins are of exceeding great value. They are a practical help to the practical farmer. I myself read them with great interest, and I am sure that no one, whether he be interested in farming from the standpoint of the amateur or from the standpoint of the practical farmer, can fail to find a great deal of benefit in them.

The object of the statute is, as I say, to maintain a station where experiments can be conducted and where scientific investigations can be carried on, the results of those experiments and of those investigations to be communicated to the people by bulletins from the Agricultural Department. I feel that this work has been done in a most excellent manner by the Secretary of Agriculture, and I believe there is no appropriation in the pending bill that will give more real practical benefit to the country than the \$20,000 provided in the clause under consideration.

Mr. TELLER and Mr. PLATT of Connecticut addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PERKINS in the chair). The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. TELLER. I will yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. I wish to say only a word.

Mr. President, I am very far from saying that scientific investigation and experiment along the lines of agriculture are unwise, but I do want to say, and I think the farmers of the United States agree with me, that they can be very much overdone, and are being overdone in the Agricultural Department at the present time. I do not care to discuss the matter, but I wanted to make that statement.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President, one reading this bill and seeing the great number of experiments that the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to enter upon might think that this Department of the Government were getting more than its share of labor even if it is not getting its full share of pay. Farming is an important branch of American industry. There are 10,500,000 farmers in the United States, according to the last census. That does not include the very many young men who are still living at home and working on farms. There are a good many things in the bill that to an old-fashioned man might seem rather comical and ridiculous, but they are rather harmless after all.

In 1862, owing to a pretty general demand in this country that something be done for the farmers, Congress passed a bill

establishing, by appropriation of public lands, certain agricultural colleges. Later it added to that in every State an experimental station. It limited the appropriation to \$15,000 a year. Most of those experimental stations have been connected with the agricultural colleges, so that the two have been doing the work together.

While it would seem as if the Department were reaching out and including a great many things, yet practically all of them are connected with agriculture, even the weather reports and the examination of soils, and the use of water for irrigation. All those things are important.

The appropriation for this Department is six millions and a half, I believe, in round numbers, without looking at the report. The other day we passed the fortifications appropriation bill, containing more in amount, I think, than does this bill, and then we followed it with \$70,000,000 in the army bill; and we will follow that in a few days with a hundred millions for the Navy; and even those sums will not begin to touch all the expenditures for war purposes, for defense or offense, as the case may be. I am not going to say at this time that they are not proper. I am only going to say we can afford this appropriation if we can afford any that we have made.

I do not complain that the Department wastes some money in investigations here and there which do not turn out to be profitable. The Department of Agriculture has done a good many things within the last few years that I know have inured to the benefit of the farmers. It has made some discoveries, I may say, and as long as the Department confines itself to matters of that kind, I do not think any State can complain of the violation of its sovereignty or its rights. As long as the Department confines itself to saying what kind of sirup we shall buy or how somebody can be taught to manufacture a better sirup than now; or how we may be instructed to raise a better kind of grass or wheat or oats or corn than we have been raising; how we can combat the destructive insects that are preying upon the orchards and the cotton fields, I do not feel very much alarmed about its invasion of the provinces of the State.

I think I know of some recent investigations by the Department that will turn out to be of very great value. I know some things that the Department is now trying to do, and if it succeeds the people will be benefited. I should like to name just one, although there are a dozen I could name.

Out in my country we are raising beets for sugar. Every beet seed ordinarily has a germ of from three to six plants, and after that seed is planted the time comes when somebody has to tear from the beet the surplus of plants. That is what we call the "thinning," and that is what makes trouble in beet raising and adds largely to the expense. The best illustration in the world of what can be done by breeding a plant is that of the case of the beet itself.

When Napoleon directed his great intellect toward producing sugar from beets in France and encouraged the industry, there was about 4 or 5 per cent of sugar in the beets. By breeding—that is, by taking the best beet and planting it, then planting the next best one, and so on—in the last hundred years or so we have gotten to a point where, in the State of Colorado, we have raised beets that are nearly one-third sugar, or almost that.

The Department says, and I believe it can do it, that it can raise in time a seed that will contain but one germ, one plant life, and then you can automatically drop your seeds in such a way that there will be no thinning required. That would save an immense amount to the farmers of the country. It would reduce the cost of sugar and increase our ability to supply ourselves with that article. Should the Department succeed in doing that, I believe in a few years we will be able to raise in the United States all the sugar that we need in this country. There is a growing demand for sugar, and it will continue to grow, of course, with the growth of population.

That a good deal of this appropriation may be wasted in experiments nobody will deny. That is true of all experiments, I do not care what they are. In every department of manufacture to which you may turn your attention there have been immense sums wasted in determining the best machinery and the most economical method of getting results. So it will be with this matter. They will waste some money, but what we shall get out of it will be worth more money to us than the two or three hundred million dollars that we shall expend every year in the appliances of war. I do not mean that we must not expend those sums, but this is an appropriation that comes nearer to the men who produce, who create in this country, than any other appropriation that we make.

Mr. HEYBURN. Mr. President, the experiments that have been undertaken by the Agricultural Department with a view of determining the advantage of certain processes of fertilizing sugar beets have resulted within the last two years in an average increase of more than a ton of beets per acre; that is

about 25 per cent of an increase, due solely to the processes of fertilization that have been developed and applied through the experiments provided for in the pending bill.

Not only have they increased the production of sugar beets to that extent, but through the same class of experiments, with reference to the production of seed of the highest quality, they have added another 25 per cent to the value of the sugar-beet crop of the United States.

Close upon the borders of the State of Idaho, in Spokane County, in the State of Washington, is perhaps the largest enterprise for the production of sugar-beet seed in the United States. The seeds, known as the "Morrison seeds," are raised upon the land of Colonel Morrison, in Spokane County, in the State of Washington. The experiments have been carried on largely in cooperation with the Agricultural Department of the United States, and while a few years ago we depended upon German sugar-beet seed we now can supply practically all the sugar-beet seed required in this country, entirely resulting from the encouragement and assistance and cooperation of the Agricultural Department of the United States.

This increase in the production of sugar alone means millions of dollars to the people of this country. More than that, it is building up an industry purely American, which will result in a short time in enabling us to produce all of the sugar we consume, which is one of the principal items of consumption of the American people to-day. Practically the entire credit for this advance in the development of this industry is due to the experiments that are contemplated and provided for in the bill under consideration.

One hundred and twenty-five thousand dollars is to be appropriated for the purpose of carrying on this class of experiments. It is returned to the people twentyfold every year in the growing industry of sugar-beet raising that results naturally from these experiments. It would be false economy to reduce this appropriation. It might very well, with profit to the people of the country, not only to those engaged in producing sugar, but to those who consume it, be multiplied instead of being decreased or adversely criticised.

Within the State of Idaho there has, within the last four years, been invested perhaps six or eight million dollars in the establishment of sugar-beet enterprises, in the preparation of land, in bringing under cultivation for this purpose land that had lain idle before this industry was developed. It is due in large measure to the assistance that has been given by the Government. Instead of a product of from 14 to 16 per cent of saccharine matter in the beets under the old system of cultivation before the Government interested itself in this question, they now produce from 20 to 25 per cent, and even more than that, of saccharine matter in the beets. The saccharine in the beets comes from the sun and not from the soil, but the process of fertilization regulates the season of the year at which the crop is harvested, and it makes a material difference whether the sugar beet is harvested in one month or in some other month.

The sugar industry is one of the greatest industries in the country, reckoned in dollars and cents, and as an industry in which the people are directly interested it stands in the very first rank for consideration. And when we have the opportunity here, with the experience of the Agricultural Department as our guide, with the results unquestioned, it seems to me that it would be poor policy, false economy, to attack an appropriation made for the purpose of maintaining and pushing forward and extending these experiments, both in the production of the beet by increasing the character of the seed and where a large proportion of the expense of raising sugar beets lies in the thinning of them. The seed germinates in a peculiar way, and it is impossible to so distribute it over or through the ground that the crop can be raised without the weeding or thinning process.

The Department has directed its attention and those who are cooperating with the Department are directing their attention to the production of seeds that will germinate a single plant of the very highest grade or quality. Under this system, which has been inaugurated and is being encouraged by the Department, they are making experiments along these lines with splendid results. When the beet is growing they go through the field and select and mark the beets of the highest character for seed. The beet seed does not germinate the first year's growth. Those beets are taken up and preserved according to an approved system for the next year's planting. They are then planted out and produce the seed that germinates and produces the crop.

Now, that present development is the result of these experiments which the Government is carrying on, and we might very well extend help to this Department to a greater extent than is proposed by this bill in order that this industry may grow.

Until a short time ago we brought all our seed from abroad, and no one thought of planting any sugar-beet seed except the German seed. Yet to-day we are driving the German seed out of the market for two reasons—first, because our seed is peculiarly adapted to our soil, and, second, because our seed results in a product that produces at least 30 per cent more saccharine matter than the German seed.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, it has been my intention to say something in regard to the paragraph about the purchase and distribution of seeds which follows immediately upon the one now under discussion, but I have been informed that there are Senators who desire to speak upon the statehood bill. I had assumed that this bill was going on simply because no one did desire to speak on that bill. Of course, it is the understanding of the Senate that the statehood bill has the right of way at all times, and if there are Senators who desire to discuss that bill I think we ought to return to it without a moment's delay, in observance of the unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. GORMAN. I think that is quite right.

Mr. BATE. I did not understand what the Senator from Massachusetts said.

Mr. PATTERSON. He said if anyone wants to discuss the statehood bill he should be permitted to go on.

Mr. BATE. I have no objection to that course.

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. President, that was the understanding when the unanimous-consent agreement was adopted, but I discovered a little while ago that the Senator from Tennessee and a few other Senators on this side labored under the impression that the appropriation bills, unless by unanimous consent, would put everything else aside. So I spoke to the Senator from Massachusetts, and his views coincided with mine. I understand there are several Senators on this side who were ready at least at 2 o'clock to proceed upon the statehood bill, and I suppose they are ready to proceed yet.

Mr. LODGE. The unanimous-consent agreement does not contain the very common clause about being subject to appropriation bills. I certainly understood the unanimous-consent agreement to mean that all the time should be given to the statehood bill and that appropriation bills should only be considered when Senators did not desire to go on with the statehood bill.

Mr. PROCTOR. There was no misunderstanding on my part about that. I expected to give way at any time when there was any Senator who wished to be heard on the statehood bill.

Mr. BATE. I understood that we were to go on with the appropriation bill until the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BEVERIDGE] got back. He has gone somewhere, it seems, and is out of his place. The Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE] has been waiting to speak all day, but he stepped out of the Chamber just a few minutes ago. We had better perhaps wait and go on with the appropriation bill until the Senator from Missouri comes back.

Mr. PROCTOR. I will give way at any time when any Senator who wishes to speak on the statehood bill is ready.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Unanimous consent was given until such time as the Senator having charge of the unfinished business should be present. There was no intention of interfering with the statehood bill. The original unanimous-consent agreement will supersede the appropriation bill, if Senators desire it.

Mr. PROCTOR. Mr. President, for a partial and hasty answer to what was said by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. SPOONER], I think if he will go back to the time when the appropriation bills were distributed he will find that there is no bill that has increased in a less percentage than the bill now under discussion, the agricultural appropriation bill. When I came into the Senate thirteen years ago the annual appropriation for this Department was a trifle over \$3,000,000. It has now reached a little over \$6,000,000, and when you reckon the percentage for thirteen years, you will see that it is a very small increase by the annual increment, while other bills have gone up with great bounds. This has not yet reached the cost by a million dollars of a single battle ship equipped for service, and battle ships do not return any profit, I believe, to the Government, while this bill does in two ways. It returns a great profit by the reduction of losses from diseases of animals and plants and a direct profit, on the other hand, by the development of new methods of cultivation and new plants.

I have nothing to say against the order of the Senate being rescinded and the appropriation bills going back to the Committee on Appropriations. I am not going to discuss that matter. I will merely say that a great many times I have personally wished that they were back there, but until they are I propose to do the very best I can to keep within reasonable bounds,

and I think the bills I have had the honor to report have been kept within reasonable bounds.

The increase of the appropriation for the Department of Agriculture certainly has not been in any such proportion as the development of our country in agriculture and in industrial enterprises of all kinds.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will continue the reading of the bill.

The reading of the bill was resumed at page 29, line 4, and continued to line 21, page 32, the last paragraph read being the appropriation for the "purchase and distribution of valuable seeds."

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I do not suppose there is very much use in entering a protest against a practice which it is as impossible to change or defeat as anything that can well be conceived. At the same time I should like to make some protest, as I have in the past once or twice, however vain, in regard to the provision for the purchase and distribution of what are facetiously called "valuable seeds."

No one can think more highly of the work of the Agricultural Department than I do. I think it has saved the people of this country millions of dollars and has been of enormous value, and to no one are we more indebted than to the present Secretary of Agriculture. But the present Secretary is not responsible for the clause to which I am now addressing myself. It comes down, moss-grown, from many years back. It began with the modest and very intelligent purpose of encouraging the domestication of foreign plants and seeds, and the introduction of new and valuable varieties of plants into the United States. It has changed into giving a vast amount of cheap common seeds to a proportion of the constituents of each Member of the other House of Congress and each Senator. The cause, on its face and in all its provisions, is a humbug. There is a certain ingenuousness about the statements. It begins by saying:

For the purchase, propagation, testing, and distribution of valuable seeds, etc., \$242,920.

We find that \$202,000 is to be spent in seeds given to Members of the other House of Congress and to Senators for distribution among their constituents. But the pretense is kept up throughout the paragraph. At the bottom of page 30, it says:

and the person receiving such seeds shall be requested to inform the Department of the results of the experiments therewith.

That is, the constituents to whom these seeds are sent shall tell us how they get on growing petunias, or how the turnip seeds we sent them have flourished, and other rare and valuable plants that they have been trying experiments with; for all we do for the mass is to distribute common seeds purchased by the Government from seed dealers and given away to a very small percentage of the people of the United States. The newspapers and the people of the United States at large regard the Congressional distribution of seeds as a joke, and it is treated as a jest, but it is a jest that costs the people of the United States \$200,000 a year.

We hear a good deal said about paternalism. There never was a greater instance of it than taking the money of the people and buying seeds and giving those seeds to a small portion of the people. People like to receive seeds; it is a pleasant thing to send them out; and so attractive is the appropriation that the strict constructionist vies with the liberal constructionist of the Constitution in voting this extraordinary appropriation year after year. There are no party lines upon it, and yet it is doing something that I venture to say is not attempted in any other direction—to take the money of the people, buy seed or anything else, and give it at the wish of Congressmen and Senators to a small percentage of the people. We know the seeds that are sent out. The present Secretary has made an effort, I think, to get Congressmen and Senators to distribute some valuable things in the way of cuttings and trees.

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. LODGE. Certainly.

Mr. PATTERSON. Do I understand the Senator from Massachusetts to say that the seeds which are annually distributed are purchased by the Government from seed dealers, and that they are not the product of fields under the direction of the Secretary of Agriculture?

Mr. LODGE. I have not looked in the past year, but I know they have bought them of seed dealers within a very short time, and I think they still do it. They are not grown by the Government.

Mr. PROCTOR. They are purchased by contract.

Mr. LODGE. Precisely.

Mr. PROCTOR. From the lowest bidder.

Mr. LODGE. They are furnished by seed dealers by a contract, under bids. They are not Government seeds. They are the common turnip seeds and flower seeds that you can buy in any shop. They are furnished under contract and distributed, and the great mass of them, as the Senator well knows, if he has ever taken the trouble to look at the labels, are the commonest kind of garden and flower seeds. They are nothing in the world but a free gift; that is all.

Mr. PATTERSON. The popular impression is, and I think that is the general belief which justifies the procedure, that the seeds, as a rule, are rare and valuable seeds; that they are distributed because of their unusual qualities, and that they are Government seeds in no other sense than that they have simply been bought with Government money. I do not believe that the public at large understand that the Secretary of Agriculture goes into the market and, under the contract or competitive system, purchases these different kinds of seeds, to be subsequently distributed under the franks of Members of Congress. I do not believe that is the general understanding at all.

Mr. LODGE. If the Senator from Colorado will allow me—
Mr. PATTERSON. I am simply inquiring for information, for I was not aware of the fact.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator had not read the bill any more carefully than I read it, but the Senator from California [Mr. BARR] calls my attention to the fact that what is done appears on the face of the bill:

And the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby directed to expend the said sum, as nearly as practicable, in the purchase, testing, and distribution of such valuable seeds, bulbs, shrubs, vines, cuttings, and plants, the best he can obtain at a public or private sale.

They are furnished, as the Senator from Vermont says, by contract, and always have been, ever since I have known anything about it, and they and the mass of them are the common flower and vegetable seeds that can be bought in any country grocery or anywhere throughout the United States. It is nothing but a gift. It does not improve the culture of a single flower or a single plant.

Mr. PATTERSON. I think the criticism of the Senator from Massachusetts is very well taken under those circumstances, because the method of distribution is not one that is well adapted to the giving of the seeds to the needy or to those who will better use them. It becomes a matter of favoritism—

Mr. LODGE. Purely.

Mr. PATTERSON. More than anything else; and those receive the seeds who may make no use of them, or who may make a poor use of them, while those who do not receive seeds as a rule would stand most in need of the beneficence. I think the criticism of the Senator from Massachusetts is exceedingly well founded under those circumstances.

Mr. LODGE. If the Senator will turn to page 32 he will see there exactly what is the real amount appropriated for a purpose that we all commend.

Mr. BACON. If the Senator will pardon me, there may be entire accuracy in what he states as to the manner in which these seeds are procured—

Mr. LODGE. That is stated in the bill.

Mr. BACON. Speaking generally, but it is not true as to all seeds. I happen to know that in the case of cotton seed, where there is a very considerable advantage in having improved varieties—

Mr. LODGE. If the Senator would have allowed me to finish my sentence, I was coming to that.

Mr. BACON. If the Senator will allow me to add one word, I will simply state the fact. I was about to mention—I know that in such cases the Secretary of Agriculture does exercise great diligence in securing the most approved and improved varieties of cotton seed for distribution, in order that such improved varieties may be generally adopted throughout the country and that those engaged in that industry may generally have the advantage of the results of the experiments and efforts which have been made by different cultivators in the improvement of their seed; and I have no doubt, while I am not informed as to other matters, that there are other kinds of seeds as to which improved varieties are very much desired and are diligently sought after by the Department and of which the public in that way get the benefit and advantage.

Mr. LODGE. Of this total appropriation of \$242,000, \$202,000 is for seeds for Congressional distribution. Of the remaining sum, \$37,780 is to be used by the Secretary of Agriculture for collection, purchase, test, propagation, and distribution of rare and valuable seeds, bulbs, trees, plants, etc., from foreign countries or from our possessions for the purpose of domestication here. That is an excellent appropriation, to which nobody can object. But out of that \$10,000 is carved to make a seed warehouse for mailing seeds for Congressional distribution, so that

the Secretary of Agriculture has \$27,000 for the introduction of foreign seeds and plants and for experiments with them, which is what the whole appropriation was originally founded upon.

Mr. STEWART. If the Senator will allow me, would it not be useful not only to collect seeds from foreign countries but, our own being such a large country, to also provide for the collection of seeds in certain sections where improved plants and seeds have been produced? The whole of the appropriation should be directed not only to the collection of foreign seeds, but also to making collections from sections of our own country of such seeds as people are desirous of experimenting with in other sections. To my certain knowledge with an appropriation of but \$40,000 much is being done along that line.

Mr. LODGE. I have not the least doubt of the truth of what the Senator from Nevada [Mr. STEWART] says. With an appropriation of \$27,000 for making experiments with foreign seeds, plants, and cuttings, and with an additional appropriation for making similar experiments with seeds, plants, and cuttings the product of different portions of our great country, where the climatic conditions vary enormously, I have not the least doubt that the Secretary of Agriculture could accomplish results that would be of immense value. If this was confined to the Secretary of Agriculture taking plants, seeds, and cuttings from foreign countries and from different portions of the United States and sending them to individuals and to experiment stations in the various States, I have not the least doubt there would be great good done, and that it would be a valuable thing. But what I object to, and what I have objected to in the past, though entirely in vain, is to the taking of \$200,000 for the distribution of turnip seeds, the common seeds that are bought from and furnished by the seedsmen of the country under contract, and purchased of the lowest bidder. That does not advance agriculture; that does not give us a single new plant; that does not help at all. That is simply a pleasant gift for us to make to some of our constituents. That is all there is in it.

We might as well look at this question fairly, so as to understand just what we are doing. We are, and have been year after year, appropriating the public money in order to enable us to give seeds to some of our constituents. We like to do it; and that is the reason the appropriation goes through. I want to say a word, Mr. President, on that point. I do not know exactly how much is spent among seedsmen in buying seeds, but it runs up apparently to the sum of \$200,000. This is a year of economy—

Mr. LATIMER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. LODGE. Yes, sir.

Mr. LATIMER. Before the Senator moves off from the point he has just been discussing, I want to ask if he referred a few moments ago to the authority given the Secretary of Agriculture to purchase improved seeds in foreign countries?

Mr. LODGE. Yes. That was a special appropriation.

Mr. LATIMER. I want to ask the Senator if he does not believe that it would be just as beneficial to agriculture in the United States for the Secretary of Agriculture to buy improved and rare varieties of seeds that are produced in any State of the Union as it would be to buy seeds in foreign countries and bring them here?

Mr. LODGE. I have just said I did in answer to the Senator from Nevada [Mr. STEWART].

Mr. LATIMER. Then the next question is—

Mr. LODGE. What I object to is the Congressional distribution.

Mr. LATIMER. Then how would you distribute?

Mr. LODGE. I would have the Secretary of Agriculture do it. He is in touch with every part of the country; he knows the men to whom he can send plants, shrubs, and cuttings for experiment; and he will get some reports.

It is said that it is expected that the people to whom seeds are sent will make reports. As I have said, how many reports are received from the people about the growth of petunias, pinks, carnations, or some common flower? Those are what we send out. I would let the Secretary of Agriculture distribute the seeds. It would not then cost one-fourth of what it costs now, and we should get very much better results.

Mr. LATIMER. I should like to ask the Senator if he does not believe that the American people get as much out of this appropriation as out of any other appropriation made by the Federal Government?

Mr. LODGE. I think a very small percentage of the American people get some seeds out of it. The distribution is not universal.

Mr. LATIMER. I do not know whether it was the Senator from Massachusetts or some other Senator who, speaking in

regard to agriculture, admitted that our great wealth came from that source. This is encouraging the people along the line of agriculture.

Mr. LODGE. No; it is not. Our agricultural wealth does not come from flowers that are planted in seed boxes in city districts.

Mr. LATIMER. I thought you were discussing turnip seeds?

Mr. LODGE. Well, as to turnip seeds, why should we furnish some of our farmers with turnip seeds and not furnish all? You are not experimenting with turnip seeds. The nominal purpose of this appropriation is to improve American agriculture and to make agricultural experiments. Why should we take \$200,000 with which to buy common seeds of seedsmen and give them to a small percentage of the American people? As I have already said, strict constructionists and liberal constructionists, Democrats and Republicans alike, we all vote for such appropriations. That is merely taking the public money and giving it in the form of seeds to a percentage of the American people, and only a very small percentage.

Mr. LATIMER. I want to say to the Senator that in the distribution of rare and improved varieties of seeds, varieties that are grown in New England are rare and improved varieties in certain other sections of the country, and that the distribution of those seeds through Congressional agencies, taking the seeds that are grown in certain sections of the country and sending them to certain other sections of the country, has been the cause of great improvement in farming.

Mr. LODGE. That is an excellent thing; but the Senator does not send out rare and valuable seeds. He sends out, and I send out, common garden seeds bought of seedsmen.

Mr. LATIMER. It is the duty of the Secretary of Agriculture, under this clause and under the original appropriation, to buy the best seeds that are in the market.

Mr. LODGE. I did not say that he did not buy good seed.

Mr. LATIMER. We have a provision regarding the distribution of seeds in the different States, and no man can estimate the great benefits to agriculture that have come from such distribution as has been heretofore made.

Mr. PERKINS. Will the Senator from Massachusetts permit me to read an extract from the report of the Secretary of Agriculture?

Mr. LODGE. Yes.

Mr. PERKINS. The Secretary in his report says:

The work is now all under the direct supervision of efficient officers of the Bureau of Plant Industry. Every effort is being made to improve the quality of the seed by securing pure stocks. Extensive work is being conducted in the matter of a critical study of varieties under different conditions of soil and climate. Testing gardens for this purpose have been established in a number of localities, and the work is under the supervision of a thoroughly competent expert horticulturist. Every effort is being made to encourage home seed growing. Practically all of the vegetable seed now distributed by the Department is grown in the United States.

A few years ago nearly all the flower seed, except sweet peas, was imported. Now fully 75 per cent is grown here, through the encouragement offered by the Department in this work. A special effort is put forth in the matter of distributing promising varieties of cotton, tobacco, forage crop, and other seed. The cotton experts of the Bureau have been constantly at work securing new and desirable sorts wherever they have been found in connection with the other cotton investigations. The results of this continuous distribution of improved strains are already beginning to show in a number of sections of the South.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I do not deny one word of that. That is the work of the Agricultural Department. It is well done; and undoubtedly it is giving us new plants, improved seeds, improved cuttings, and all that, and it is helping agriculture. But what I was referring to are these millions of little packages of common seeds that are sent out under our franks to anybody who asks for them, which are simply given away. They do not improve agriculture; they are not of the slightest value. All this talk about improving agriculture in that way is merely the ancient, respectable, time-worn pretense under which we were given power to scatter seeds among our constituents.

Mr. President, we hear a great deal about economy; but I observe that when it comes down to making absolute economies in detail they do not appear to be so generally liked as when they are confined to the general statement of their need. This bill is nearly a million dollars more than the bill of last year, and it is more than the estimates of the Department.

Mr. PROCTOR. I beg the Senator's pardon, it is not.

Mr. LODGE. Well, I take the Senator's own figures. The estimates of the Department for 1906 were \$6,419,810. The bill as it comes to the Senate from the committee is \$6,787,170. If that is not more than the estimates, then I do not know—

Mr. HANSBROUGH. It is not a million more.

Mr. LODGE. I did not say it was. I say that within \$100,000 it is a million dollars more than the appropriation for last

year. That is not economy, at all events. It is not only a million dollars more than was appropriated last year, but it is more than the estimates of the Department for this year. Now, I do not say, and I have not said, that it is not necessary.

Mr. PROCTOR. I beg the Senator's pardon. He is mistaken in his figures.

Mr. LODGE. Then the Senator's own figures are mistaken. The amount of the estimates for 1906 was \$6,419,810; the amount reported to us by the House committee is \$6,204,710; the amount of the bill as passed by the House is \$6,580,430; the amount as recommended by the Senate committee is \$6,787,170. If \$6,787,170 is not more than \$6,419,810, then my knowledge of figures is even less than I supposed it to be.

Mr. PROCTOR. The Senator has made this mistake: The estimate for the forest reserve division was not included in the general estimate. That has increased the aggregate of the appropriations.

Mr. LODGE. That is the Senator's explanation, Mr. President—

Mr. DIETRICH. Mr. President—

Mr. LODGE. One moment, please.

That is the Senator's explanation of the reason why the appropriations are increased, but that does not appear—

Mr. DIETRICH. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. PROCTOR. It does appear, for there was an estimate for the forest reserve division under the Interior Department, which has been transferred to the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. LODGE. How much was the estimate for the forest reserve division?

Mr. PROCTOR. The estimate was \$375,000.

Mr. DIETRICH. Mr. President—

Mr. LODGE. Wait one moment.

The appropriation for the forest reserve as given in the report of the committee on this bill is \$875,140. Was not that estimated for?

Mr. PROCTOR. There was an estimate of something in the neighborhood of \$500,000 for the original forest service, which has always been in the Department of Agriculture. The addition of nearly \$400,000 is for the transfer from the Interior Department of the forest reserve division.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President—

Mr. GORMAN. Will the Senator from Massachusetts permit me to interrupt him a moment right there on the very point he is making and that I made a few moments ago?

Mr. LODGE. I yield to the Senator with great pleasure.

Mr. GORMAN. The appropriation contained in this bill for the forest service is nearly \$400,000 more than the estimates sent in by the Department.

Mr. LODGE. That is what I gathered from the Senator's statement.

Mr. GORMAN. Precisely; and therefore the bill, as it stands to-day, is an increase over the estimates.

Mr. LODGE. Precisely.

Mr. GORMAN. There may have been a supplemental estimate made by the Department, or a request, but it is not contained under the heading of the Agricultural Department in the estimates that come to Congress regularly in the Book of Estimates, which have to pass the scrutiny of the Treasury Department. That Department has supervision of the estimates of all the Departments, and it cuts down the estimates so as to bring them within the revenues, if possible. Now, the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry in the Senate have simply increased by three or four hundred thousand dollars that estimate.

Mr. PROCTOR. Mr. President, the estimate for the forest service in the Department of Agriculture, before the passage of the bill transferring the forestry reserve from the Interior Department, was, in round numbers, \$500,000. When that transfer was made an appropriation was necessarily included for that service, amounting to \$375,000. That accounts for all the increase in that appropriation.

Mr. DIETRICH. Mr. President—

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I believe I still have the floor; at least I did not intend to yield.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Massachusetts has the floor.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, taking the figures of the Senator from Vermont, it then leaves the bill as it comes from the Senate committee, carrying \$6,412,000, the estimates being \$6,419,000; that is, it is equal to the estimates, if it is not increased by the appropriation consequent upon the transfer of the forest reserve division. But the appropriation on that account increases the amount, as I said, and it is an increase

over the estimates. The Senator has explained why it is increased; but explaining why it is increased does not prove that it is not increased.

Mr. PROCTOR. I should like to say to the Senator that there is no increase on the service estimated for. The increase is for a service entirely outside of and that did not belong to the Agricultural Department at all, but which is made necessary by the transfer from the Interior Department of the forest reserve division.

Mr. LODGE. Then would not this appropriation of \$375,000, representing the increase, have been made in the sundry civil bill? If so, where is the amount saved?

Mr. HALE. In the appropriations for the Interior Department.

Mr. LODGE. In the sundry civil bill?

Mr. HALE. In the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill.

Mr. PROCTOR. It is deducted from the amount appropriated for the Interior Department and transferred to the appropriations for the Agricultural Department.

Mr. LODGE. But leaving out the \$375,000, the appropriations proposed by the Senate committee make the total \$6,412,000, as compared with the estimates of \$6,419,000, and nearly a million dollars more than was provided last year for the expenditures of the Agricultural Department.

Mr. President, I do not want to be misunderstood. I do not mean to say that a single one of these appropriations or additions is improper. I am not at all sure that they are not all needed. I am not an expert in these matters, and I have great faith in the work the Secretary of Agriculture is doing; but I do say when we come to the question of the Congressional distribution of seeds, something which affects ourselves—it does not affect the working of the Department at all; it does not affect the public service; it would not cripple the public service or hurt the country in the least if the free distribution of seeds were cut off—I do say that it is a good place to begin to economize.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. LODGE. Certainly.

Mr. BAILEY. I rose to ask the Senator from Massachusetts if the amendment which he proposes or suggests, or intends to propose or suggest, will simply dispense with the free distribution of the ordinary commercial kind of seeds, and yet leave the Department with power to provide the rare and unusual kind?

Mr. LODGE. That is all I should propose, and all I should think of proposing.

Mr. BAILEY. I myself should support such an amendment with great pleasure. I am not able, begging the Senator's pardon for the interruption—

Mr. LODGE. Certainly.

Mr. BAILEY. To explain why the Government should furnish the average citizen with seeds to plant his garden any more than with implements to work it.

Mr. LODGE. Precisely. They are exactly the same.

Mr. BAILEY. If there be rare and unusual seeds—and that was the original purpose of this provision—

Mr. LODGE. Precisely.

Mr. BAILEY. I think it entirely proper, safe, and desirable that the Government should secure a general distribution of them. Possibly there could be no fairer way than to provide for their distribution through Senators and Representatives, thus insuring that they go to all the districts; but this modern practice of using the Government to scatter "seeds of kindness," as it were, among our constituents should not, in my judgment, commend itself to any thoughtful representative.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, the Senator will see, if he reflects a moment, that if we confine the distribution to valuable plants, whether we send them through Senators and Representatives or not, the number will be so few that they will not be particularly attractive as a form of Congressional distribution. They may improve agriculture.

Mr. BAILEY. I agree with the Senator; and yet I would rather spend \$400,000, providing a wider distribution of the right kind of seeds—

Mr. LODGE. So should I.

Mr. BAILEY. Than to spend \$200,000 distributing the ordinary seeds, to save our constituents the expense of buying them.

Mr. HALE. Let me ask the Senator a question.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Maine?

Mr. LODGE. Certainly.

Mr. HALE. Let me ask if this is not the practical and actual

operation of the general distribution of common seeds: That the common seeds which are sown in the spring by the farmers and gardeners are generally purchased at seed houses, or of the grocers, and paid for? The Government, by this appropriation, is spending \$200,000 in purchasing seeds of the same parties, of the same great seed houses, and is sending them to a few—and they are very few—people.

Mr. BAILEY. And the same kind of seeds.

Mr. HALE. The same kind of seeds that my constituents buy in the groceries or seed stores of Maine. It is not an improved seed; it is not claimed to be an improved seed; it is claimed to be a good seed, and nineteen out of twenty of my constituents who buy them get the same kind of seed that the other one gets who sends for them. They are just the same, and it does not in any way affect the distribution of the other class of seeds that are experimental and for which there is a small appropriation which is intended to improve seeds. Is not that the whole situation?

Mr. LODGE. That is the whole situation, as I understand it.

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. LODGE. Certainly.

Mr. PATTERSON. I want to reenforce what the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] has said by a quotation from a paragraph of the bill. The quotation is as follows:

And such seeds so purchased shall include a variety of vegetable and flower seeds suitable for planting and culture in the various sections of the United States.

Mr. LODGE. That is the whole thing.

Mr. PATTERSON. That is all there is about it. Are they suitable for planting and culture in one district or in one State or another State? If they are, the Secretary of Agriculture is to expend so much of this money as he desires to supply Senators and Representatives with that class of seeds.

Mr. LODGE. Certainly. Confine it to the rare and valuable seeds; confine it to a plant from a foreign country that you want to try or a plant from one State that you want to try in another, and I have no objection to the appropriation of whatever sum is thought proper by the Department and the committee. But I do say, Mr. President, that it is with very doubtful power that we make this distribution, and I do think that the distribution of common seeds under the paragraph the Senator from Colorado [Mr. PATTERSON] has just read is a sheer waste of the public money and that it does not improve agriculture.

Mr. LATIMER. Mr. President—

Mr. LODGE. I should like to go on. I have tried to yield to interruptions. I will be through in a moment.

I have no desire to cripple the Department. I am ready to vote all the appropriations that can properly be given and that they properly need. I want to encourage them in every way; but I do think that an appropriation like this is a sheer waste of the public money.

We hear continual talk about the Navy; that we ought to cut the Navy down. It is said that is the place to economize. From my point of view, Mr. President, that is the cheapest money that we spend. I listened to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROCTOR] when he said that the whole amount carried by the agricultural appropriation bill would hardly more than build a battle ship, and a battle ship yielded no return. According to my theory, Mr. President, the battle ships of the American Navy yield the return of the peace of the United States, and in one month of war all the wealth, great as it is, which the Agricultural Department has been enabled to add to this country would be swept away.

I am not in favor of undue economy at any point. I do not believe it is wise economy to scale down the appropriations for the District of Columbia as we have been cutting down their appropriations. We are cutting the appropriations for the District service to the bone, because it is an easy place to economize. Here is a place to economize where nobody is affected except members of the two Houses. Not a human being would be hurt by stopping the distribution of the seeds and common plants mentioned on page 30 of the bill.

Mr. BERRY. Will the Senator permit me to interrupt him?

Mr. LODGE. Certainly.

Mr. BERRY. I simply want to make a brief statement. It seems that the Senator from Massachusetts is in favor of every other appropriation except this one. He wants a large navy, and he wants his section of the country to be thoroughly well provided for.

Mr. LODGE. I do, and I want to provide for the District of Columbia thoroughly, too.

Mr. BERRY. In my judgment, these seeds go to thousands

and tens of thousands of people in the agricultural districts of this nation who never receive directly or indirectly one dollar or one cent from this Government in any other way whatever. They want these seeds; they write for them; they plant them, and seek to improve agriculture, and, in my candid opinion, as the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. LATIMER] said, no one can estimate the great benefits that flow from their distribution.

I say, again, the Senator favors a bill for the Navy which, I understand, will carry \$100,000,000 this year.

Mr. LODGE. I hope so.

Mr. BERRY. The Senator says that is all right; he is very much in favor of that. Of course that money is expended in the section from which he comes; but he objects to this small item which is for the benefit of the poor farmers throughout the hills and hollows of the agricultural States of this Union. Then he tells us that he wants larger appropriations for the District of Columbia; but he objects to this appropriation of \$200,000. I think he is unreasonable; I do not think it is quite fair.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, if I may be allowed to finish what I was saying—

Mr. BERRY. Certainly. I thought the Senator had yielded; otherwise I should not have said what I did.

Mr. LODGE. I did yield, but the Senator broke in on me with a speech before I had finished what I had to say.

Mr. BERRY. I did not want to take the Senator's time, and would not have done so had he not yielded to me.

Mr. LODGE. I mentioned the Navy and I mentioned the District of Columbia, but I think it ungenerous for the Senator to say that I mentioned the Navy because it affects my State. The benefit my State gets from building of ships amounts to little or nothing.

I do not believe in crippling and cutting down the appropriations for river and harbor improvements, and the Senator's State receives more benefit from the river and harbor bill than any State in the Union. We are cutting our river and harbor improvements; it is proposed that we should not provide for any additional public buildings, although I know they are needed in many places, and yet here is \$200,000 given away in seeds.

The Senator says the distribution of seeds pleases thousands of people. How about the thousands of people who do not receive seeds; who could not use them if they did? There are thousands of my constituents who live in cities and to whom they are of no use whatever. It would gratify them very much to be each given a watch. Why should they not have it, in order to improve the watchmaking industry of the country? They are just as much entitled to it as the other people are entitled to receive common garden seeds. That is my point.

Mr. BERRY. I will ask the Senator why it is we give to the men engaged in the fisheries up in his country so much money out of the Treasury every year? You might just as well give the people of another section a watch, as you say, as to appropriate the money which is appropriated to his people and to his constituents and which is a direct gift out of the Treasury.

Mr. LODGE. We do not give the fishermen of the United States one dollar.

Mr. BERRY. You give—

Mr. LODGE. There is a bill proposing to give them something.

Mr. BERRY. Yes; there is a law—the tariff law—that gives them advantages which it does not give to any other section of the country.

Mr. LODGE. Oh, Mr. President—

Mr. BERRY. The Senator knows it; and the bill that he has reported and which is on the Calendar proposes to give them so much money directly out of the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. LODGE. It does. It follows Thomas Jefferson's plan of giving bounties to the fishermen, and I think it a sound policy for other reasons which it is not necessary to discuss now. I think it is of value to the general defense of the country.

Mr. President, unfortunately a bill proposed is not a law. There is nothing given to the fishermen to-day—not one dollar. There is nothing given to any of the seafaring people that I know of—not a single dollar. Theirs is the one interest in this country which has not had protection for years. All the others have had it. It is an unfortunate instance to select the seafaring man as being engaged in a protected industry, for it is the only industry I know of which is not protected. But it is not a question of tariff. It is not a question of locality. This continual cry, "Your State gets the benefit of this; your State gets the benefit of that"—

Mr. BERRY. Will the Senator permit me?

Mr. LODGE. In one moment. I should like to finish my sentence.

Mr. BERRY. Very well.

Mr. LODGE. I should not refer to the river and harbor bill and throw it up against the Senator from Arkansas that his State probably gets more money out of the river and harbor bill, owing to the great Mississippi River improvements, than any other State. I vote for that bill because I think it is good for the whole country, and I vote for the naval bill on the same basis, because I believe it is for the advantage of the entire country. I think it is to the advantage of the United States to be properly liberal with the District; I think it is proper for the United States to be properly liberal in regard to public buildings, and I think it is proper to be liberal with the Agricultural Department. There is not an appropriation there that I want to cut down or vote against.

Mr. BERRY. Now will the Senator permit me?

Mr. LODGE. But I come back to this one matter. This is our own thing. It is we who give out these seeds, not to all our people, but to part of our people. It is we who get the benefit of it, and if we are going to enter on general economies—cutting down on rivers and harbors, cutting down on the Navy, cutting down on the Army, cutting down on the District—let us pass a self-denying ordinance and cut off our own little pleasure of sending some flower and vegetable seeds to a small percentage of our constituents.

Mr. BERRY. Now will the Senator permit me?

Mr. LODGE. Certainly. I yield the floor entirely.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. President, the Senator from Massachusetts says he dislikes the mention of localities. He was the first to mention the Navy. He was the first to mention the District of Columbia.

Mr. LODGE. May I ask the Senator if he regards the Navy as local?

Mr. BERRY. Very much local, so far as the expenditure of money goes.

Mr. LODGE. Does the Senator think that is all there is to the Navy?

Mr. BERRY. Oh, no; I think there is a great deal more than that to it. Then the Senator mentioned the District of Columbia, and said he was afraid it was going to suffer by reason of the reduction of appropriations.

Mr. LODGE. I think it is.

Mr. BERRY. Thereupon I, following his example, mentioned other interests and other localities.

Mr. President, I wish to say simply a word in regard to rivers and harbors, which the Senator has twice mentioned. In my judgment the river and harbor appropriations are more evenly distributed in all the localities of the United States than those of any other of the supply bills that go out from Congress. I will take this occasion to say—and in what I am going to say I do not intend to reflect on any locality, because it occurs in the nature and character of things and their surroundings and can not be avoided, perhaps—that the vast expenditures made for the Navy and for the Army and for every other purpose, save and except for rivers and harbors, are, to a large extent, made and distributed in one particular section of the country.

I do not complain of it because, as I said, it can not be otherwise, perhaps, but I do not think it is quite fair always to be referring, whenever we speak about such subjects, to the river and harbor bill, because the section from which I come does not get any more, if it gets that, than what results from a full and fair distribution and what it is entitled to by reason of the great rivers and harbors in that section of the country.

I repeat, I think it is more evenly, more justly, and more fairly distributed than any other appropriation. But it is not true that my State gets any more than the due proportion, to which she is entitled by reason of the great river that runs along our eastern border and the numerous other rivers within the State.

Mr. LODGE. If the Senator from Arkansas had not, I thought rather ungenerously, intimated that my support of the naval bill was due to the fact that much of the money expended under it was spent in my State, I certainly should not have alluded as I did to the river and harbor bill, for I think they are both national measures, and I do not favor unreasonable economies in either of them. But in regard to the naval bill, it would not alter my opinion about the need of a great navy if not one dollar was spent in my State. As a matter of fact most of the money that is spent on the United States Navy is spent in Pennsylvania and Virginia, in the great yards on the Delaware and the great yards at Newport News. It does not trouble me that there is so much money spent in Newport News for the American Navy. I am glad of it. I am glad that the State of Virginia has a great yard and is able to take that great share.

I do not think the distribution of the appropriation is the way to consider it. There is only one way to consider it, as I look at it, and that is whether it is of value to the whole country, to

the valley of the Mississippi, to the Atlantic coast, to the Pacific coast. My only plea has been that here is a thing which it would not hurt anybody to cut down.

Mr. LATIMER. Mr. President, I desire to make my position clear in regard to the question we are discussing—the distribution of seeds.

I served in the other body about ten years before I came here, and this question was constantly up there. I took the position then, and I believe now, that the best way to distribute the seeds would be to give, through the Agricultural Department, to each experiment station—and we have one in every State in the Union—improved varieties of seed that we get from foreign countries or in the different States of the Union. We should allow the experiment stations to determine what seeds are suited to the soil and climate of the different States, and those that are valuable could be distributed through the experiment station, and in that way we would take it away from the Representatives and Senators. That was my position in the House of Representatives. It is my position now.

When you get seeds in Pennsylvania and send them to South Carolina, for instance, they are not adapted to the latter's climate and soil. If you will send improved varieties of seeds to the experimental station in South Carolina and let that station grow those seeds and give the station the franking privilege, so that it may send the seeds out to the farmers of that State who may desire them, it will remove this discussion from Congress each year. But we have not been able to pass a bill of that kind. Constantly gentlemen like the Senator from Massachusetts stand upon the floor of the Senate and upon the floor of the House and denounce these appropriations for the distribution of seeds which go out to the poor farmers in every section of the country. As I said a few moments ago, it brings back greater remuneration in the shape of wealth to the American people than any other similar sum of money, in my judgment, that is appropriated by the Government.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I want to state a fact before I take my seat. We spend on these common vegetable and garden seeds \$101,000. Forty-nine thousand dollars of the appropriation goes to a firm in my State. I merely cite to the Senator from Arkansas, when he thinks I want to economize only on other people, the fact that my State gets \$50,000 of this appropriation.

Mr. BERRY. You can always rely on Massachusetts. She will get everything she can.

Mr. LODGE. I am glad she does; but at least the figures show that when I attack seed distribution I am not attacking it because it benefits somebody else and does not come to my State.

Mr. PETTUS. Mr. President, I desire to call attention to the part of the bill under consideration. I think there is an entire misapprehension as to what it is for. The Senator from Colorado went down into the middle of the section and said, "Here is all of it." I read:

And such seeds so purchased shall include a variety of vegetable and flower seeds suitable for planting and culture in the various sections of the United States.

He said that was all there was of it. The Senator from Massachusetts, as I understand, desires that we should select only valuable seeds. If this section had been read as a whole, instead of being criticised, he would have found that it provides exactly what he wants in some respects.

Mr. LODGE. The section was read.

Mr. PETTUS (reading):

For the purchase, propagation, testing, and distribution of valuable seeds, bulbs, trees, shrubs, vines, cuttings, and plants—

That is the introduction of it, and various other purposes are stated—

And the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby directed to expend the said sum, as nearly as practicable, in the purchase, testing, and distribution of such valuable seeds, bulbs, shrubs, vines, cuttings, and plants, the best he can obtain at a public or private sale, and such as shall be suitable for the respective localities to which the same are to be apportioned, and in which same are to be distributed as hereinafter stated.

Mr. President, I believe that that provides for as valuable an investment as has been made by any appropriation bill that has passed this body. I think some farmer ought to get up here and explain this transaction. I do not happen to be one myself, but I have had considerable observation of the value of the distribution of seeds, of which there is so much complaint.

It sometimes happens that we have a Secretary of Agriculture who is not in sympathy with this appropriation. It sometimes happens that we get a lawyer in that office, and he thinks the Department might as well distribute law books as seeds. It has happened, as I have been informed, that one of the Secretaries of Agriculture went down to Richmond and bought cotton seed by the ton, without any reference to what it was,

where it was raised, or what it was fit for, and distributed it all over the cotton-growing country. A man who would do that ought to be impeached for gross misconduct in his office and willful neglect of duty.

But the man we have now as Secretary of Agriculture is a farmer. He understands what this law was made for, and he has, so far as my information goes, devoted his time and his talents to discovering what valuable seeds ought to be distributed. He has devoted his time and attention to ascertaining what can be properly grown in one section and what can not be properly grown in another; and he complies with the law. He sends no cotton seed to Maine. I do not know whether he has a nutmeg seed or not. But he sends the seed where they will do good. He sends valuable seed. In other words, the officer whom we have as Secretary of Agriculture now is a man who tries to be Secretary of Agriculture. He tries to discharge the duties of that office; and he has done more good, I suspect, in that office than all the men who have preceded him, because he understands the business. I would not put a lawyer there, even though he came from Texas. He would administer the office honestly—there is no doubt about that; but he would do it very poorly.

Mr. President, just think of it for a moment. What is the purpose of distributing valuable seeds and bulbs, and flowers, too? Do you all forget your country raising? Do you suppose a farmer ought not to have flowers in his yard? You forget your youth if you do not forget your raising. We young men remember the flowers that we saw. Do you not remember the box that stood on the cabin front porch? Do you not remember the violets that grew in that box? Senators, do not forget what you once knew. Do not forget when you were better, if not wiser, than you are now. But practically, and as a matter of profit and as a matter of furnishing food to the people, this is one of the most valuable sections that you have in the law when it is administered by such a man as is the present Secretary.

We used to eat "mushmelons," as we call them, that long [indicating]; a red pumpkin, as it were. Now one of the greatest luxuries and one of the best foods in America is the nutmeg melon, cultivated all over the United States. It will grow almost anywhere, though our country is the best for it. It is the most elegant food that can be found, as wholesome as oranges and as abundant for a few weeks. Do you think the people of the United States are not benefited by such cultivation? Those melon seeds are distributed all over the United States by the Agricultural Department.

There are a thousand such things. When you were a boy you used to have a tomato about as big as the end of your thumb. In our country they grew in great abundance. We ate them. They were good food, although they were not very palatable. By reason of the distribution of those seeds all over the United States you can not go into a neighborhood without finding, at the proper season, that fine food, and, as the doctors say, the best medicine in the world, scattered all over the country.

I do not want to take the time of the Senate in discussing this question. I say it is the most valuable appropriation that you can find on the statute books.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, I ask leave of the Senate to present a proposed amendment to the pending bill, which I ask may be read, in order that it may be printed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

Amend by inserting, on page 54, at the end of line 17, after the word "month," the following words: "And in the case of the cotton crop reports issued on the 3d, 10th, 17th, and 25th days of each month."

Amend further by inserting, on page 55, in line 2, after the word "Columbia:"

"And provided further, That in the case of the cotton crop the Secretary of Agriculture shall issue, at least semiweekly, a summary report of the information received by the Department upon which the Department makes the periodical estimates of conditions of said cotton crop."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be printed.

Mr. PROCTOR. Mr. President, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] hardly stated fairly the increase in this appropriation. It is a half million in round numbers—\$509,000 increase for the Department of Agriculture as it stands. The remaining increase of nearly \$400,000 is for the transfer of the bureau referred to from the Interior Department.

In reference to the seed business, it may be paradoxical, but I in a large measure agree with both sides of this discussion. I agree with the Senator from Massachusetts that the distribution of mere ordinary commercial seeds is a humbug. It is a cheap chromo. I might call it a hoary-headed humbug. It is

entitled only to the respect that age gives to all things and persons.

I have tried in every way since I have been on this committee to keep that appropriation as low as possible, and I wish to say that the Department has constantly worked in the direction of getting rid of the mere commercial-seed matter and to turn the appropriation into the distribution of valuable seeds. A seed of a valuable variety may be common in one section of the country, and unknown in another section of the country which is suited for its cultivation. The Department sends out specifications very carefully prepared, with the very best statistics from all sections of the country, and it asks for particular varieties, and that branch of this appropriation has been constantly increasing. So I think this \$200,000 can not fairly be called an appropriation for the distribution of mere common commercial seeds. I believe a very large part of it might fairly come under the designation of rare and valuable seeds.

Now, Mr. President, I have not tried seriously on the floor or in the committee for some time to reduce this appropriation. Some years ago there was an effort in that direction, and it resulted in an increase, and I thought much the safest way was not to undertake to discuss the matter, but leave it as it was, and perhaps that course might not open the door for any discussion and possible change in it. I have thought that gradually and with considerable rapidity, by the work of the Department, the distribution would be changed to that of rare and valuable seeds.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I wish to say a word about the matter of the distribution of seed.

I think the argument is certainly far from a fair one when it presupposes that the Secretary of Agriculture, when he wants timothy seed, simply advertises for timothy seed, and when he wants peas, advertises for so many pounds of pea seed, and so on with the different seeds. I have reason to believe that he first investigates certain sections where certain varieties of pea or timothy or clover or any other kind of seed has been carefully raised and propagated, and where he finds an exceedingly good product from those seeds. He then advertises for seed of that particular character, and those seeds are first tried to determine whether they are adapted to the State of Minnesota or North Dakota or any other one of our agricultural States, and if it is found that they are so adapted, then seeds of that character are sent out.

Referring to the great order of some forty-odd thousand dollars that is filled in the State of Massachusetts, the people in the State of Massachusetts who raise those seeds have been engaged for years in producing the highest type of product. Therefore, when they are sent out to the other States they produce a better product than those States had generally produced before. As I look over the conditions agriculturally in my own State, in the State of Minnesota, where I spent my early boyhood, and remember the character of the vegetables we had at that time, and remember the rapid advancement and development in the line of vegetable products in the entire Northwest in the last twenty years, I can say fairly and candidly that the advance has been made almost wholly through the efforts of the Agricultural Department. In the State of Minnesota, for instance, we used to raise the old sorghum cane. We afterwards got cane seed, through the Agricultural Department, from South Carolina and from other States where they had perfected that product, and we have a much-improved article there since those seeds have been used.

I can say so of lettuce; I can say so of the pea. We used to have a lettuce that we raised in our gardens, a mere green vegetable without anything except that it was of such a nature that it could be cut up to be used upon the table. But to-day we have a quality of lettuce that is a hundredfold better than that which we raised twenty and twenty-five years ago.

It does not make any difference to me whether those seeds come by being advertised for, whether they have been propagated in a Government garden, or whether they have been propagated somewhere else, provided they are a better variety than what has been raised before in our own State. As a matter of fact we are getting a better variety of vegetables every day, and the same is true of the flowers in our gardens. They are superior to-day simply because year after year, under the test of the Agricultural Department, we have had flowers that grow more profusely, that are more intense and beautiful in their coloring, until they have supplanted the flowers of our childhood.

Mr. President, I can not recall a single instance in which the seeds which have been sent to my State have not proven to be better seeds than we have used before. I looked at some rutabagas a short time ago that were raised in my State, the seed of which I myself sent and which was furnished by the Agri-

cultural Department. I must say that in size and in quality they were far superior to anything I had ever seen before. Now, I do not know where the seed came from; I do not know whether it was propagated in a Government garden or otherwise; but I do know that it was better than that which we have had before.

I am not pleading for any poor farmers. Our farmers are not poor. Not a single one of them is poor. They can buy their seeds. They are able to do that. But they do not always know where to go to get the right kind of seed. They believe in supporting the Agricultural Department, because that Department tells them where to get it, and it has furnished them with the peculiar kind that they want, and which is adapted to our own State.

Mr. President, if this little appropriation of \$200,000 is properly and intelligently utilized by the Secretary of the Department of Agriculture, resulting benefits must necessarily follow in the future as they have come in the past.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, as I listened to the speech of my distinguished friend from Alabama [Mr. PERRUS], and then the speech of my distinguished friend from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER], I marveled what would have become of the agricultural and gardening interests of the United States if our predecessors had neglected to establish the Agricultural Department. I suppose we would have still been eating tomatoes the size of your thumb, as described by the Senator from Alabama, and probably planting seeds that would not germinate, as described by the Senator from North Dakota.

I am not one of the men who believe that all the progress made in this world depends upon either the favor or the patronage of a government. I believe that no more baleful doctrine can be taught the people of the United States than to tell them that their only hope of progress is asking either the gifts or the guidance of the Federal Government.

The original spirit and purpose of this provision was that if there was some rare seed grown in other lands, under climatic conditions similar to certain parts of our own country, the Government might experiment with such. In this way the Government has introduced some useful improvements in respect to plants and seeds. But what I object to in this distribution under the uniform practice is that a small part of the money is applied to the purchase of seeds that may be rare and are valuable, and the balance of it is applied to the purchase of the same kind of cabbage and turnip seed that you can buy at any cross-roads grocery in the land. I protest that it is neither within the province of the Government nor within the spirit of the original law that men should be supplied with what they can easily and conveniently purchase.

Now, if the Department will take this whole appropriation and buy the best seed that can be bought and only the seeds that are both rare and valuable, or seeds that are valuable and not easily purchased, it might be defensible. The Senator from North Dakota intimates that so common a seed as timothy ought to be provided by the Government; that because the timothy seed in one State might be better than the timothy seed in another, the Government should become a commission merchant to supply the farmer with the best quality of seed. If the Senator from North Dakota knows as much about farming as my friend from Alabama—

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

Mr. BAILEY. Certainly.

Mr. McCUMBER. My position is simply that the Government can well afford to send out a few packages of seed to be tested in Wisconsin or Minnesota or North Dakota, and if they prove a great success then those who use them will raise their own seed therefrom—not that the Department shall supply them at all times with all of the seed that can be used, any more than it should buy our seed wheat, but that the Department should introduce into the several sections, in small quantities, certain products that can be raised with advantage, and with great advantage, in that section—using and utilizing the specialized knowledge of the Department for that purpose, and not that the Secretary of Agriculture should be the commission merchant who would furnish to the farmers all their timothy seed or other seed.

Mr. BAILEY. Now, Mr. President, that statement brings the Senator and myself very much nearer to an agreement. I should not object, indeed I should very cheerfully vote, to have the Government purchase rare and valuable seed. The Senator knows that there is as much difference between corn seed as there is between men; that there is as much difference between corn seed as between horses.

Mr. McCUMBER. Is it not a fact that the Secretary only purchases the most valuable of the corn seed? If he wants to

propagate a sweet corn, he investigates and ascertains what variety of sweet corn is the best adapted to the soil and climate, and that which has the greatest amount of saccharine in it, or whatever may be necessary to make a good, palatable article. That is the kind he secures, and not any kind of cheap sweet corn. Is not that true?

Mr. BAILEY. I do not understand that to be the practice; but even if it were it hardly brings the case within the Government's proper province. Here, I understand, would be a legitimate exercise of this power. If, either by accident or by patient and scientific application of a certain principle, a farmer, either in this country or in any other country, should produce a particular seed, rare and valuable, I believe the Government might buy a large or small (and I think the larger the better) quantity of that seed and introduce it for general use, the purpose being there not to supply the given man to whom the seed is sent, but to secure the general introduction and use of an improved variety. For instance, I send to the State of Illinois and buy a special corn seed. Certain men there are engaged almost entirely in producing seed corn as a business, and when you see the corn which they produce for seed it hardly resembles the ordinary corn cultivated in a haphazard manner.

Now, after purchasing some of it and finding it successful, I do just as any good neighbor would do with that which the Government furnished, I divide it among the neighbors. It is a question, of course, how long that seed will reproduce itself in perfection unless it is produced under circumstances similar to that under which it was grown to perfection. I have no objection to the Government doing that; and so far as the amount of the appropriation is concerned I do not complain. I believe the Government would better, infinitely better, spend this money in hunting good seed than in building the instruments and implements of war which my friend from Massachusetts so highly commends.

Mr. President, I am one of those people who years ago became imbued with the spirit that has made every State in this Union believe that the surest way for a man or a nation to involve himself or itself in a broil is to be exactly prepared for it. All the States of the Union have prohibited their citizens from carrying concealed weapons upon the theory that whenever a man is ready for a fight he is more than halfway apt to have it, and I think that is just as true of nations as it is of individuals. I think if nations, like men, had to pause and prepare for a conflict, the awful calamity of war would frequently be averted.

I do not subscribe to the doctrine that the money of this Government is well or wisely employed when building battle ships. I do subscribe to the doctrine, without reserve, that whenever the Government is trying to procure rare and valuable seed to be introduced for general use, it well applies the public money. What I object to, and what I protest against, is that the Government shall become a seed broker and distribute them to our constituents as a matter of Congressional favor. That is not within the province of the Government.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Mr. President, I do not think I would have said anything on this subject of the distribution of seeds if it had not been for the pleasant allusion of my genial, distinguished, and youthful colleague from Alabama [Mr. PERRUS], whom I value very much regard. I think that to all his other excellent qualities he adds that of mind reading, because I certainly agree with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. BAILEY] and other Senators who think that there is a misuse of the public money in the seed distribution as it is now carried on.

It is quite true that originally this appropriation was confined to the procuring of new, rare, and valuable seeds for distribution throughout the country for the purpose of seeing if their cultivation could not be introduced in those sections of the country. That was the original act. I have not the language of it by me, but I remember what the original act was. That was the purpose of the act, and it was a very creditable, proper, and useful expenditure of money.

The chairman of the committee who has this bill in charge thinks, as we do, that there has been a departure from the original purpose of this expenditure; that it is no longer, except in a very small degree, an expenditure for the purpose of new or rare or specially valuable seeds to be distributed throughout the United States, to observe what their growth will be in different localities, but it has come to be largely the purchase of the ordinary seeds which are sold in the stores and at the cross-roads of the United States.

Mr. PROCTOR. What I intended to say was that there had been a very wide departure, indeed, but that we were gradually getting back to what was the original purpose, and I think the

quickest way to settle the matter right is to leave it with the Department of Agriculture, which is working earnestly to get back to the original design of the appropriation.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Very gradually, Mr. President.

Mr. PROCTOR. Just as rapidly as possible.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Let us see what the Secretary says about it:

The enormous quantity of seed required for the regular distribution makes it impossible to use seed of new and rare varieties, because such seed is not on the market in sufficient quantity.

Now, let us see a little about this matter. I did not suppose it would be questioned that the great bulk of the seeds which are distributed are purchased by the Agricultural Department from the same wholesale dealers who supply the retail stores throughout the United States, and that you can buy in any retail store throughout the United States the same seeds which are sent out by the Agricultural Department; that is, the great bulk of them.

Mr. PROCTOR. They have sometimes been largely purchased from seed dealers, but at other times a large proportion of them have been purchased from men who planted the special varieties desired, and who were not seed dealers at all.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. That is a mere bagatelle. The great bulk of the seeds which are distributed throughout the country gratuitously are the same seeds which are purchased from wholesale dealers, and which persons not receiving them from the Government have to purchase in the retail seed stores. Now, let us see what this money is spent for.

Quantities of seeds purchased to put up the packets and packages sent out.

Beans, 5,910 bushels; corn, 4,609 bushels; peas, 2,483 bushels; beets, 86,045 pounds; cabbage, 3,155 pounds; corn salad—that may be rather a rare variety—5,559 pounds; cucumber, 15,921 pounds; lettuce—this improved lettuce that my friend from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] talks about—53,456 pounds; muskmelon—which my colleague from Alabama [Mr. PETTUS] talks about—2,982 pounds. I will not read it all. Parsnip, 8,970 pounds; radish—and I am sure it is not a new variety of radish—\$3,212 pounds; spinach, 12,762 pounds; watermelon—which my friend from Alabama thinks is such a blessing to the people to have the seeds of—41,033 pounds; sorghum seed—which so appeals to my friend from North Dakota—300 bushels; and I find that the entire expenditure for sorghum seed out of the appropriation of \$263,000 was \$550.

It is perfectly apparent, Mr. President—there is no use denying it, everybody knows it—that the great bulk of this appropriation is spent to purchase from wholesale dealers seeds of the ordinary varieties, the same as they sell to their customers, the retail dealers of seeds throughout the United States. I am not saying that there is none of the money expended for the distribution of rare and valuable and newly improved seeds, but the great bulk of it goes for just what is sold in the retail stores in the United States; and it can not be claimed that the Government is benefiting the farmer or gardener by the distribution of those seeds any more than it can be claimed that the wholesale raiser and dealer is also benefiting the Government by his work and the distribution of his seeds.

Now, that brings it just to this point: Are there a few men, farmers and gardeners, in the United States who are entitled to the generosity and favoritism of the Government as against other farmers and gardeners in the United States who do not happen to be on the list of a Member of the House of Representatives or a Senator for distribution? That is precisely the question, and I do not think, Mr. President, it is right. Everybody knows it is not right. And yet, as the chairman of the committee says, it is impossible to stop it.

Mr. President, I am not one of those who has ever had a list of constituents to whom to distribute vegetable seeds and flower seeds. I have not known what to do with the seeds that are sent me, and so I adopted the plan of dividing them up as equitably as I could and sending them to the different granges in Connecticut. The plan worked pretty well for one year and two years, and then the granges began to protest. Several of them said they would not take them from the office. They refused to take them, and I had to have the bags sent back here and disposed of in some other way. During this very session of Congress I presented to the Senate a memorial of one of the granges in Connecticut remonstrating against this practice. Notwithstanding the suggestion of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. MARTIN] a little while ago, I have a good many farmers among my constituents. We do practice agriculture in Connecticut to a limited extent.

Mr. PATTERSON. I am interested in the experience of the Senator from Connecticut in dealing with his garden seeds. I

should like to know what reasons were given by the grange that protested against the distribution of them in his State. That might throw some light upon the question.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Mr. President, I did not intend to go into that. There were two reasons given. One was that the seeds were not so good as they could buy from the regular dealers in their towns; they were not so new; they were two or three years behind the present market; and the second was the one to which I have been alluding, that they did not think a few people should receive the favor of the Government when it was not extended to all.

We all know how this is usually done. Some Member of the other House or some Senator sends out and gets a list of a few people in each town to which seeds are to be sent. I suppose the persons who receive those seeds with a frank of the Senator or the Representative upon them experience for the moment a kind of gratification that they have been remembered by their Representative or their Senator, but the great proportion of the people in the town or the county, or wherever it may be, who do not receive such seeds, think perhaps they have been neglected and that they ought to have been put upon the list. So I am not so sure, after all, that it is even a personal benefit to the Representative or the Senator to pick out a few of his constituents and favor them with free seeds from the Government, even though they do bear his frank.

Mr. TELLER. Will the Senator allow me to make a suggestion to him?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KEAN in the chair). Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Certainly.

Mr. TELLER. If the Senator has correctly stated the present conditions to which he objects, we might remove them by simply increasing the appropriation so that all of the people may participate.

Mr. BAILEY. Establish a Government commissary.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. I would say this: There would be something like equity in the distribution of the seeds if the appropriation was so increased that every farmer and every gardener in the United States would receive a package of free seeds from the Government. Then some of the arguments that have been made here as to the benefit of this system might be well founded.

Mr. LATIMER. Complaint still exists though now each Representative and Senator gets twelve or thirteen thousand packages. The same complaint was made in the House of Representatives about ten years ago. We were then getting 3,000 packages. That number was not sufficient to go around; it would not go over one county. When seeds were sent to a few people at each post-office, we received so many letters of complaint that Members of Congress went to work to increase the amount allowed. Now there is complaint because we have not got 25,000 packages instead of twelve or thirteen thousand.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. That illustrates, Mr. President, the absolute inconsistency and the arrant humbugism of this whole thing.

Mr. PROCTOR. I should like to have the reading of the bill continued to the end of the topic we have been discussing, going down to the provisions for the forest service, on page 32, and then I will yield for a motion to go into executive session or for an adjournment.

The reading of the bill was resumed, beginning at line 22 on page 32.

The next amendment of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was, on page 33, line 10, to increase the total appropriation for maintenance of the Bureau of Plant Industry from \$731,880 to \$776,880.

The amendment was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

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

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After eight minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 5 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, February 3, 1905, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 2, 1905.

CONSUL.

George E. Anderson, of Illinois, now consul at Hangchow, to be consul of the United States at Amoy, China, vice John H. Fesler, resigned.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY.

W. H. H. Llewellyn, of New Mexico, to be United States attorney for the district of New Mexico, vice William B. Childers, whose term will expire February 12, 1905.

TO BE PLACED UPON RETIRED LIST.

Col. David P. Heap, Corps of Engineers, to be placed on the retired list of the Army with the rank of brigadier-general from the date upon which he shall be retired from active service.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 2, 1905.

CONSUL.

James Johnston, of New Jersey, now consul-general at Hankau, to be consul of the United States at Algiers, Algeria.

POSTMASTERS.

FLORIDA.

W. C. Eddy to be postmaster at De Funiak Springs, in the county of Walton and State of Florida.

NEW YORK.

Ernest J. Robinson to be postmaster at Plattsburg, in the county of Clinton and State of New York.

WYOMING.

Willis F. Hoadley to be postmaster at Green River, in the county of Sweetwater and State of Wyoming.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, February 2, 1905.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. HENRY N. COUDEN, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou eternal, ever-living God, our Heavenly Father, who controlleth the destinies of men and of nations, continue, we beseech Thee, to preside over us that we may increase our intellectual, moral, and spiritual life, and thus become a potent factor in the civilized forces of the world, and so hasten the coming of Thy kingdom upon the earth; to this end quicken, we beseech Thee, the individual conscience and increase our moral responsibility.

We remember, O Lord, with anxiety and solicitude, this morning, the Members of this House who are dangerously ill. Be with them, O Lord, and increase their strength that they may overcome the inroads of disease and again become strong and well to fulfill their duties here and elsewhere. Minister unto them, and be with those of their friends who are anxious, and guide them and give them strength, and be a support to them now and always, in the name of Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

BONDS FROM AGENTS AND FACTORS FOR CUSTOMS DUTIES.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I desire to present a privileged report from the Committee on Ways and Means.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman desire the bill or the report to be read?

Mr. PAYNE. This is a privileged bill and I would like to have it considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the title.

The Clerk read as follows.

A bill (H. R. 16646) to amend section 2787 of the Revised Statutes of the United States.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I would like to know what it is.

Mr. PAYNE. If the gentleman will reserve his right to object, I will explain. This statute was passed March 2, 1799, and requires that whenever an agent or factor receipts for imported goods where duty is to be collected that agent or factor must give a bond in each case in the penal sum of not less than \$1,000. Under the growth of the express companies and railroads express companies very often act as agents of the consignee, and in every case they are required to give a bond of a thousand dollars, although the amount of the duty may be trivial, less than \$5. This bill amends that statute. In the first place, the Secretary of the Treasury may dispense with the bond where the value of the goods is less than \$100; then in all cases the bond shall be not less than \$100 and not more than twice the duties to be collected on the goods.

There is a further provision that any agent or factor may give a general bond covering all the cases, in such amount as the Secretary of the Treasury may approve, and the further

provision that when, after due diligence, this agent can not find the consignee to deliver the goods he shall be released pro tanto, upon making satisfactory proof to the Secretary of the Treasury. It is something that is very much needed, and is recommended by the Treasury Department and indorsed unanimously by the Committee on Ways and Means, both parties being well represented.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. What becomes of the goods when he can not find the consignee?

Mr. PAYNE. Then the goods are returned to the custom-house.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. This seems to be a very ancient statute. How is it that it has never been thus modified before?

Mr. PAYNE. The business of collecting duties through the agency of express companies has grown largely of late years. The agents have been complaining about it, but never have reached the point where they asked Congress to legislate. It has been a very burdensome thing, because each agent had to give a bond for a thousand dollars for every consignment of goods.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request to consider the bill in the House as in the Committee of the Whole? [After a pause.] The Chair hears no objection. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc. That section 2787 of the Revised Statutes of the United States be, and is hereby, amended so as to read as follows:

"SEC. 2787. Whenever any entry is made with the collector of any district of merchandise imported into the United States subject to duty by any agent, factor, or person, other than the person to whom it belongs or to whom it is ultimately consigned, the collector shall take a bond with surety from such agent, factor, or person in the penal sum of an amount equal to double the estimated duties, with condition that the actual owner or consignee of such merchandise shall deliver to the collector a full and correct account of the merchandise imported by him, or for him on his own account, or consigned to his care, in the same manner and form as required in respect to any entry previous to the landing of merchandise; which account shall be verified by a like oath, as in the case of an entry, to be taken and subscribed before any judge of the United States, or the judge of any court of record of a State, or before any collector of the customs, or before any properly qualified notary whose seal shall be attested by the clerk of the county in which he is resident, or before any notary public designated by the Secretary of the Treasury. In case of the payment of the duties at the time of entry by any factor or agent on the merchandise entered by him, the condition of the bond shall be to produce the account of the proper owner or consignee, verified in manner as before directed, within ninety days from the date of such bond.

The bond in no case shall be for less than \$100, and may not be required when the appraised value of the merchandise does not exceed \$100. In the event of failure to produce the declaration of the owner or ultimate consignee within the time herein prescribed the bond may be canceled, at the discretion of the Secretary of the Treasury, upon due proof that the factor or agent who entered the merchandise exercised proper diligence in the effort to fulfill the requirements of this act."

The Clerk read the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 18, strike out the word "appraised" and insert in lieu thereof the word "entered."

And at the end of the bill add:

"Provided, That with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, any agent, factor, or common carrier engaged in the entry of merchandise at the port of first arrival may give a general penal bond at said port for the production of the oaths of owners or ultimate consignees. Said bond shall be fixed by the Secretary of the Treasury at an amount sufficient in his opinion to cover all obligations to the United States that may accrue, and the record and cancellation of liabilities under said general bond shall be in accordance with such rules as he may prescribe."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill as amended.

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

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

BRIDGE ACROSS THE TUG AND LEVISA FORKS OF BIG SANDY RIVER.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 17935) authorizing the Louisa and Fort Gay Bridge Company, of Louisa, Ky., to erect a bridge across the Tug and Louisa forks of the Big Sandy River, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill at length.

The committee amendments were read.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

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

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

CHANGE OF LEVELS OF CERTAIN LAKES IN OREGON AND CALIFORNIA.

Mr. GILLETT of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 6312) providing for the construction of irrigation and reclamation works in certain lakes and rivers, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GILLETT of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House amendment in the nature of a substitute be read in lieu of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the Clerk will read the House amendment in the nature of a substitute.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized, in carrying out any irrigation project that may be undertaken by him under the terms and conditions of the national reclamation act and which may involve the changing of the levels of Lower or Little Klamath Lake, Tule or Rheit Lake, and Goose Lake, or any river or other body of water connected therewith, in the States of Oregon and California, to raise or lower the level of said lakes as may be necessary and to dispose of any lands which may come into the possession of the United States as a result thereof by cession of any State or otherwise under the terms and conditions of the national reclamation act.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

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

VIEWS OF MINORITY ON RAILROAD RATES.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that certain minority members of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may withdraw the report or views of those members of the minority, filed with the House the day before yesterday, for the purpose of making certain verbal alterations in the report, and also for the purpose of adding to the bill contained in the report an additional clause declaring private freight-car lines and refrigerator-car lines to be common carriers, and subjecting them to the provisions, requirements, and penalties of the interstate-commerce act and of the act in which the clause is embodied.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

Mr. SHACKLEFORD rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to withdraw the objection I entered to this request last evening.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, I rise to renew the objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin renews the objection.

CONDEMNED CANNON FOR ARMORY AT ST. PAUL, MINN.

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the following joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of a joint resolution, the title of which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 184) authorizing the Secretary of War to furnish a condemned cannon to the armory at St. Paul, Minn., to construct a memorial tablet.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and the Clerk will report the joint resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Secretary of War be, and is hereby, authorized to deliver to the armory board of the armory of the National Guards at St. Paul, Minn., if the same can be done without detriment to the public service, one condemned 12-pound bronze field gun, of a weight not to exceed 1,800 pounds, as he may deem proper, to be used in the erection and construction of a memorial tablet in said armory to commemorate the sacrifices of the various members of the military organizations using said armory who died while in the service of the United States.

The Clerk read the amendment, as follows:

Provided, That the donation shall be without expense to the United States.

The amendment was agreed to.

The joint resolution as amended was ordered to be engrossed

for a third reading; and being engrossed, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the joint resolution as amended was passed was laid on the table.

DECLARING GRAND RIVER TO BE NOT A NAVIGABLE STREAM.

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

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of a bill, the title of which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 17350) declaring Grand River to be not a navigable stream.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and the Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to remove from the list of navigable streams the name of Grand River, in the State of Missouri; and the same is hereby declared to be not a navigable river.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend by striking out all after the enacting clause and inserting the following:

"That Grand River, in the State of Missouri, above the city of Brunswick, in the county of Chariton, in said State, is hereby declared not to be a navigable stream and shall be so treated by the Secretary of War and by all other authorities."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading; and being engrossed, was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. RUCKER, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill as amended was passed was laid on the table.

FLATHEAD INDIAN RESERVATION, MONT.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 16906).

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Montana asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill, the title of which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 16906) to amend section 12, chapter 1495, Statutes of the United States of America, entitled "An act for the survey and allotment of lands now embraced within the limits of the Flathead Indian Reservation, in the State of Montana, and the sale and disposal of all surplus lands after allotment."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to have a statement of the purpose of that bill, if we can have order.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, I did not understand the inquiry of the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. In the confusion I did not get the purport of the bill, and I would like to have a brief explanation.

Mr. DIXON. Yes. At the last session of this Congress we passed an act opening to settlement the Flathead Indian Reservation, in Montana.

Mr. MADDIX. We can not hear the gentleman; you must speak louder than that.

Mr. DIXON. At the last session of this Congress we passed a bill opening to settlement the Flathead Indian Reservation, in the State of Montana. Under the terms of the bill the reservation lands were to be surveyed and allotted to the Indians. Under the terms of the bill the use of 640 acres of land was allotted to the Catholic Church on that reservation, by agreement with the Indians, lands which they had used for probably fifty or sixty years. Their church is built on these lands. Under the bill as passed only the use of the land was granted. Under the rules of the church they can not dedicate their church there finally unless they have a fee simple title to that portion of the land on which the church is situated.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Why did not they get a fee simple title before they built the house?

Mr. DIXON. The house was built by the missionaries probably thirty years ago, an edifice costing probably forty or fifty thousand dollars.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I do not press the point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears no objection, and the Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 12, chapter 1495, Statutes of the United States of America, entitled "An act for the survey and allotment of lands now embraced within the limits of the Flathead Indian Reservation, in the State of Montana, and the sale and disposal of all surplus lands after allotment," be, and the same is hereby, amended so as to read as follows:

"SEC. 12. That the President may reserve and except from said lands, not to exceed 1,280 acres, for Catholic mission schools, church, and hospital and such other eleemosynary institutions as may now be maintained by the Catholic Church on said reservation, which lands are hereby granted to those religious organizations of the Catholic Church now occupying the same, known as the Society of Jesus, the Sisters of Charity of Providence, and the Ursuline Nuns, the said lands to be granted in the following amounts, namely: To the Society of Jesus, 640 acres; to the Sisters of Charity of Providence, 320 acres, and to the Ursuline Nuns, 320 acres, such lands to be reserved and granted for the uses indicated only so long as the same are maintained, used, and occupied by said organizations for the purposes indicated, except that 40 acres of the 640 acres hereinbefore mentioned as granted to the Society of Jesus are hereby granted in fee simple to said Society of Jesus, its successors and assigns.

"The President is also authorized to reserve lands upon the same conditions and for similar purposes for any other missionary or religious societies that may make application therefor within one year after the passage of this act in such quantity as he may deem proper. The President may also reserve such of said lands as may be convenient or necessary for the occupation and maintenance of any and all agency buildings, substations, mills, and other governmental institutions now in use on said reservation, or which may be used or occupied by the Government of the United States."

SEC. 2. That all acts or parts of acts in conflict herewith are hereby repealed.

The amendment was read, as follows:

Insert after the word "assigns" in line 17, page 2, the following:

"And be it further provided, That the President shall further reserve and except from said lands for the use of the University of Montana for biological station purposes 160 acres of said lands, which lands are hereby granted to the State of Montana for the use of the University of Montana; and the governor of said State, with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, is hereby authorized to locate said last-mentioned lands."

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the committee amendment be concurred in.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

On motion of Mr. DIXON, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill as amended was passed was laid on the table.

HOT SPRINGS RESERVATION, ARK.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 9298) granting the right of way for the construction of a railroad and other improvements over and on that part of the Hot Springs Reservation known as West Mountain, Hot Springs, Ark.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of a bill, the title of which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, is this the army and navy hospital reservation there?

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. No, sir; it is known as the West Mountain.

Mr. HULL. What is the character of the land on the reservation?

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. It is wild mountain land, and it is not occupied for any purpose now.

Mr. LACEY. It is the Hot Springs Reservation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. This bill is one which, under the rules, should receive its first consideration in the Committee of the Whole. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] asks unanimous consent to discharge the Committee of the Whole from the further consideration of the bill, and that the same be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the right of way 45 feet in width, upon which to construct, equip, operate, and maintain a railroad with one or more tracks, is hereby granted to George F. Considine and Edward Burke, their associates and assigns, upon and over that part of the Hot Springs Reservation known as the West Mountain, as follows: Commencing at a point on first line marked "A-1," 7 feet east of the line marked "M," or as near thereto as practicable, on Government plat survey, 1892, for topography; thence by a route heretofore approved by the Secretary of the Interior, under authority of an act approved December 21, 1893, to the west boundary line of said West Mountain Reservation, but the said railroad shall not obstruct any highway contemplated by the plans for the improvement of the Gov-

ernment Reservation of Hot Springs, Ark., and the said grantees shall, by the erection and permanent maintenance of substantial iron bridges with closed beds and sides, avoid rendering the crossings dangerous to passengers on the said highways, either in conveyances or on foot.

SEC. 2. That the said grantees or their assigns shall construct said incline railway according to the map profile and specification now on file in the Department of the Interior and as have been heretofore approved by the Secretary of the Interior, as provided by the act approved December 21, 1893. The Secretary of the Interior shall have supervision and control over the construction of said incline railroad, which must be built to the top of said mountain within two years from and after the passage of this act. But nothing herein shall be construed to prevent the Secretary of the Interior from making any changes in the plans and specifications as may be deemed conducive to the public interest.

SEC. 3. That the said parties or their assigns shall have the privilege of erecting on said West Mountain observatories, hotels, and such other buildings as may be considered by the Secretary of the Interior desirable for the accommodation of the public, and for such purposes, and for laying off and beautifying a park surrounding or adjacent to such buildings, the said parties or their assigns are hereby privileged to use 10 acres of ground upon said mountain, they agreeing to build upon and beautify the same at their own expense. A survey and plat of the grounds to be used for the purposes herein mentioned shall be first submitted to the Secretary of the Interior and approved by him before any improvements shall be begun upon said land. Plans for all buildings shall be submitted to and approved by the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 4. That the said parties are to pay semiannually to the Interior Department, on account of the fund for the improvement of the permanent Hot Springs Reservation, the sum of 2 per cent of the gross annual earnings of said railroad and buildings and grounds.

SEC. 5. That all tolls, charges, or income received under or by reason of this grant shall be subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, who shall from time to time prescribe rules and regulations for the management of said property.

SEC. 6. That the act approved December 21, 1893, granting the right of way, and other privileges therein mentioned, on the West Mountain of said Hot Springs Reservation, is hereby repealed, and Congress hereby reserves the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act.

The following committee amendments were read:

In line 15, section 2, page 2 of the bill, after the word "built," insert the words "and in operation."

In line 16, section 2, page 2 of the bill, strike out the words "two years" and insert "eighteen months."

After the word "act," in section 2, line 17, page 2 of the bill, insert "and a failure to comply with the requirements of this section, or of any other provision of the act, shall of itself work a forfeiture of the rights hereby granted."

In section 3, page 3, line 2, of said bill strike out the word "ten;" and in line 3 of same section and page strike out the words "acres of ground on said mountain" and insert in lieu of the same the following: "Such quantity of land, not exceeding in all 10 acres of ground upon said mountain, as in the judgment of the Secretary of the Interior may be necessary in connection with the exercise of the rights conferred hereunder."

After the word "Interior," in line 9 of section 3, page 3 of the bill, insert the following:

"Provided, however, That no timber shall be cut along the right of way herein granted, or upon the land to be used in connection with this right of way, without the approval first had and obtained of the Secretary of the Interior, and upon payment to him of such reasonable compensation as he may determine for the use of such timber as may be required in the construction and maintenance of said railway."

After the word "are," in line 10, section 4, page 3, insert "hereby required to submit to the Secretary of the Interior semiannually a detailed report as to the condition of the company, its assets and liabilities, its receipts and expenditures, the amount of business transacted by it, etc., and also;" so that section 4 as amended shall read as follows:

"SEC. 4. That said parties are hereby required to submit to the Secretary of the Interior semiannually a detailed report as to the condition of the company, its assets and liabilities, its receipts and expenditures, the amount of business transacted by it, etc., and also to pay semiannually to the Interior Department on account of the fund for the improvement of the permanent Hot Springs Reservation the sum of 2 per cent of the gross annual earnings of said railroad, buildings, and grounds."

Strike out all of said section 5, on page 3 of the bill, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 5. That all tolls, charges, or income received under or by reason of this grant, including the character of the means or classes of entertainment to be provided for the public on the land granted hereunder, shall be subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, who shall from time to time prescribe rules and regulations for the management of said property: *Provided, however,* That no pavilions, hotels, observatories, or any kind or character of means of providing for the public entertainment on this tract of land shall be installed or constructed on the land herein granted without the approval first had and obtained of the Secretary of the Interior. No transfer or assignment of the franchise herein granted or of any stock in any company which may be organized for the purpose of carrying into effect the provisions of this statute shall be valid without the approval first had and obtained of the Secretary of the Interior."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill with amendments was passed was laid on the table.

AMERICAN REGISTER FOR STEAM LIGHTER PIONEER.

Mr. KALANIANAOLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 11961) to provide an American register for the steam lighter *Pioneer*.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. KALANIANAOLE] asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of bill H. R. 11961, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Commissioner of Navigation be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to cause the foreign-built steam lighter Pioneer to be registered as a vessel of the United States.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, what is the reason for this?

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I will explain, on behalf of the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. KALANIANAOLE], that this is a bill that has been unanimously reported by the Committee on Marine and Fisheries. It involves only a small lighter, about 300 tons burden, and while we are opposed to bills of this character, and have uniformly, and at this very session, as far as our committee is concerned, turned down quite a number of them, this bill presents an exception to the rule, as we believe, and therefore ought to have favorable consideration.

Mr. PAYNE. Was this ship wrecked?

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. No; it was constructed in parts in a foreign country during the period before Hawaii was admitted as a part of the United States. The contract for construction was made in good faith prior to the admission of Hawaii, and with an expectation that she would be on a par with other Hawaiian vessels when Hawaii might be annexed to the United States. Her material came here in parts, and they paid twenty thousand odd dollars in duties, and then she was assembled here at relatively large additional expense. She operates only in the harbor of Honolulu, and she is owned by people in Hawaii and is used for purely local purposes. We see no reason under the circumstances why a register should not be granted.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

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

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

D. S. PORTER.

Mr. HILDEBRANT. Mr. Speaker, I desire to offer a privileged resolution (No. 472) from the Committee on Accounts.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HILDEBRANT] presents the following privileged resolution, which the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Appropriations is authorized to provide in the general deficiency appropriation bill for the payment to D. S. Porter of the sum of \$500 for extra and expert services to the Committee on Pensions as assistant clerk of said committee by detail.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution? It seems to the Chair it is not privileged.

Mr. MADDOX. Mr. Speaker, I would like to hear some explanation of it, reserving the right to object.

Mr. HILDEBRANT. Mr. Speaker, this is in conformity to the usual custom of the House in providing additional pay for the clerks of the regular Pension Committee, Mr. Gauss and Mr. Porter. I have the resolution in my hand for Mr. Gauss, and I should have presented it first. It is simply following the custom that has prevailed in this House since I have been a Member, and for years before, as I am informed. These gentlemen are detailed from the Pension Bureau to assist the committee.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

HERMAN GAUSS.

Mr. HILDEBRANT. Mr. Speaker, I desire to present a privileged resolution (No. 471) from the Committee on Accounts.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HILDEBRANT] offers the following privileged resolution from the Committee on Accounts, which the Clerk will read:

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Appropriations is authorized to provide in the general deficiency appropriation bill for the payment to Herman Gauss of the sum of \$500 for extra and expert services to the Committee on Invalid Pensions as assistant clerk of said committee by detail.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

COMPENSATION OF SESSION CLERKS TO CERTAIN COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. HILDEBRANT. Mr. Speaker, I ask consideration of House resolution 463.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Clerk of the House is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of the contingent fund of the House, to each of the clerks of the Committees on the Census, Interstate and Foreign Commerce, Indian Affairs, Pacific Railroads, and Private Land Claims whose employment was authorized by House resolution adopted December 17, 1904, an amount equal in the aggregate to that authorized by law to be paid to other committee clerks employed "during the session" only.

The resolution was agreed to.

NOAH DILLARD.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the bill (H. R. 3109) for the relief of Noah Dillard, with Senate amendments, which were read.

Mr. GRAFF. Mr. Speaker, I move to concur in the Senate amendments.

The motion was agreed to.

POST-OFFICE APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. OVERSTREET. 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 post-office appropriation bill. Pending that motion I ask unanimous consent that debate upon the appropriation for the Southern Railway proceed for fifty minutes, twenty-five minutes to be controlled by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MOON] and twenty-five minutes controlled by myself. And I will ask that the same agreement be entered into with reference to the item making appropriation for the Tahitian service. I will say that this is the result of a conference with the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MOON], the ranking member of the minority on the committee.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. MACON. If the gentleman will amend his request, making it one hour, I will not object.

Mr. OVERSTREET. You mean thirty minutes on a side?

Mr. MACON. Yes, sir.

Mr. OVERSTREET. Well, then, I amend it, and let it be thirty minutes on a side under the same terms.

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

Mr. CROMER. Who is to control the time for debate on the Tahitian question?

Mr. OVERSTREET. The gentleman from Tennessee has control of one half of the time and I am to control the other half of the time.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Indiana, that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, pending that motion, I would like to ask unanimous consent to extend the remarks I made upon this measure in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The motion to go into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union was then agreed to.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 17865. When the committee rose yesterday the pending motion was to strike out, on page 18, lines 6 to 12, inclusive.

Mr. OVERSTREET. Mr. Chairman, I yield one minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. DRISCOLL].

Mr. DRISCOLL. Mr. Chairman, heretofore I have voted against this appropriation; but I am paired with another gentleman from New York on this vote, and therefore can not vote on it. I believe this is an unnecessary expense, and I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my views upon this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that he may extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. OVERSTREET. I yield ten minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD].

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, we are now engaged in our annual picnic over this proposition of facilitating southern

mails. I have always been perfectly candid with the House and with my colleagues in discussing this question; and to my mind, Mr. Chairman, there is but one question here to be decided. It is not necessary that we should discuss the question of subsidies or bounties or premiums. The question for the membership of this House to determine is whether or not a large and rapidly developing section of this country shall get the mail facilities that are afforded by this proposition. That is the only question that is entitled to be considered here.

But what are the facts? In 1892 a provision was put upon the post-office appropriation bill intended to facilitate the delivery of the mail from Washington—or, rather, from New York at that time—to New Orleans. It will be remembered by the House that the Southern Railway, which undertakes the facilitating of these mails, traverses nearly the whole of a route through a sparsely settled country. By the operation of this appropriation and the agreement with the Southern Railway to undertake to arrange its schedules and fix the delivery of mails at southern points from five to twelve hours have been saved in the time of delivering the mails. Those of us, Mr. Chairman, who are directly interested in this question realize more fully, perhaps, than gentlemen can realize who are not affected by its operation what the benefit has been. We believe, and we have very good reason to believe, that the facility offered of rapid transmission of these mails and their delivery at every point between this and New Orleans and beyond has contributed more than any other item that goes into this or any other bill passed by Congress toward our recent development, which has been, I may say, phenomenal.

I know gentlemen will say, "Well, you will get your mail without this appropriation." That is true; we will get it in the ordinary course of mail delivery, but under the operation of this appropriation we get our mail so much earlier, so much more promptly, than we can possibly hope to get it without it.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the fact is that under the operation of this appropriation the Post-Office Department assume absolute control of this train. They fix the schedule for it. It can not leave Washington until the Post-Office Department say that all connections have been made; and they also provide that if this train reaches any of the junctional points five minutes behind the regular schedule time the whole pay for that day is deducted.

Mr. HOLLIDAY. Will the gentleman yield for one question?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Certainly.

Mr. HOLLIDAY. Can the gentleman give any reason why this particular train should be regulated by the Government that would not apply to any other train carrying the mails?

Mr. BANKHEAD. No; I do not pretend to give any reason for it, except the conditions that exist.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. It does not carry passengers.

Mr. BANKHEAD. This train carries nothing but mail coaches until it gets to Atlanta, and there it takes on a passenger coach. Its schedule time, including stops, is 43 miles per hour.

Mr. FINLEY. I understood the gentleman to say that this fast mail train, No. 97, carries only mail coaches.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Yes; from here to Atlanta.

Mr. FINLEY. Does the gentleman not know that this train carries express cars?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Oh, well, perhaps it does carry one express car. I am talking about passenger coaches and passenger traffic.

Now, gentlemen, the question is, Will the Southern Railway maintain this train on this schedule, delivering the southern mails six to fifteen hours in advance of the time at which they were delivered before its operation commenced, unless it receives this subsidy? That is the question. Why should the company do that? They will carry the mail; they will get the regular mail pay for carrying it as all other railroads do. The question here is whether or not this House is willing to put its hand upon this schedule and say to the people who are benefited by it: "You can not have this appropriation because it facilitates the delivery of your mails as it facilitates the delivery of mails in no other section of the country."

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

Mr. BANKHEAD. Certainly.

Mr. GILBERT. What are the terms of the mail contract between that corporation and the Government as to the scheduled time of the train?

Mr. BARTLETT. The Government makes the schedule.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I have just stated that the Post-Office Department makes the schedule.

Mr. GILBERT. What trains would it run in the absence of this appropriation?

Mr. BANKHEAD. It would run the regular passenger trains.

Mr. GILBERT. Is it your contention that this particular mail train is operated by reason of this special appropriation?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Certainly.

Mr. GILBERT. And would not be operated without it?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I have not the least idea that it would be operated without it.

Mr. GILBERT. And it would not violate any of the terms of its contracts by not operating it?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Why, of course not. The terms that apply to this particular train are made with special reference to it, and this train would certainly be discontinued, and there is every reason why the Southern Road should discontinue it if this appropriation were withheld.

Mr. SPALDING. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Certainly.

Mr. SPALDING. I should like to inquire about how many hours, at the principal points on this line, the operation of this train expedites the mails?

Mr. BARTLETT. From eight to fifteen.

Mr. BANKHEAD. From here to Atlanta, six hours and a half; and comparing the schedule now with the schedule in operation before this special-facility train was put on the time to New Orleans is fourteen hours shorter than it was before. Now, gentlemen, there is no use in talking—

Mr. GILBERT. One other question.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. GILBERT. I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman be extended five minutes.

Mr. OVERSTREET. Mr. Chairman, that can not be done in committee. The gentleman must control his time and not permit interruptions, because I have not the time to yield further; it is all promised.

Mr. GILBERT. I only want to ask the gentleman one question. I want to know if there is any other instance in the appropriations for the Post-Office Department where an additional train beyond the contract service is provided for?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Yes; Kansas City, in this same bill.

Mr. OVERSTREET. I hope the gentleman from Tennessee will now occupy some of his time.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MOON of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield ten minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GAINES].

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, since the Fifty-fifth Congress we have had what the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] calls a "picnic" about this subsidy. The trouble about it is, gentlemen, that the people are furnishing all the barbecue and paying the fiddler and the railroads are doing all the dancing. [Laughter.]

This matter has been a bone of contention here since the Fifty-fifth Congress, to my personal knowledge. Each year there has been a large number of Democrats and some Republicans who have opposed it; the Democrats opposing it, first, because they are opposed to subsidies; second, because it is not needed. The Department in recent years has, in effect, at least, reported against the necessity for the appropriation. By the Department failing to squarely take sides it has caused contention and confusion as to the real merits of the case, which I sincerely regret.

The House is familiar with the recent hearings on the subject. They are unsatisfactory. They fail to show this subsidy is or is not needed, is condemned or not condemned; and this has been the status of the case for eight years I know. Hence I seek new fields for information in discussing this matter today, where the subject is met and squarely treated.

This subsidy policy began in 1879 during President Hayes's Administration, when our railroads were in a bad fix every way, I assume. But are they to-day?

No; not one of them; certainly not the Southern road.

This subsidy was condemned by Postmaster-Generals Dickinson in 1888 and Wanamaker and Assistant Postmaster-General Bell in 1892, and again in 1893 by Postmaster-General W. L. Wilson, and possibly by others; and no Postmaster-General that I recall has asked for it since then.

These officers met the situation and squarely condemned this policy as "hampering" them in executing the law and carrying on properly the public mail service. I will insert in my remarks what they each, in part, said.

Postmaster-General Dickinson, a Democrat, in 1888, said:

Appropriation for special facilities in the Railway Mail Service.—I desire to call attention to the settled application of the appropriation made for extra facilities and to the absence of any means to improvements of the service in portions of the country and on lines equally if not more deserving than those for which special appropriations are made. These special appropriations are not sufficient for proper distribution and create an indisposition on the part of railroad companies to cooperate for the best attainable service. Dissatisfaction is natural enough when the Government pays one road more than others, and for no better or more necessary service than is expected or required from many others.

I do not venture an opinion as to whether or not the rate of compensation allowed by law is sufficiently liberal to secure for the Government adequate and the best service. It is certain that the dissatisfaction caused by extra compensation to some, and not to others, has prevented in some instances cordial cooperation with the Department to secure much-needed improvement. (House Ex. Doc., vol. 9, 50th Cong., 2d sess., p. XXV.)

Postmaster-General Wanamaker, in his report for 1891 (House Ex. Doc., 1st sess., 52d Cong., vol. 13, p. 69), said:

NO RAILROAD BONUS NEEDED.

In 1879, when railroad facilities were few and train service slow, Congress appropriated \$295,000 in extra allowances for such railroad companies as could not afford to make schedules sufficiently numerous or fast. These sums were to be in addition to the payments of ordinary rates for railroad transportation. The quantity of mail matter was then perhaps one-half of what it is now, so that each of the companies by the natural growth of mail transportation has, since 1879, doubled its revenue from mail pay. At each weighing, moreover, there is a further increase of pay according to the increase of service. In view of this fact, and because abundant facilities were to be had without granting extra pay, and because of the frequent charge by railroad companies giving similar service without extra pay that the Department was discriminating against them, I have concluded henceforth to remove the embarrassments, so far as lies in my power, by not including in the budget for the next year any estimate for special facilities. This course, if approved, places all the transportation companies on exactly the same basis of pay.

Second Assistant Postmaster Bell (p. 345) said:

No recommendation has been made for the customary special-facility allowance for the next fiscal year, because I do not believe there exists occasion for perpetuating the preferential method whereby a limited number of railroads would be paid both ordinary and special transportation and full car compensation, while other railroads, performing precisely the same character of service, can be allowed nothing more than the compensation which we are by statute permitted to pay for ordinary transportation.

AN ANNOYANCE—A TEMPORARY PLAN.

The continuance of the special-facility allowance has for some years past been the source of much annoyance to the Department, and has hampered the best interests of the mail service, because railroads operating in contiguous territory and to some extent paralleling the roads which receive the extra pay, object to rendering equally good or quicker schedule mail service except they be paid corresponding rates. They ask that all be treated alike.

When the special-facility payments were first started it was well understood that they were but temporary, so as to bridge over a period until the natural growth of the mails would yield sufficient compensation to do away with occasion for additional allowances.

COMPENSATION INCREASED.

This was as far back as 1879, since which time the aggregate yearly compensation to the railroads drawing the special-facility allowances for ordinary mail and car transportation, independent of the special service, has more than doubled, so that ordinary compensation, even after the reduction of this year, will be greatly in excess of ordinary and special compensation added together ten years ago; and as most of the special-facility routes will have their compensation re-adjusted commencing with July 1, 1892, when their pay, it is estimated, will be increased still further at least 20 per cent, this Office has not felt satisfied in recommending the continuance, after June 30, 1892, of any portion of the present special-facility allowance.

In the face of all these official facts, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] says that he has no doubt but that this service would stop if these special facilities are taken away. Was it stopped on the other roads? No. The observation that I make from the official reports shows that in the beginning there were about fifteen of these railroads that were subsidized, and that they have all relinquished their subsidies, continued

the same schedule as if subsidized, and are doing as good service to-day without the subsidies as the Southern Railway is doing with the subsidy. The Post-Office reports I hold in my hand say this. The report of Second Assistant Postmaster-General Bell, of 1903, states that in effect. I will insert in my remarks what he said.

In the Report of the Postmaster-General for 1893 (House Ex. Doc., 2d sess. 53d Cong., vol. 12, p. 146) Second Assistant Postmaster-General Bell says:

RELATIONS TO RAILROAD MAIL CARRIERS.

Nothing of extraordinary moment has occurred the past year necessitating our calling upon any of the leading railroad carriers for more than the ordinary extent of cooperation in the acquirement of satisfactory results.

RAILROADS CONSULT DEPARTMENT IN MAKING SCHEDULES.

It can be said there has been a steady and general improvement both in rapidity and frequency of the ordinary train service utilized by the Department for the carriage of its mails, because of which the occasion for asking the adoption of schedules primarily from the standpoint of the necessities of the Post-Office Department is not as great now as it was a few years ago. It deserves to be mentioned, however, that there prevails a growing disposition on the part of railroad managers to give weight to the suggestions of the Department concerning important schedules. It is a common practice now to request our attendance at conferences whereat train schedules are to be determined, and it is usual at these meetings to ask for the Department's suggestions before other features are presented.

I call to mind but a single instance in the past year where the management of an important railroad mail system has evinced an unwillingness to maintain as good schedules for mail purposes as in former years, and singular as it may seem, in this instance the ground for declining to accede to the Department's request was the discontinuance of a special allowance of less than \$12,000 per annum, while simultaneously with the discontinuance of the payment of this sum the system to which it applied received notice that its ordinary pay for mail transportation had been advanced more than \$140,000 per annum. The particular line over which the management declined to maintain the schedule of the Department's choice receives more than \$1,800 per mile for its regular mail service. It is to be hoped the direction of this line will consent to such modification of its action as shall permit of the restoration of the mail service throughout its lines and connections, at least to the standard that prevailed a year ago.

AFTER THE SUBSIDY WAS WITHDRAWN.

To offset the single instance of unwillingness to fully cooperate it is not improper to make record of the fact that all of the other roads which have been receiving special-facility pay up to the close of the last fiscal year have continued the same trains in service or have consented to substitute other trains possessing greater value for mail purposes. Because of this disposition, commencing with the month of December, we shall be able to inaugurate a double daily fast mail service between New York and Florida points, something we have heretofore been unable to accomplish over the entire distance, and furthermore the hours of departure and arrival will be such as shall dispense with the serious delays that resulted from the former schedules.

Here we see that good service was continued after the subsidy was given up. Carrying the mail pays too well for the railroads to rebel.

Postmaster-General Wanamaker, in 1892, in his report said:

SPECIAL-FACILITY PAY.

I have not included in the estimates for next year any sum for special railroad facilities. I am stronger than ever in the belief that the continuance of the preferential method of compensating railroads is injurious to the general service and an injustice as well to the roads who do not receive equal pay. There will be less justification than ever before for continuing the special payments next year, because many of the railroads sharing in this year's allowance on July 1, 1892, had their ordinary compensation advanced more than 20 per cent under the quadrennial weighing, and a corresponding advance in ordinary compensation will be given to all the remaining special-facility routes commencing with July 1, 1893.

Second Assistant Postmaster-General J. Lowrie Bell, in his report to Postmaster-General Wanamaker in 1892, in part said:

SPECIAL FACILITIES.

The annual rate of expenditure for this service on June 30, 1892, was \$196,614.16. This sum was expended as shown in the following statement:

No. of route.	Termini.	Railroad company.	Miles.	Pay per annum.
106005	New York, N. Y., to Springfield, Mass.	New York, New Haven and Hartford	135.73	\$11,431.34
107011	4.35 a. m. train, New York to Albany, N. Y.	New York Central and Hudson River	144.00	16,666.66
113006	Baltimore to Hagerstown, Md.	Western Maryland	89.10	10,475.50
109001	Philadelphia, Pa., to Bay View (n. o.), Md.	Philadelphia, Wilmington and Baltimore	92.00	13,333.00
113013	Bay View (n. o.) to Quantico, Va.	Baltimore and Potomac	80.03	14,600.00
114001	Quantico to Richmond, Va.	Richmond, Fredericksburg and Potomac	61.50	11,612.84
114008	Richmond to Petersburg, Va.	Richmond and Petersburg	23.07	2,806.85
114009	Petersburg to Weldon, N. C.	Petersburg	63.54	7,790.70
119002	Weldon to Wilmington, N. C.	Wilmington and Weldon	161.47	19,694.18
120002	Wilmington to Florence, S. C.	Wilmington, Columbia and Augusta	110.00	13,333.34
120005	Florence to Charleston Junction (n. o.)	Northeastern	95.00	11,558.33
120004	Charleston Junction (n. o.) to Savannah, Ga.	Charleston and Savannah	108.00	13,140.00
121009	Savannah to Jacksonville, Fla.	Savannah, Florida and Western	171.50	20,373.14
123018	Jacksonville to Sanford, Fla.	Jacksonville, Tampa and Key West	126.18	15,244.83
123007	Sanford to Tampa, Fla.	South Florida	116.29	14,033.45
				196,614.16

The appropriation for the current fiscal year is \$196,614.22. The amount estimated as necessary for the current fiscal year is \$196,614.16.

In the report of a year ago I stated my reasons for declining to recommend further appropriations for so-called "special facilities," and I feel it to be a duty both to the Government and as well to the service to again decline making such a recommendation. I believe the granting to a few and refusing to extend like compensation to the many who are performing as good or better mail schedules is a source of injury to the mail service. The preferential method should cease or all who expedite the mails should be granted the same benefit.

The impression that the special facility compensation allowed the lines extending to Port Tampa, Fla., advances the Cuba mails is incorrect. It practically retards those mails because it prevents the enforcement by the Department of the twenty-five-hour schedule provided for in the contract for the ocean service between Port Tampa and Habana.

The Richmond and Danville Railroad, operating south and southwest via Atlanta; the East Tennessee, Virginia and Georgia Railway System, operating south and southwest from Cincinnati; the Norfolk and Western Railroad, in conjunction with the East Tennessee, Virginia and Georgia lines, operating west and south from Washington, D. C. and Norfolk, Va., via Bristol and Chattanooga, Tenn.; and the Illinois Central Railroad, operating south from Chicago via Cairo, Ill., have each created an extent of expedited mail schedules within the past year that is much superior to those termed "special facility" trains via Jacksonville, Fla., to Port Tampa; and some of these railroad systems have asked the Department to tell why it is that they ought not to be given the same consideration that has been accorded the lines via Jacksonville. There is, besides, far less reason for granting the special compensation hereafter than a year ago, as the ordinary compensation to the railway mail carriers which draw the special facility allowance was on July 1, 1892, because of a reweighing, advanced more than 20 per cent, so that an extension of the special facility allowance after June 30, 1893, means that it shall supplement an advance to the same lines of more than 20 per cent in the ordinary compensation allowed for the year closing June 30, 1892, and which continues thereafter.

Your letter of February 25, 1892, in reply to the inquiry from the chairman of the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads, House of Representatives, furnishes in detail the views of the Department con-

cerning special facilities, and I have therefore thought it proper to make it a part of my annual report, as follows:

POST-OFFICE DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE POSTMASTER-GENERAL,
Washington, D. C., February 25, 1892.

SIR: In reply to your inquiry of the 18th instant, concerning the appropriation for special facilities, I have thought it worth while to invite your attention, first of all, to that portion of my last annual report appearing on page 69, headed "No railroad bonus needed."

In 1879, when railroad facilities were few and train service slow, Congress appropriated \$295,000 in extra allowances for such railroad companies as could not afford to make schedules sufficiently numerous or fast. These sums were to be in addition to the payments of ordinary rates for railroad transportation. The quantity of mail matter was then perhaps one-half of what it is now, so that each of the companies by the natural growth of mail transportation has, since 1879, doubled its revenue from mail pay. At each weighing, moreover, there is a further increase of pay according to the increase of service. In view of this fact, and because abundant facilities were to be had without granting extra pay, and because of the frequent charge by railroad companies giving similar service without extra pay that the Department was discriminating against them, I have concluded henceforth to remove the embarrassments, so far as lies in my power, by not including in the budget for the next year any estimate for special facilities. This course, if approved, places all the transportation companies on exactly the same basis of pay.

In the same connection it is proper to submit the following table and accompanying explanation taken from the last report of the Second Assistant Postmaster-General, as I believe it will, in comprehensive form, convey to you the information desired in relation to the manner in which the appropriation was expended in 1891. The expenditures of the amount estimated as necessary for the current fiscal year will, it is expected, be made pro rata to the same railroads to which the allowances were made in 1891.

SPECIAL FACILITIES.

The annual rate of expenditure for this class of service on June 30, 1891, was \$295,421.78. This sum was expended as shown in the following statement:

No. of route.	Termini.	Railroad company.	Miles.	Pay per annum.
196005	New York, N. Y., to Springfield, Mass.	New York, New Haven and Hartford	136.00	\$17,647.06
107011 (part)	4:35 a. m. train, New York to Albany	New York Central and Hudson River	144.00	25,000.00
113603 (part)	Baltimore to Hagerstown	Western Maryland	86.10	15,713.25
113601	Philadelphia, Pa., to Bay View (n. o.), Md.	Philadelphia, Wilmington and Baltimore	91.80	20,000.00
113603	Bay View (n. o.), Md., to Washington, D. C.	Baltimore and Potomac	79.80	21,900.00
114001 (part)	Washington, D. C., to Quantico (n. o.), Va.	Richmond, Fredericksburg and Potomac	81.50	17,419.26
114008	Quantico (n. o.), to Richmond	Richmond and Petersburg	23.07	4,210.27
114009	Richmond to Petersburg	Petersburg	63.54	11,545.05
114002	Petersburg to Weldon	Wilmington and Weldon	162.07	29,541.27
120002 (part)	Weldon to Wilmington	Wilmington, Columbia and Augusta	110.00	20,075.00
120005 (part)	Wilmington to Florence	Northeastern	95.00	17,375.50
120005 (part)	Florence to Charleston Junction (n. o.)	Charleston and Savannah	108.00	19,710.00
120004 (part)	Charleston Junction (n. o.) to Savannah	Savannah, Florida and Western	171.50	31,360.70
121009	Savannah to Jacksonville	Jacksonville, Tampa and Key West	126.18	22,867.25
123018	Jacksonville to Sanford	South Florida	116.39	21,675.17
123007	Sanford to Tampa			
Total				\$295,421.78

The appropriation for the current fiscal year is \$295,421.79. The amount estimated as necessary for the current fiscal year is \$196,614.22.

No recommendation has been made for the customary special facility allowance for the next fiscal year, because I do not believe there exists occasion for perpetuating the preferential method whereby a limited number of railroads would be paid both ordinary and special transportation and full car compensation, while other railroads, performing precisely the same character of service, can be allowed nothing more than the compensation which we are by statute permitted to pay for ordinary transportation.

The continuance of the special-facility allowance has for some years past been the source of much annoyance to the Department, and has hampered the best interests of the mail service, because railroads operating in contiguous territory and, to some extent paralleling the roads which receive the extra pay object to rendering equally good or quicker schedule mail service except they be paid corresponding rates. They ask that all be treated alike. When the special-facility payments were first started it was well understood that they were but temporary, so as to bridge over a period until the natural growth of the mails would yield sufficient compensation to do away with occasion for additional allowances. This was as far back as 1879, since which time the aggregate yearly compensation to the railroads drawing the special-facility allowances for ordinary mail and car transportation, independent of the special service, has more than doubled, so that ordinary compensation, even after the reduction of this year, will be greatly in excess of ordinary and special compensation added together ten years ago; and as most of the special-facility routes will have their compensation readjusted commencing with July 1, 1892, when their pay, it is estimated, will be increased still further at least 20 per cent, this office has not felt satisfied in recommending the continuance, after June 30, 1892, of any portion of the present special-facility allowance.

The appropriations for special-facility service appear to have been started in 1879, and each year the expenditures have been as follows:

1879	\$23,887.43
1880	49,313.64
1881	125,984.50
1882	202,478.30
1883	185,123.24
1884	184,821.24
1885	250,647.72
1886	251,540.84
1887	285,372.81
1888	294,568.86
1889	293,042.87

1890	\$293,744.26
1891	291,565.73
1892 (estimated)	196,614.22
Total	2,928,695.66

The practice of compensating a few railroads upon a higher basis than others rendering the same or more satisfactory service has been the source of much annoyance, which each year becomes more perplexing to the Department and hurtful to the general service, because it acts as a check to the extension of the fast-mail system in sections where it would work great benefits.

From the report of Postmaster-General Dickinson for the year 1888, I quote as follows, bearing upon the subject of special compensation to railroads:

"I do not venture an opinion as to whether or not the rate of compensation allowed by law is sufficiently liberal to secure for the Government adequate and the best service. It is certain, however, that the dissatisfaction caused by extra compensation to some and not to others has prevented, in some instances, cordial cooperation with the Department to secure much-needed improvement."

Postmaster-General Dickinson outlined in the above his strong belief that the appropriation for special facilities ought to be made sufficiently large to be applied all over the country, or that it should be cut off altogether, and had he continued in office it is reasonable to believe he would have ceased to make recommendation for any allowance of the kind after the quadrennial readjustment in 1880.

To your inquiry for the history of the special-facility appropriations, I would reply: The Department records do not explain its origin; but it is well understood that in connection with the establishment of a continuous service between New York and Cuba the railroads were asked to fix upon a continuous-service schedule, the permanency of which they were reluctant to guarantee until they had ascertained the extent to which the schedule could be used for general traffic. There is no doubt but that it was well understood by all interested, both in and outside of the Department, that the occasion for the special allowances was not likely to exist for more than a year or two, and that its termination would be satisfactory to the railroads as soon as the increase of the ordinary compensation made it apparent to the Department that the exceptional payments were no longer justified. The only reason I can give for its continuance so long is that each year the railroads have urged its retention for a little while longer, and it may be that intimations have been given that perhaps its discontinuance would be allowed by the adoption of arbitrary train schedules that would disarrange the mail service.

In order that you may appreciate the extent to which the ordinary

compensation of the railroads interested in the transportation of the West India mails has grown. I call your attention to the following table showing their payments by adjustment periods:

1879, \$226,234.99 per annum; 1880, \$270,233.54 per annum (increase \$43,998.55, 20 per cent); 1884, \$349,881.50 per annum (increase \$79,647.96, 29 per cent); 1888, \$476,385.36 per annum (increase \$126,503.86, 36 per cent); 1892 (estimated), \$595,096 per annum (increase \$118,710.64, 25 per cent).

FOR ORDINARY COMPENSATION ALONE.

The increase in 1892 over 1880 will exceed 117 per cent.

The increase of \$118,710.64 in 1892 over 1888 is likely to be exceeded; but should it be no more, it carries with it an increase for the adjusted period of \$475,842.50.

In addition, the allowance for special facilities to the same railroads in 1891 was \$237,061.47.

It is in place for me to add at this point that the schedule to which the special-facility allowance now applies really possesses no marked advantages at this time for the advancement, in either direction, of the West India commercial mail, while it is believed it operates to the disadvantage of the commercial mails between the North and the South, as will be explained farther on. More than 90 per cent of the business mail with Cuba is associated with New York; and, as between New York and Boston, including New England, 99 per cent is with New York. Practice has demonstrated that going out of New York the bulk of the mail is in readiness for dispatch by 8 p. m. Into New York nothing is accomplished in the way of the delivery of the letter mails arriving between 7 p. m. and 5 a. m. The largest, and by far the most important mail for the South, via the coast line route, starts from New York at 9 p. m., and at 4 a. m. it is reached Washington, D. C. At 4.30 a. m. it leaves Washington, D. C., for Richmond and beyond, or as far as the regular schedules will advance it.

The so-called fast mail for which a subsidy is paid, and that which is supposed to advance the West India mail, leaves Jersey City at 4.45 a. m., and it need carry only such letter mail as comes into the New York post-office after 8 p. m. the night before, which is less than one-third of that ready to be dispatched at 9 p. m. The starting time from Jersey City you will observe, is fifteen minutes later than the most important mail of the day before from New England, New York, Philadelphia, and Baltimore, for the coast line route as far as South Carolina, has passed Washington; and the natural conclusion is, that the p. m. schedule out of New York has not been carried all the way through Georgia and Florida at a modern rate of speed, because doing so, primarily for mail purposes, would have rendered valueless the subsidized schedule.

In like manner the so-called fast mail train, north bound, does not accomplish anything in the way of promoting the delivery of the West India mails at New York, because it reaches New York at 7.50 p. m., and the mail matter can not be made available for business purposes until after 8 a. m. of the day following.

Explaining more fully the statement that it is believed the continuance of the special payments operates to the disadvantage of the commercial mails between the North and the South, I would say: So long as the Department continues payments for schedules that, in point of time, have practically remained stationary for years, the roads getting the allowances are guarded in so adjusting their through schedules, generally, as shall prevent the Department from fully utilizing the regular schedules, and then abandoning—except for purely local service—the subsidized trains.

Ten years ago the commercial interests in some sections of the country did not fully appreciate the importance of starting the letter mails out of large cities in the evening, and moving in the other direction into trade centers early in the day; and, while ten years ago the so-called fast mail train may have had its advantages throughout Florida, it has not progressed as have train schedules generally, including a few other schedules upon this particular route; and the advancement of the mails by other routes between the North and the South, which are receiving ordinary pay alone, has been much greater than upon the coast line route. What I desire to emphasize is that the mail service between the chain of northern cities, starting in New England and extending via Washington into those portions of South Carolina, Georgia, and Florida as are tributary to the coast line, is not such as the natural developments of trade and population, associated with railroad progress, warrants. Because natural conditions have been permitted to prevail in other sections of the South allied to railroads not subsidized, the mail service with Atlanta, Macon, Mobile, New Orleans, and other cities of like importance, has advanced.

The principal railroads have learned to value the liberality of the ordinary compensation for mail transportation, and praiseworthy consideration is being given to the adjustment of schedules that shall expedite, primarily, the most important of commercial mails. The distance between Washington and New Orleans, via Atlanta, is 1,143 miles. The time for the most important mail train averages 35 miles per hour. Between Cincinnati and Jacksonville, via Chattanooga, the most important mail service requires less than twenty-nine hours, the distance being close to 850 miles. Between Chicago and New Orleans the fast mail occupies less than twenty-nine hours; the distance is 915 miles. These and many other expedited schedules have been the result of conference with the Department, and the railroads will be content to continue them for the ordinary compensation if they have the assurance of the Department that they are being paid upon as favorable a basis as is allowed other lines. The fast mail system over the Iron Mountain system between St. Louis, via Little Rock, and Texarkana, and thence throughout Texas, from the Texarkana standpoint, is not what it ought to be; nor is the continuous fast mail service defecting at Sedalia, Mo., through Missouri, Kansas, Arkansas, the Indian Nation, and Texas, via the Missouri, Kansas and Texas system, what it should be. Again, the fast mail service from a Louisville, Ky., standpoint, into Kentucky, Tennessee, Georgia, and Alabama, is not as complete as the Department aims to have it; but we can not look for hearty cooperation from all the railroads operating north and south so long as they can point to the special payments made to a few roads; and to many of our applications for expedited schedules the reply comes back that, upon the promise of the Government that they shall be paid in like manner as the most favored, they will cheerfully respond to requests for improved schedules.

Turning again to the mail service throughout the South, via the subsidized Coast Line route, it will, I believe, be of interest to know that the subsidized fast mail beyond Washington does not average 32 miles per hour. Of course, over some portions of the route the speed is much faster than the average; but the Department, in dealing with schedules upon a continuous route, must consider it as one interest, the re-

spective managements comprising the line deciding which portions of the through route shall occupy more than its proportion of the time assigned between termini. That you may know the necessity of this train for other than mail purposes at this time, you should be told that it carries from Washington six coaches and sleepers, besides a baggage and a mail car. En route there occur some changes in the make-up of the train, but ordinarily it goes into Jacksonville with four coaches and sleepers, besides the mail and baggage cars. The section through which this route operates needs a fast mail service corresponding with that of the Air Line railroad system and others I have mentioned and corresponding with those it is our earnest desire to have established. I mean a continuous schedule that shall leave New York, say, at 9 p. m., and at an average speed of 35 miles per hour beyond Washington could certainly reach—

(Subsidized train now arrives at)

Richmond, Va., at 7.50 a. m., instead of 8.48 a. m.-----	2.38 p. m.
Wilmington, N. C., at 3.10 p. m., instead of 6 p. m.-----	9.55 p. m.
Charleston, S. C., at 9.20 p. m., instead of 1.20 a. m.-----	5.00 a. m.
Savannah, Ga., at 12.55 a. m., instead of 5.20 a. m.-----	6.44 a. m.
Jacksonville, Fla., at 6 a. m., instead of 11.35 a. m.-----	12.00 noon.
Port Tampa at 1.16 p. m., instead of 9.40 p. m.-----	9.40 p. m.

This schedule would practically make a large quantity of the Florida mail available one day earlier than it is now by the West India fast mail train.

Coming north a continuous schedule as slow as 30 miles per hour, leaving Port Tampa right after the arrival of the West India mails, would enable the through mails to leave Jacksonville at 3.30 a. m., now 8.30 a. m.; Savannah at 9.30 a. m., now 2.10 p. m.; Charleston at 1.30 p. m., now 7.01 p. m.; Wilmington, N. C., at 8 p. m., now 2.10 a. m.; Richmond, Va., at 4 a. m., now 9.34 a. m. Arrive at Washington at 7.40 a. m., now 1.31 p. m.; arrive at New York at 3.20 p. m., now 7.50 p. m.

This schedule would, at New York, advance the through mails one day over present West India fast-mail schedule.

Coming north 35 miles per hour would, of course, be better still, as it would advance the mails all along the route and bring them into New York ready for delivery about 10 a. m.

As I have already stated, the indications all tend to the belief that the fear of jeopardizing the subsidy has acted as a check to continuous regular schedules at hours corresponding with through schedules prevailing elsewhere in the South. It is true the subsidized service leaving New York at 4.30 a. m. carries out the morning newspapers, the advancement of which the Department would regret to see checked; but, as compared with the importance of the letter mail for territory south of Richmond, Va., newspaper mail should not be permitted to delay the letters; in fact, there ought to be no occasion for retarding the newspaper, because the regular passenger business by itself calls for this train, and the extent of the mails, the growth of the ordinary mail compensation, and the requirements of the communities and commercial interests upon and contiguous to the Coast Line route have become such that without subsidy the railroad interests should not hesitate to respond to any reasonable schedules the Post-Office Department may request. If this is done, and schedules approximating those mentioned are enforced, and advantage is taken of the saving in distance caused by the construction of the Wilson Cut-off, it will be possible within a year to revolutionize much important mail service associated with the route between New York via Washington, and Wilmington, N. C.; Charleston, S. C.; Savannah, Ga.; Jacksonville, Fla., and into Florida, and as well promote the West India mails. This route will then become truly a fast-mail route, in the sense that similar unsubsidized service exists elsewhere. It will fulfill all the requirements of the West India mails, and, besides, practically make available one day earlier than at present the mails of a wide section of southern country. Until the people experience the changed conditions that will then exist they can not fully realize the great importance that will result from having their letters leave the North at the close of each day's business, and coming north, be delivered to correspondents sufficiently early in the day to be made available for the same day's business.

In this communication I have not deemed it necessary to dwell particularly upon the merits of a continuance of the subsidy to the two routes operating out of New York and that between Baltimore and Hagerstown, Md., principally because they have received but a small part of the special-facility payments.

The general grounds, however, upon which the Department deprecates allowances of this kind, as explained in connection with the West India fast-mail route, can be applied with equal force to the remaining items of the last fiscal year's payments.

Yours, respectfully,

JOHN WANAMAKER,
Postmaster-General.

HON. JOHN S. HENDERSON,
Chairman Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

Mr. Chairman, I do not mean to take up much time of the House in reading from these reports. Here is Mr. Wanamaker, one of the best business men in this country, who utterly repudiated it not only as unnecessary, but in the way of the administration of the law. Mr. Bell, his second assistant, utterly repudiated it in all his reports, and when Postmaster-General Wilson, a Democrat, came in he said that, as Congress had given this money to be used, he took it as a mandate from Congress that it should be used, and he did use it, but did not recommend it.

In 1896 Postmaster-General Wilson (Democrat) said:

Congress has appropriated each year during the last twenty years a speciality fund for a fast mail service from New England and New York to Southern States reaching as far south as New Orleans. The total amount for the current year is \$196,614.22.

There has been a difference of opinion as to the necessity for making these appropriations, but as each Congress has seen proper to follow the action of the former Congress, the Department, while not recommending the appropriation, has thought it advisable to apply the fund for the purpose indicated. (Report of the Postmaster-General, House Doc., Vol. II, 54th Cong., 2d sess., 1896-97, p. 35.)

That answers somebody's question who asked us yesterday or the day before why it was if this money was not necessary it was used. These men have all repudiated it, and yet Congress takes from the river and harbor people a million of dollars to help along railroads that are able to help themselves. It takes this money for the railroads and leaves the claims of the people of this country unpaid. It leaves public buildings un-erected that should be built. It leaves locks and dams un-completed in this country that should be completed. There are several in my own district that should be completed and for which I can not get the money. The two hundred and fifty or three hundred thousand dollars that this "picnic" costs would build or complete several dams even in Alabama. It would finish two or three in Tennessee, for which I have been laboring for years and can not get the money to complete. Instead of taking the money for that purpose, the money that my people pay is taken here and given to the railroad that is able to buy all I own and all the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] owns and all that a great many more own.

The Southern Railroad is one of the richest railroads in the country. It is hauling so much traffic that it is actually building a double track southward, and yet we must go along here and take the people's money simply because in somehow or other they get it—God knows how! Now, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has said here time and again that the Postmaster-General has not condemned it. I challenge the statement, and cite the gentleman to the authorities that I referred to to support my position.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Would it not be well for the gentleman to confine himself to the present Administration?

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I leave that for the other side. I have since the Fifty-fifth Congress tried to get the Administration to "stand pat" one way or the other for our benefit, but the reports are unsatisfactory.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I presume the gentleman desires to be fair.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Oh, I do. The only trouble about this Department in this respect is that they are like some other people that I know—they work both sides of the street, not telling us what the Department deems best in plain and unmistakable words. Hence I go back to Wilson, Wanamaker, Bell, and others, who do.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Read the report.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I have read all that General Shallenberger ever said on the subject, and he has talked both ways, it is contended. I will tell you what he said to me several years ago. He said that at first the railroads needed help, and then the Government gave this subsidy to them; that the railroads did not need help now, and that this appropriation hampered him—"that the tree now could stand alone." I have repeated this before in the House. That is what General Wanamaker said, and that is what General Dickinson said, and that is what General Bell said. That is what every man who is impartial must say, if he will but read impartially these reports.

Mr. Chairman, I have stated this appropriation started back in President Hayes's Administration, away back yonder in 1879, and it has been coming along and along by railroad coercion, so to speak, down to date. Finally General Dickinson started opposing it, and General Wanamaker utterly condemned the proposition; and simply because somehow or other there is enough influence in this House and out of it, rightfully or wrongfully, intelligently or ignorantly, they come in here and have for eight years secured this money, a part of which goes to a road that goes through my own city, the glorious city of Nashville, historic for her beautiful women and her glorious citizenship, the Athens of the South. [Applause.] Yet no man has ever come to me on the streets of Nashville—and it is useless to come, for I know I am right—and said "GAINES, you are wrong in this matter."

I am against subsidies. I am against taking the people's money and giving it to charity in this way. Now, think of it! Why, General Wanamaker said in 1892 or 1893 that the pay of railroads increased in his administration about 20 per cent, more than possibly the subsidy would amount to, and yet he says there are some who want this subsidy and he says it is in the way of the public service. It is not necessary. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I want to place in the RECORD quotations from General Dickinson and others and a letter from General Wanamaker, bearing me out in what I have said.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks

unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

A MEMBER. Why not put in something from General Shallenberger?

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. No; General Shallenberger is all through the RECORD, covering the debate on this subject for the past eight years.

Mr. OVERSTREET. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. RICHARDSON].

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I propose to vote on this subject just as I have been voting ever since I have had the honor to be a Member of Congress, and I am actuated to-day more strongly in the considerations that have influenced me heretofore than I have ever been before. I have learned from experience the great and incalculable benefit that this fast-mail service has been to my own people and our section. I am in no wise interested or concerned in the operations of railroads, and I take occasion to say that I never had the honor of being a railroad attorney in a practice of the law of over twenty years. I believe that it is the first and the highest duty of a Representative, first, to vote for that which he believes to be right and proper, and, second, closely allied to that consideration is the one to vote to represent what he believes to be the will and the wishes of his own people. That I consider true democracy and the principles of a representative government.

My home, Mr. Chairman, is quite a hundred miles west of Chattanooga, Tenn., where this fast mail service passes. The people of that immediate section realize the great benefit of this fast mail service in the fact that our eastern mail reaches us some thirteen hours sooner than it otherwise would do. What are the real undesirable facts in connection with this controversy? Let me enumerate them briefly.

Fast mail expedites mail from Greater New York and vicinity and from the States of New Jersey, Delaware, Pennsylvania, Maryland, District of Columbia, to commercial centers in the Carolinas, Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, and Texas. Saving in time over other trains twelve to twenty-four hours.

If the fast-mail measure fails of passage the train now expediting the mail will continue to be operated, but upon a speed schedule reduced in speed some twelve to fifteen hours to New Orleans and Texas points.

This fast train now leaves Washington at 8 o'clock a. m. daily and arrives at New Orleans at 11 a. m. the following morning, a distance of 1,244 miles, and makes immediate connection at New Orleans with fast train of the Southern Pacific Road, delivering the mails throughout points along this line the afternoon of the second day from New York and Washington, to say nothing of the immense territory served between Washington and New Orleans by diverging lines, such as Greensboro, N. C., Charlotte, N. C., and Atlanta, Ga., Birmingham and Montgomery, Ala. And yet gentlemen on this floor denounce it as a subsidy, and do so with emphasis.

Not only have I been importuned by the chambers of commerce and the different business leagues of my own section to vote for this measure, but recently, by the establishment of rural free-delivery service, where a number of routes pass from my town into the country, the farmers in that neighborhood are able to get New York papers of recent date that heretofore would have taken them several days to get. Can anyone with real sincerity charge a subsidy under such circumstances? The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GAINES] goes back to the ancient days of Wanamaker. Why, he might just as well quote what some one has said commending the old stagecoach mode of travel as compared with the present improved railroad routes. Why does he not take the statement of the Second Assistant Postmaster-General, Mr. Shallenberger, who has charge of the department controlling this matter, when he says, as was shown in the RECORD yesterday, "It unquestionably has brought benefit to the service?" Can any man fairly believe otherwise, provided he is able to discard—if you will excuse me for saying it, without any personal reflection—the "populistic" idea and cry that everything is a subsidy where the Government acts for the benefit of the public? My friend from Tennessee [Mr. MOON] said:

The gentlemen on the Democratic side of this House might as well understand now as hereafter that they can not make an exception in this case; they can not inveigh against subsidies and corruption in administration on the part of the Republican party and when they desire something that they regard as of especial benefit for themselves and their section stand by it and demand it. [Loud applause.] If you are Democrats, be national Democrats, and not Southern Railway subsidy Democrats. [Applause.]

Does he mean to say by implication that the gentlemen on this side, whose Democracy is just as unquestionable, as true as his,

are supporting this matter simply because it is a gift to the Southern Railroad?

I confess, Mr. Chairman, that I am surprised at this language coming from the gentleman from Tennessee. It does not accord with his usual generosity in passing on the motives of his colleagues. I feel sure that he would not desire or seek to gain a certain kind and species of popularity by reflecting on the sincerity of those who see proper to differ with him and decline most respectfully to accept his definition of a subsidy, or what a subsidy is. We believe that where an honest and fair contract is made by the Government with a railroad—yes, a railroad company—for certain service that benefits the public, as Mr. Shallenberger says this fast mail service does, and that service is faithfully performed, the Government ought to stand up to its part of the contract, and not only that, but continue that contract just so long as that service is of benefit. Why, Mr. Chairman, the objection that the gentleman makes to this fast mail service is chiefly because the same service is not enjoyed by all of the railroads of the country. He forgets that certain sections of the Union do not require such expedition of their mails. Their population is dense, towns and villages are near to each other, and railroads, by reason of abundant patronage in the transportation of persons and property, find it to their interest to run passenger trains hourly that also carry the mails. Does such a condition exist in our southern section, through which this fast mail service passes? Is not the contrary more than true? It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that the "subsidy" objection made by the distinguished gentleman [Mr. Moon of Tennessee] and other gentlemen on this floor applies to the whole management of our Post-Office Department as forcibly as it does to this particular fast mail service.

While it is true, Mr. Chairman, that I do not support this service alone for the reason that it benefits a large portion of the business people of our Southern section, but I certainly will not vote against it for that reason. I stand ready at all times to aid by my vote any legitimate measure that aids in the improvement and development of our section, and I am not disposed to stop and hustle around to find some objection to it, and especially by giving a strained construction to what a subsidy is.

If I recall it correctly, the general assembly of the great State of Tennessee, since this fast mail service has been under discussion during the last several years, passed resolutions or gave some expression favorable to the continuance of fast mail service. Surely the honorable gentlemen who constituted that distinguished body of Tennesseans were not "subsidists" as defined to-day on this floor. Besides that, Mr. Chairman, we who compose the membership of this House are prone to differ as to what a "subsidy" really is. I recall the oleomargarine legislation. No one could deny that the taxing power of the Government without the hope of a dollar of revenue was used to destroy that great industry to promote the interests of another competing industry. That, it seems to me, was not only undemocratic, but in the most offensive way created a subsidy—not by paying down the cash, but by using the taxing power of the Government to destroy one legitimate business for the benefit and advancement of another. Yet there are some gentlemen here on this floor who complacently supported that proposition—that subsidy—who now cry out most lustily against this fast mail service, denouncing it as a subsidy.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. OVERSTREET. I will ask the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Moon] to occupy some time now.

Mr. MOON of Tennessee. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HAMLIN].

Mr. HAMLIN. Mr. Chairman, I dislike very much to oppose any measure which will benefit any particular section of our country, but the fact of this item being in the post-office appropriation bill is so antagonistic to my ideas of proper legislation that I am forced to enter my protest. Of course we have been told here by gentlemen that this is not a subsidy. They object to having it thus characterized. It is called a "special facility." I know that sometimes we call railroad passes "transportation." It sounds a little better, but I am reminded that "a rose by any other name smells just as sweet." Now, Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to these things on principle. If it be a good thing to this special portion of the country for the Government to pay a hundred and forty-odd thousand dollars per year to

hasten the mails South about three or four hours, why would it not be a good policy to subsidize all the railroads of the country engaged in carrying the mails?

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. They did once, but they have taken it away from all but this one.

Mr. HAMLIN. I know this to be true that as a matter of fact the railroads of this country on account of the demand for the carrying of passengers, brought about by competition at competitive points, are hurrying mails through the country much more rapidly than they once did, but I can not believe that it is good legislation thus to pay a certain bonus or subsidy to any special railroad in order to benefit a special section of the country. What would you think in a town out of which there ran several rural free-delivery routes, all of a maximum limit receiving the same compensation, for you to select out some special route and pay that carrier \$500 more a year to hurry his mail around two or three hours sooner than the other carriers?

I do not believe in these discriminations. Why, my Democratic friends, we have always been opposed to subsidies, and you can not make anything else out of this. I remember only the other day, when there was an effort made upon this side of the Chamber to appropriate a little more money for the paying of the teachers in the District of Columbia, the question of economy was raised, not only on this side, but upon the other side of the Chamber. And while I am opposed to the payment of subsidies upon any condition, yet I believe if there was ever a reason or excuse for subsidizing anybody or any class of persons it is the teachers of this country, honest and conscientious in not only molding the characters of our boys and girls, but shaping the destinies of those who shall, after we have passed off the stage of life, control this nation. [Applause.] That can not be done, but \$146,000 can be voted here to the payment of one railroad for the purpose of hurrying patent medicine advertisements into the southern portion of the country a few hours earlier than they would otherwise reach there. [Applause.] No, Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that we will be furthering good legislation if we pass this item in this post-office bill. I wanted to enter my protest, and I sincerely hope that the motion of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] will prevail, and that this item will be stricken from the bill. [Applause.]

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that some of the gentlemen who are opposed to this motion are not basing their arguments upon substantial grounds. There has been quite a controversy as to whether this is a subsidy or something else. Mr. Chairman, as I look at it, it is absolutely immaterial what you call it. We all know what it is. I presume that those who have conscientious scruples against voting for subsidies could vote in favor of this appropriation and find solace in their hearts by calling it a "subvention," or something of that kind. If this railroad company which is the beneficiary of this contemplated appropriation is an eleemosynary institution, you might call this philanthropy. If it is bankrupt, why call it charity or a donation. If it is a religious corporation, call it a contribution to missionary work. But whatever you call it, the fact remains just the same that there is, at least in my judgment, no good substantial reason why this payment should be made.

The rose, we are told, would smell just as sweet by any other name, and it does not make any difference what you call this appropriation. It ought to be taken out of this bill, for there is no reason why it should be given to this corporation. Why, the only argument, Mr. Chairman, that I have heard in its favor is that it gives some particular location special mail facilities. Why, sir, if that is a good argument for this, then let us have special mail facilities in every other man's country and district. I know, and every other Member knows, where special mail facilities would be advantageous to certain localities.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, we did have those special facilities, I will say to my friend from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS], and every one of them has been abandoned except two roads, and this is one of the two.

Mr. NORRIS. Yes; all abandoned. Now, I take it, Mr. Chairman, that the testimony of Mr. Shallenberger, which was read here, that this did give additional mail facilities, is no argument for the retention of this item in the bill. If it is true that it would give additional mail facilities, Mr. Chairman, the same thing could be said of every other locality in the United States.

Mr. GILBERT. Is there any other railroad so situated as to compete with the carrying of this mail from Washington?

Mr. NORRIS. I do not know anything about that. I was not here when it was commenced.

Mr. GILBERT. What I want to get at is whether this corporation did not virtually get the contract at its own figures to carry the mail?

Mr. NORRIS. It may be that it did. I am not informed as to that.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we have been talking several days on the matter of economy. Gentlemen have called attention to the fact that we ought to be economical, and that the condition of the Treasury is such that we should look after these matters. Let us consider it for a moment. Here is an item in round numbers in these two paragraphs of about \$200,000 going to the railroad companies simply for the purpose of giving to certain localities little better mail facilities. It strikes me, Mr. Chairman, that it is a good place for us to practice economy, and here is a good place for us to take out of this bill this appropriation, that has no reason for its foundation and no justice in its favor.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] has expired.

Mr. OVERSTREET. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire how much time is yet remaining to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MOON]?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is informed that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MOON] has five minutes remaining.

Mr. MOON of Tennessee. I think the Chair has miscalculated my time.

Mr. OVERSTREET. I did not hear the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee has consumed twenty-five minutes.

Mr. MOON of Tennessee. I yielded five minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS], ten to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GAINES], and five to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HAMLIN]. That is all the time I have yielded, at least.

The CHAIRMAN. Maybe the Clerk has made an error.

Mr. OVERSTREET. I think I have fourteen minutes remaining.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk has the gentleman from Indiana credited with nineteen minutes.

Mr. OVERSTREET. I yielded ten minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], five minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. RICHARDSON], and one to the gentleman from New York [Mr. DRISCOLL], according to my count.

The CHAIRMAN. Evidently there has been an error of five minutes in the time of the gentleman from Tennessee, who is entitled to ten minutes more.

Mr. MOON of Tennessee. Then I yield five minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FINLEY].

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

Mr. OVERSTREET. I yield ten minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KLUTTZ].

Mr. KLUTTZ. Mr. Chairman, I have listened patiently to the thrashing over of the old straw of this old discussion. I have heard here this morning and yesterday the same old acrimonious assertions that we heard last year and the year before. I have heard the charge that this was a subsidy; I have heard the attempted cracking of the political whip over the heads of Members on this side who have the courage to vote for a meritorious appropriation for their own section; and I shall not undertake to answer in kind—for I have neither the time nor the inclination—the diatribes which have been hurled against this appropriation and its supporters. I deny that it is a subsidy in any proper understanding of that much misunderstood word.

A subsidy, as I understand it, is "a gift or grant of money or other thing of value for the promotion, establishment, or maintenance of a private enterprise which it is supposed will result in some incidental public benefit."

If it was to build railroads, if it was to equip them, then it would be a subsidy. Here the railroads are already built, and this special appropriation is only made for special facilities, and when those special facilities are not given the appropriation is withheld. For the year ending June 30, 1903, out of the \$167,000 appropriated for the Atlanta-New Orleans line, \$49,000, nearly, was deducted by the Government for failure to make the schedule time. Neither storm nor wind nor accident nor flood nor anything else avails the railroad when it fails to make the schedule by five minutes at any one of the terminal points, and the pay for the entire trip is docked. General Shallenberger tells us that rule is absolutely enforced.

Starting in the city of Washington, it goes nearly 1,400 miles down to New Orleans and over 2,000 miles further to Los Angeles, facilitating the mail by a day to New Orleans and by

two days to Los Angeles, and according to the testimony of General Shallenberger facilitating it at all intermediate points and to all connecting lines. I shall put the statements of General Shallenberger and of the Chief of the Railway Mail Service in the Record as against the unsupported assertions of gentlemen here that this service is of no benefit to the South and to the country which it traverses.

Ah, gentlemen talk about subsidies! And yet gentlemen know that nearly every item in the post-office appropriation bill is for special facilities, for expedition of the mails. Why not go back to the star routes, costing one hundred and fifty or two hundred dollars? Why give \$600 to the rural mail carriers? It is to expedite the mails to the homes of the country people. Why appropriate millions for the city carriers, to save the city people the trouble of going to the post-office? It is in the interest of expedition of the mails. Why appropriate \$500,000 for pneumatic-tube service in a few of the great cities, in order to expedite the mails by a few minutes in those cities?

Why appropriate—and, gentlemen, do not blink at it—\$463,410.64 in this bill as an absolute subsidy, according to you, gentlemen, to the seven ocean mail routes now in operation? I shall put into my printed remarks the report of the Superintendent of Foreign Mails showing that to be a fact. Ah, that goes somewhere else—goes to foreign countries—and you vote it without blinking, with all your objections to subsidies. [Applause.] Yet, when we ask for an appropriation going to the great southland for carrying the mails 3,000 miles over a route by way of New Orleans, where there are but three trains a day going and only two coming back, or five trains in all, whereas you have twenty-one trains carrying mail going out of Washington to New York and twenty-one returning, or forty-two in all every day, you ask why there should be help given to this mail route, when we have but five trains as compared with your forty-two the other way.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee rose.

Mr. KLUTTZ. I have not time to yield to my friend, although I should be glad to do it.

As General Shallenberger says, it is because of the difference in the situation in the North and in the South.

Mr. Chairman, when we are voting for these great sums to expedite the mail, I ask this House not to cut off this little ewe lamb of the South, the only appropriation we get to expedite the mail. It is for the interest of the East, it is for the interest of New York, it is for the interest of New England, it is for the interest of New Jersey, it is for the interest of Maryland that their great mails should be gathered up and expedited on the way to the South and delivered to their correspondents in time to be answered in one to two days earlier than it could be possible without these special facilities.

Gentlemen say that the train would be continued if this was taken away. Well, it may be possible that the Southern Railway would run a mail train, but does any sane man think that it would give the Government absolute control of that train; does any sane man think it would make a schedule of more than 41 miles an hour, the fastest single-track schedule in the United States, and would make it every day in the year all that distance without this appropriation given by the Government? I say it would not; I say it could not, and it would not be good business policy for it to undertake to do it.

With these considerations, gentlemen, I ask you to vote down this proposition. It is not for \$250,000, as my friend from Tennessee said. It is \$167,000 in this item, \$48,000 of which was deducted last year by virtue of failures to make the schedule, leaving only \$90,000 as the cost of this special service. I ask you gentlemen, to retain this item in the bill and to give us for our southland, blossoming as it is like the rose, having caught the quickstep of the great march of progress which has blessed other sections of this country, due in no small extent to this aid which the Government has extended to it—I ask you not to cut it off, but leave us the blessing which it has brought us and which will be more extended in the future. [Applause.]

The first witness I shall call is the General Superintendent of the Railway Mail Service, who, in his last annual report, found on page 465 of the Report of the Post-Office Department for 1903, says:

The fast mail service during the year has received that attention and interest at the hands of the Department which has specialized that feature of improvement in recent past years, and such additions have been made therein as it was thought would tend to further strengthen and improve the fast mail system so as to meet all requirements. As stated in my report of last year, the fast mail service can not properly be considered solely with reference to the benefits which may result to the patrons of the terminal offices by later dispatch and earlier arrival of the mails, because the entire intervening territory also partakes of the benefits of these fast trains, includ-

ing localities served by lateral and connecting trains, and thus the benefits reach far beyond the immediate lines upon which the fast service may be operated.

It is gratifying to say that at this time there is hardly a railway system of any importance but operates directly or indirectly in the fast mail feature of service, either as a part of the fast mail system proper or by direct connection therewith.

One of the most important and far-reaching improvements in the fast mail system of the service was placed in operation November 2, 1902, between New York, N. Y., and New Orleans, La. The schedule was arranged to leave New York at 2.15 a. m. and arrive at New Orleans the following morning at 11.50 a. m., as follows: Leave New York at 2.15 a. m.; Washington, D. C., 8 a. m.; Lynchburg, Va., 12.17 p. m.; Charlotte, N. C., 5.25 p. m.; Atlanta, Ga., 11.15 p. m.; Montgomery, Ala., 3.22 a. m., reaching New Orleans at 11.50 a. m. (The arriving time at New Orleans now is 11.30 a. m. by recent schedule change.) The distance from New York to New Orleans is 1,369 miles.

At New Orleans this fast mail makes direct connection with trains via the New Orleans and Houston railway post-office, and thence by Houston and Eagle Pass, Houston and El Paso, El Paso and Tucson, Tucson and Los Angeles, and San Francisco and Los Angeles railway post-offices, covering a distance approximately of 3,850 miles from New York, N. Y., to San Francisco, Cal. By this new schedule New York and New Orleans are brought practically a day nearer to each other for purposes of correspondence. Previously the mails left New York at 4.30 a. m. and reached New Orleans the second night, too late for receipt by the public, and hence the mail was not available until the following morning, thus making two full days between the points in question. Under the new schedule all mail available for dispatch at 2.15 a. m. from New York is deliverable at noon next day in New Orleans.

The territory intermediate between Washington, D. C., and New Orleans, La., including lateral connections, is also correspondingly benefited, as close connections are made at intermediate junctions by railway post-offices operated on connecting lines, giving the offices and lines served and connected by the latter the advantage of the fast train from New York, with its accumulation of mail gathered en route. The fast train from New York, leaving at 2.15 a. m., also receives a connection from Boston, Mass., leaving the latter city at 5 p. m., and thus extends the benefits of the new fast train to Boston, in the East, and connections at that place, including New England intermediate between Boston, Mass., and New York, N. Y.

The following is an extract taken from a New Orleans daily paper of November 4, 1902:

"For the first time in the history of the country letters posted in New York Sunday morning were delivered to people in New Orleans Monday, shortly after the noon hour, thus marking a new epoch in the history of railroading in the South. Letters posted in Atlanta Sunday night were brought in on the train and delivered at 1 o'clock, and for the first time Sunday New York papers were sold on the streets of New Orleans before 12 o'clock the next day after publication.

"Traveling men and tourists at different hotels were pleased to learn that this service had been inaugurated, as it saves a day in the delivery of their mail, and many of the commercial men who were not informed as to when the service was to be inaugurated were surprised to get checks from their houses yesterday that they did not expect until to-day."

The foregoing quotation is assumed to give a fair idea of the opinion held at that point concerning this effort of the Department to improve the mail facilities and provide means for a quick interchange of correspondence from New York to this important commercial section of the country.

Is not this a sufficient answer to the bold assertions of gentlemen?

The next evidence I shall offer is from the report of Second Assistant Postmaster-General Shallenberger, on page 142 of the Report of the Post-Office Department for 1903:

One very important improvement in the fast-mail system was inaugurated November 2, 1902, between New York and New Orleans. A schedule was arranged by which mail leaving New York at 2.15 a. m. reaches New Orleans at 11.30 next day. Previous to that date mails leaving New York in the early morning did not arrive in New Orleans until the following night, too late for delivery to the public.

Not only has mail been quickened to New Orleans by this improvement in schedule, but corresponding advantages are derived from a close connection at New Orleans with Pacific coast trains?

Communities served by connecting lines at intermediate points enjoy the benefits of these improvements as well as terminal cities.

I shall next offer the statements made by Second Assistant Postmaster-General Shallenberger on the recent hearings before the Post-Office Committee.

It will be observed that he was repeatedly pressed to say that this service was of no benefit to people living on lateral or connecting lines, but that he emphatically negated this; that he was repeatedly pressed to say that as good service could be gotten without this appropriation as with it, but expressly declined to so commit himself; that he was pressed to say that under similar conditions as good schedules were made in other parts of the country without special-facility appropriations, but that he failed to so admit; that he emphasized the great speed of the schedule and the stringency with which it was required to be made, showing that out of the \$142,000 appropriated for the great Southern facility \$48,800 had been deducted within the past year for failure to make that schedule by five minutes. But I prefer to let Mr. Shallenberger speak for himself, in the following quotations from the hearings, which, for lack of time, I can only print in the RECORD:

AS TO BENEFITS.

The CHAIRMAN. The next item was for the appropriation for special facilities on trunk lines. What have you to say as to that item?

[Page 146.]

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. We have nothing to say other than what has been stated in recent years, that it is an item for which we make no recommendation. We simply use the appropriation that is placed in

the bill by Congress to the best possible advantage, so as to secure some compensating service.

The CHAIRMAN. There is a provision in the current law which, I understand, has been inserted for a few years last past, to the effect that no part of this appropriation shall be expended unless the Postmaster-General shall deem such expenditure necessary in order to promote the interest of the postal service. Have you followed that provision and determined that it is necessary before you utilized that appropriation?

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. We have in the sense that I have stated, that we do secure what is regarded as necessary service by the communities served by this particular line.

[Page 147.]

The CHAIRMAN. While you have made no recommendation of that item, General, have you found it to be of some service to the Government to have that item available?

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. I will say in answer to that that I have not regarded it as of service to the Government, but that it is of service to the communities there is no question. It is of special service to the communities reached; but when you ask me whether I consider it of service to the general postal administration, I will say that I have not considered it and have not recommended it for several years.

My predecessor, I believe, did not recommend it, the reason for that being that it seems to be a special privilege given to one section and several railway systems that is not given to railway systems in every section, and the general administration of the office would be more pleasant for me, and more impartial, if I could say to all systems and communities that there is no special appropriation out of which I could pay for expedited service.

Now, Congress having viewed this question from this standpoint, and having decided year by year that they would continue the appropriation, and they having charged me with getting compensating advantages, I have so arranged these trains and their schedules, approved by the Department, on the condition that unless they do perform this special service, which other roads are not required to do, we simply do not give the special-facility pay.

[Page 150.]

Mr. MOON (quoting the part of his question relative to the point argued). Are the people in the interior of the country supposed to be benefited by it?

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. I can see no reason why the benefit, if any, that attaches to the main lines should not follow the connections.

[Page 151.]

Mr. MOON (quoting from another question the part relative to benefit to the country not on the main line). Do we get any benefit from it that is worth what we are paying?

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Of course the entire section of the country must be considered as getting the benefits. If we consider it as a through service from Washington to New Orleans, then, of course, Atlanta receives the mail by a very quick schedule, which is maintained within five minutes, and it necessarily receives for the entire section south and west of Atlanta those advantages.

[Page 152.]

The CHAIRMAN. Does the delivery of mail by the special trains No. 97 and No. 37 at Atlanta for points in northern Alabama and southern Mississippi and northern Louisiana enter into your consideration as to the benefit which is derived from this special facility?

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. They receive what advantage there is in the service for the reason that we make it a continuous service and do not permit the train to leave Atlanta until it has received its special-facility connection, nor do we permit it to leave Montgomery until it has received its special-facility connection, so that that is a continuous special-facility connection all the way to New Orleans.

COULD THE SAME SERVICE BE OBTAINED WITHOUT THIS APPROPRIATION?

[Page 150.]

Mr. SHALLENBERGER (in answer to question from Mr. MOON). I am not prepared to say what the comparative result would be if there were no special facilities, whether delays would be greater and more numerous or not. I simply say that the payment of this money is denied to the company unless the special speed is maintained.

[Page 156.]

Mr. GRIGGS. In your opinion, could New Orleans and Atlanta be reached from New York and Washington as quickly without the appropriation as with it?

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. I am not prepared to say that. I do not know what effect it would have—the withdrawing of this appropriation.

Mr. GRIGGS. You would not say that you could keep it up?

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. I would not say that I could or could not.

[Page 157.]

Mr. STAFFORD. Supposing this special-facility appropriation was discontinued, do you think that it would be possible for the Department to obtain any fast mail connections between Washington and New Orleans, either by these same points or by other railways running to New Orleans?

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. We would secure the very best service that can be given to the traveling public, and especially to the passenger traveling public, and that is all that we can secure in any section of the country.

Mr. STAFFORD. And is the mail of sufficient quantity, and are there sufficient railroads to make it an inducement to make them put on the fast mail trains, as they are put on in other parts of the country?

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. I doubt that, but I am not positive of it.

[Page 163.]

Mr. MOON. The purpose of this subsidy is not to give those people any benefit [referring to the people living in the interior or on the roads in North Carolina, eastern and middle Tennessee, northern Georgia, and Alabama]?

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. We can not say what the purpose of the appropriation is; we simply say that we use it in such a way as to procure a schedule that will be kept at the connecting points, and the result of which will necessarily be to give a better mail service for the entire community.

Mr. MOON. Providing the connections are made?

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. I will not make that proviso, because the connections will necessarily be made.

AS TO SPEED AND DEDUCTIONS OF PAY.

[Page 155.]

Mr. GRIGGS. And this train, if I make it correctly from the schedule as put down here by the general superintendent, makes a schedule be-

tween Washington and New Orleans of twenty-seven and one-half hours. That would be a little over 40 miles an hour for the continuous trip of 1,142 miles?

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Yes, sir.
Mr. GRIGGS. Is not that a fast schedule?
Mr. SHALLENBERGER. We regard it as a very fast schedule.
Mr. GRIGGS. Is there any single-track railroad in the United States that makes it in ordinary passenger or mail service?
Mr. SHALLENBERGER. I doubt it. I am not prepared to say whether any single-track railroad makes that.

[Page 146.]

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Whenever they fail to keep the schedule time to five minutes we make a deduction, and the special-facility pay for the entire trip is withheld.

The CHAIRMAN. That practice has obtained for how long?
Mr. SHALLENBERGER. For several years.
The CHAIRMAN. That is being pursued now?
Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Yes, sir; so that we find that the deductions in the last year were \$48,846.
Mr. GRIGGS. So that left \$122,347.18 paid out?
The CHAIRMAN. Have you that separated there as to the two lines, showing how much the deduction was for the Southern line and how much for the Kansas line?

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. The Kansas line does not appear in this statement. * * * Now, out of that I have withheld, by reason of these deductions, \$48,846, so that \$90,002 have actually been paid for the service rendered.

Mr. HEDGE. Those deductions are strictly made, are they? I mean when a train is late you are very strict about that?

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Yes, sir; we watch it very closely.

And now, Mr. Chairman, I have done. I think I have demonstrated that this appropriation is neither a subsidy nor a steal, but that it is what it purports to be—an appropriation for "necessary and special facilities." The attempt to crack the party whip over the heads of supporters of this measure is too puerile to require notice. Let me say to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROBINSON] that many as good Democrats as he will not hesitate to answer against him on his threatened roll call. For one I shall welcome the opportunity to let my immediate constituents know that I have been true to their interests and the interests of the public, in spite of the carping of self-constituted censors. [Applause.]

[From Report of Superintendent of Foreign Mails, page 18.]

CONTRACT OCEAN MAIL SERVICE.

The contract mail service upon the seven routes now in operation has been performed to the satisfaction of the Department and of the contractors.

The distance traversed, the amount paid as mileage, the weights of the mails, and the amount which would have been paid for the same service at the allowance of the full sea and United States inland postage upon the seven routes in question are as follows, viz:

Route 36, New York to La Guaira, 25 trips; statute miles traveled, 60,880; mileage paid, at \$1 a mile.....	\$60,880.00
Weights of the mails conveyed: Letters and post cards, 14,919 pounds; other articles, 196,862 pounds; amount of the full sea and inland postage thereon.....	39,610.36
Excess of cost of contract service on route 36.....	21,260.64
Route 37, New York to Maracaibo, 25 trips; statute miles traveled, 63,667½; mileage paid, at 66½ cents a mile.....	42,445.00
Weights of the mails conveyed: Letters and post cards, 2,654 pounds; other articles, 41,893 pounds; amount of the full sea and inland postage thereon.....	7,597.84
Excess of cost of contract service on route 37.....	34,847.16
Route 57, New York to Southampton, 47 trips; statute miles traveled, 172,620.8; mileage paid, at \$4 a mile.....	690,483.20
Weights of the mails conveyed: Letters and post cards, 350,810 pounds; other articles, 2,384,406 pounds; amount of full sea and inland postage thereon.....	752,048.48
Excess of sea and inland postage over cost of contract service on route 57.....	61,565.28
Route 69, New York to Tuxpan, 53 trips; statute miles traveled, 132,606; mileage paid, at \$1 a mile.....	132,606.00
Weights of the mails conveyed: Letters and post cards, 5,226 pounds; other articles, 80,961 pounds; amount of the full sea and inland postage thereon.....	14,838.48
Excess of cost of contract service on route 69.....	117,767.52
Route 70, New York to Habana, 52 trips; statute miles traveled, 73,476; mileage paid, at \$1 a mile.....	73,476.00
Weights of the mails conveyed: Letters and post cards, 592 pounds; other articles, 13,710 pounds; amount of the full sea and inland postage thereon.....	2,044.00
Excess of cost of contract service on route 70.....	71,432.00
Route 74, Boston and Philadelphia to Port Antonio, Jamaica, 78 trips; statute miles traveled, 139,122; mileage paid, at 66½ cents a mile.....	92,748.00
Weights of the mails conveyed: Letters and post cards, 3,580 pounds; other articles, 46,928 pounds; amount of the full sea and inland postage thereon.....	9,482.24
Excess of cost of contract service on route 74.....	83,265.76
Route 75, San Francisco, Cal., to Sydney, New South Wales, 17 trips; statute miles traveled, 141,601½; mileage paid, at \$2 a mile.....	283,203.00
Weights of the mails conveyed: Letters and post cards, 25,860 pounds; other articles, 567,802 pounds; amount of the full sea and inland postage thereon.....	86,800.16
Excess of cost of contract service on route 75.....	196,402.84
Aggregate excess of cost of contract service.....	463,410.64

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. FINLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask for the same permission.
The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina asks permission to extend his remarks in the Record. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. OVERSTREET. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the gentleman from Tennessee now conclude his time.

Mr. MOON of Tennessee. I yield, Mr. Chairman, five minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MACON].

Mr. MACON. Mr. Chairman, I was on my feet yesterday asking for recognition from the Chair when the gentleman from Nebraska was recognized and moved to amend the pending bill by striking out the following paragraph:

For necessary and special facilities on trunk lines from Washington to Atlanta and New Orleans, \$142,728.75: *Provided*, That no part of the appropriation made by this paragraph shall be expended unless the Postmaster-General shall deem such expenditure necessary in order to promote the interests of the postal service.

Had I received recognition instead of the gentleman from Nebraska I would have made the same motion that he did. I am glad he was recognized and offered the amendment, and it is my purpose now to help him in every way I can to have his amendment adopted by the committee.

It is strange, but a fact, that whenever an unusual and unnecessary appropriation is sought to be made by the House there is some proviso about it somewhere. You will observe that there is a proviso in this paragraph, and whenever I see provisos in matters of legislation I am reminded of the prayer of an old negro that I once heard of when he was praying for forgiveness for a theft that he had committed.

He said: "Oh, Lordy, forgive me for having arrogated Mr. Smith's turkey last week to the use of myself and family for Thanksgiving purposes. If you will, I will promise not to depropriate one for Christmas, provided that the old 'oman do not use too much urgency argumentacy in favor of the Christmas turkey." [Laughter and applause.]

The proviso in the present bill says the appropriation shall not be expended unless the Postmaster-General shall deem such expenditure necessary to promote the interests of the postal service. The provision carries with it the idea that the committee was in doubt as to whether it would be a necessary appropriation or not, but for some unknown reason they put it in, hoping that the Postmaster-General might decide to favor a great railroad corporation with it, which, of course, would be a special privilege that should not be extended, and which we upon this side of the House pledged our constituents upon every platform within our districts that we would do everything in our power to prevent; and yet we find gentlemen from the South sitting upon this side of the House, pledged to oppose subsidies of every form and character, doing everything in their power to defeat this amendment, which seeks to prevent a subsidy being given to an independent and arrogant railroad corporation; and they have appealed to the committee not to take this appropriation from our Southland.

I have lived all my life in the South, and it delights me to give that section any benefit that I legitimately can, but the constituency that I have the honor of representing is too honorable and honest to ask me to vote for any measure that would extend special privileges to either corporations or individuals, though they domiciled in the heart of the South.

Gentlemen who favor the retention of this provision in the bill say that the particular section of country through which the Southern Railroad runs has been greatly benefited by reason of the special privilege extended them by way of a subsidy to a railroad to carry their mail a little faster from Washington to Atlanta, Ga., a distance of 700 miles.

I undertake to say, gentlemen of the committee, that there is not a single individual living along the line of the road between here and Atlanta that has a biscuit more to eat by reason of getting his mail a little earlier, nor a single dear old woman that has an extra darning needle on account of it. If they were benefited, however, I want to ask why the taxpayers from the Lakes to the Gulf should be required to appropriate money in order that the people who live along the line of this 700 miles of railroad should get their mail from three to six hours earlier than they would otherwise get it?

If that particular section of the country can not cope with the other sections of the country without special privileges, then it ought to be required to jog along behind. If Arkansas can not keep pace with the other parts of this country without having special privileges extended to her or her railroads, then I want

It to help bring up the rear. I believe the gentlemen who are supporting this subsidy to the railroads are honest in their convictions, and I would not, under any circumstances, impugn their motives, but I want to say, from the view I take of it there is something rotten at the bottom of this proposition.

It is a subsidy pure and simple, and subsidies are nothing more nor less than legislative steals, and persons who help to give them assist in the theft. [Applause.]

There must be some special reason why all the Members living along the Southern Railroad are voting for this steal. I have heard no legitimate reason that justifies its appropriation. In regard to this particular subsidy for this particular road, the Post-Office Department has said, "There seems to be no justification for the special facilities payment, judging from results obtained," meaning, of course, special mail facilities on the Southern Railroad. It has been argued here that the Department could withhold this appropriation if it did not think it was necessary to use it; but hear what the Postmaster-General has to say upon the subject in reply to a question propounded to him in regard to it.

He said:

Well, the Department would have power to withhold it; but having recommended to Congress the advisability of withholding it, the Department is bound to assume that Congress desires the appropriation to be expended so long as it is made.

He further says:

In submitting the estimates for several years past, this office has declined to include the item of special facilities for the reason heretofore stated, but appropriations have, however, been made.

When viewed by the fact that the Post-Office Department does not see any justification for this appropriation, and its having recommended to Congress the advisability of withholding it, I can see no sane or honest reason for making it at this time. I am advised that this special mail train only makes one trip every twenty-four hours, while there are two other trains that pass over the road every twenty-four hours, one of which leaves Washington only one hour later than the special mail train.

It seems that any reasonable people would be satisfied with two mails a day over the same road. Therefore, I am constrained to think that there is some other reason at the bottom of this project. [Applause.]

Mr. OVERSTREET. Mr. Chairman, there are four minutes remaining to me, and I wish to utilize them without any interruptions. I wish, Mr. Chairman, to draw the attention of the committee to the facts upon which they are to vote in four minutes. I am not here to discuss subsidies, nor am I shying at subsidies, for any man who votes for this bill upon the final vote is compelled to vote for subsidies, because the bill is full of them necessarily. But this is a facility, just as hundreds of other items in this bill are also facilities. I believe that this train would run if this appropriation were refused, but it would not run at the same speed which is required under the restrictions of the law.

This train carries the mail from Washington, after receiving the New York connections, to Atlanta, from which point it makes connection for southern Georgia, northern Florida, Louisiana, and northern Alabama. At New Orleans it makes connection with the Overland Limited, which delivers the mail through northern Texas and to southern California. If the speed required under these limitations is not maintained, not only do the fines fixed by the law deprive the roads from that proportion of the allowance for that trip, but the failure to deliver the mail at the points of Atlanta, Birmingham, and New Orleans makes a failure in the delivery of the mail in Florida, southern Georgia, Louisiana, Texas, and southern California at the times at which the people of those districts are entitled to receive it.

Mr. MOON of Tennessee rose.

Mr. OVERSTREET. Mr. Chairman, I can not be interrupted now. Men of the North who insist on pneumatic-tube service to facilitate the delivery of mails by thirty minutes should hesitate to vote down this proposition, which makes a difference of from twelve to forty-eight hours' delivery in some of these sections which I have briefly enumerated. I repeat that the schedule must be maintained or the fines will deprive the road of its proportion of the allowance, the proportion of that particular trip.

Mr. MOON of Tennessee rose.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. OVERSTREET. I can not yield.

Mr. MOON of Tennessee. I desire to ask the gentleman not to misstate the facts.

Mr. OVERSTREET. I ask that I be protected in my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. OVERSTREET. Gentlemen can not afford to take um-

brage at the word "subsidy," that my friend from Nebraska has rung the changes upon. Every rural route in his district is a subsidy; every one is treated alike. Each costs this Government over \$300 for operation in excess of the revenues which are stimulated by virtue of that service. Every one of the dollars spent for pneumatic-tube service in New York, Boston, Philadelphia, Chicago, and St. Louis is a subsidy to expedite the mail in its quick delivery in those cities. If the people of Florida, southern Georgia, New Orleans, northern Texas, and southern California get the benefit of quicker delivery of mail by virtue of this facility, then why get scared about the word "subsidy"?

Mr. MOON of Tennessee. I desire to say that that is not the truth.

Mr. OVERSTREET. And shy when a proposition is offered which is in line with the other policies of the service. I can not emphasize too strongly, Mr. Chairman, the fact that this schedule must be maintained at each one of the division points, otherwise the railroad loses the proportion of the allowance for the entire trip. Last year there was deducted in the two items for Kansas City to Newton and Washington to New Orleans—both items being on a par—in fines, \$53,379.45, by reason of the failure to make the proper schedules under the provisions. Now, gentlemen have made a great to-do about the refusal of the Department to recommend this appropriation.

The Department, through General Shallenberger, testified before the committee that this allowance resulted in a benefit. He said, in answer to a question from the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MOON], that the Department did not think it wise to make recommendation for these special facilities because it would lead to the establishment of a precedent in which the Department might find itself embarrassed in making similar recommendations in different sections of the country. The mail train over the Burlington route, which carries the mail from Chicago to Omaha and throughout Nebraska, gets indirectly a subsidy for special facilities because under competition to fix the degree of speed it is given a larger volume of business between those two terminals. Unfortunately there is not that competition between parallel roads running from Washington through Georgia to New Orleans.

If there were parallel roads which could enter competition and fix the degree of speed which would maintain a fixed schedule, then the same method of procedure would be pursued with this particular allowance that we to-day pursue over the Burlington route between Chicago and Omaha. Mr. Chairman, I trust that gentlemen will understand that there is merit in this proposition; that there is no disposition to smuggle something in here for favoritism. I repeat that this measure teems with facilities, because wherever the receipts are less than the expenditures for a given purpose there is necessarily a loss, and that loss measures the subsidy to that service.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. OVERSTREET. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote, and hope the motion will be voted down. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion to strike out the paragraph.

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

Mr. MOON of Tennessee and Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Division, Mr. Chairman.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 77, noes 115.

Mr. BAKER. Tellers, Mr. Chairman.

Tellers were refused, 10 gentlemen rising—not a sufficient number to support the demand. [Applause.]

So the motion was rejected.

Mr. BAKER. That is the way you kill the Democratic party.

Mr. GILLESPIE. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 18, line 11, after the word "shall" and before the word "deem," insert the following: "upon his own judgment and experience;" so it will read "shall be expended unless the Postmaster-General shall, upon his own judgment and experience, deem such expenditure," etc.

The question was taken; and the Chairman stated that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. OVERSTREET. Division, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Let the amendment be read again.

The CHAIRMAN. If there be no objection, the amendment will be again reported.

The amendment was again reported.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 69, noes 106.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 18, add after line 12: "And if the Postmaster-General shall expend said amount or any part thereof he shall state his reasons for the necessity for such expenditure to Congress."

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry. Did I understand the debate closed under the rule of the House upon the paragraph and all amendments?

Mr. OVERSTREET. That is my understanding, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I am asking the Chairman of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair did not understand that the order of the House precluded debate on amendments.

Mr. OVERSTREET. I would simply state in justification of what I have said that that was our understanding, but of course if the Chair has no such understanding naturally there would be debate.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, during the progress of this debate there seems to be a considerable confusion as to what opinion the Post-Office Department of the United States Government and its officers, whose duty it was to make recommendations and present to Congress its views with reference to propositions embodied in this bill, had upon this subject. This amendment provides that if there be doubt in the mind of the Post-Office Department that this Congress shall have the benefit of the judgment if it should be determined that this discretion should be used by that Department and this facility be granted. It is the duty of the Post-Office Department to recommend or refuse to recommend, and in a matter concerning a great section of the country that this facility concerns and concerning in larger measure the whole country as to what our policies shall be in granting largess or subsidies for special mail facilities to a few and not to others it is the duty of that Department to give the benefit of its investigation and its judgment when these amounts are granted for these facilities, and the only purpose of the amendment is to provide that if the Postmaster-General, in his discretion, it being lodged in that Department, grant facilities on southern railroads, that he shall state in writing his reasons therefor and leave this Congress hereafter free to determine from his judgment in some measure its future action. Why is it necessary year after year for us to thrash out upon the floor of this House our individual judgment and not have the benefit of the Post-Office Department's judgment, when it is the Department charged with the execution of that duty for our benefit?

The gentlemen will see from the reading of this amendment that it provides if the Postmaster-General sees the necessity for the exercise of this discretion he shall state in writing his reasons for it. And upon that proposition I think we will unite in our wisdom.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Chairman, a few days ago in some remarks I then made to the House, one of the gentlemen on the Republican side said sotto voce: "Give him rope and he will hang himself." The Republican party to-day is showing the shrewdest politics it has ever shown. It is giving the Southern Democrats rope, and they are hanging themselves. [Loud applause on the Republican side.] You Republicans are thereby stopping any sincere attack on your proposition for ship subsidies. You are closing the mouth of every man on this side of the Chamber except that of the man who merely talks for talk's sake. [Loud laughter and applause.] No man can get up on this side of the House and oppose your propositions for special privileges when he himself has voted here to-day in favor of this subsidy, this clean—if anything of that kind can be "clean"—this clean, unadulterated steal. [Laughter and applause.] The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. WILEY] a few moments ago, when I remarked that in this action of the Democrats they were killing the Democratic party, said: "We'll take care of the Democratic party." But, my friends, the only reason why he and many others come to this House from the South is because of the negro question. We have no negro question in the North. [Loud laughter and applause on the Republican side.] There we Democrats have to appeal to the higher impulses of men. The Democracy of the North wishes to appeal to the people on great moral propositions, on great economic questions, but we are killed by the action of such men as the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. WILEY] when he votes in favor of this subsidy proposition. [Applause and laughter.]

Last year we had foisted upon us, we who are really Democratic—Democratic Democrats, we who are Democratic to the

core, the men who believe in Democratic principles because they are abiding truths and should prevail throughout the world—we had forced upon us by just such men as the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. WILEY] a candidate. A candidate! [Loud laughter and applause.] Oh, my friends, a candidate! [Loud and continued laughter and applause.] I told the Democrats in this House, I told my Southern friends last session of the folly of the fatuous course on which they were entering. "Oh, no," they said, "that's only a green young man from New York. He doesn't know anything about politics. In the South is where Democratic wisdom is located, and we'll select the Democratic candidate, and then we'll go marching down Pennsylvania avenue in triumph to the White House." Are you not to-day pleased with your work and the wisdom you displayed? [Loud and long-continued laughter and applause on the Republican side.] Mr. Chairman, I hope that the applause of my Republican friends will not come out of my time. Now, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. OVERSTREET. Mr. Chairman, I hope the gentleman from New York [Mr. BAKER] may have five minutes more time. [Laughter.]

Mr. BAKER. Does the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. OVERSTREET] make that motion?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. BAKER] has not expired.

Mr. POU. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from New York [Mr. BAKER] if he voted for the nominee of the Democratic party at the last election? Did he vote for him or against him?

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Chairman, no one on this floor has ever accused me of evasion if any man asks me a question, and I am not going to evade here to-day. In fact the complaint I have usually made against my Republican friends is that I can not goad them to ask me a question. [Laughter.]

I have not abused on this floor, or anywhere else, the man who was the candidate of the Democratic party.

Several MEMBERS. Answer the question.

Mr. HILDEBRANT. It is one of your Democratic brethren who asked the question.

Mr. BAKER. I have never abused and I have never said one word against Judge Parker.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. BAKER] has expired. [Great laughter.]

Mr. BAKER. Will the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. OVERSTREET] renew his motion?

Mr. OVERSTREET. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. BAKER] may have five minutes.

Several MEMBERS. Ten minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. OVERSTREET] asks unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. BAKER] may be extended for five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BAKER. I suppose the only reason—

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will be in order.

Mr. BELL of California (to Mr. BAKER). I am going to ask you a question. I want to make an inquiry, Mr. Chairman. Has unanimous consent been granted to the gentleman to proceed?

The CHAIRMAN. Unanimous consent has been granted for an extension of the gentleman's time for five minutes.

Mr. BELL of California. I am sorry. I desired to object. I do not think we ought to make a fiasco of the proceedings of the House.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama. I make the point of order that the objection comes too late.

The CHAIRMAN. Unanimous consent was given. The Chair will ask the committee to be in order.

Mr. BAKER. Now, Mr. Chairman, in answer to the question of my friend from North Carolina, I want to say that I certainly did vote for Judge Parker, and not only voted for him, but voted for every—

Mr. POU. Why, then—

Mr. BAKER. Why, I am not through answering your question. I have a right to answer your question in my own way. I want to complete it, and I propose to do so in my own way. [Great laughter.]

Mr. POU. All right. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman desires to be courteous, will he yield to another question?

Mr. BAKER. I have not concluded my answer to your first question yet, and you are the one who is not courteous when you refuse to permit me to conclude.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the Chair understand the gentleman from New York to refuse to yield?

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Chairman, I not only voted—
The CHAIRMAN. Does the Chair understand the gentleman from New York declines to yield?

Mr. BAKER. Not at all. I am going to yield.

Mr. POU. I merely desired to ask the gentleman why, then, does he find fault with his colleagues from the South for doing that which he himself did?

Mr. BAKER. All right; I will answer both questions, then. Now, Mr. Chairman, I not only voted for Judge Parker, but I did that which I very seldom have done previously; I voted for every candidate upon the Democratic ticket, because I took the position that if I was good enough to be nominated as a candidate by the Democratic party, that party ought to be good enough for me to support. [Laughter and loud applause on the Republican side.] Now, Mr. Chairman, as to the other question of the gentleman from North Carolina. In order that I may answer it correctly, I will ask him to restate it, so that I may get it clear.

Mr. POU. The gentleman, Mr. Chairman, was proceeding to criticize his colleagues here for supporting Judge Parker—

Mr. BAKER. No, no, Mr. Chairman! [Loud laughter.]

Mr. POU. I simply inquired of him—

Mr. BAKER. Not for supporting him, but for foisting him upon the party. [Renewed laughter.] You are the people who are responsible. When Mr. Thomas F. Ryan went down through the South and said to you, "You see what you have got for eight years' support of Bryan?" "You see that Bryan has absolutely prevented the Democratic party from winning." "Come with us," says Mr. Ryan and August Belmont, "and we will deliver the goods to the Democratic party." [Great laughter on the Republican side.] You allied yourselves with the monopolists in the Democratic party, who belong in the Republican party, because there ought not to be a Democratic monopolist. These men, their agents, and their lackeys said to you people of the South, "Come with us; leave this anarchist; leave this socialist; leave this man who wants to mislead the Democratic party, and come with us, and be 'safe, sound, and conservative.'" [Great laughter.] You were the men that listened to this siren song, and you are reaping the results of your folly. [Great laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. POU. May I ask the gentleman another question?

Mr. BAKER. I want to debate the amendment of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROBINSON].

Mr. POU. I would like to inquire of the gentleman if he is denouncing Judge Parker as a monopolist?

Mr. BAKER. I say that Judge Parker's candidacy was initiated and manipulated by monopolists. [Loud applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. POU. If that is true, I would like to inquire of the gentleman if he does not think it is a little inconsistent that he should be supporting a monopolist? The gentleman remembers that Mr. Bryan supported him and knows that he would not support him if he was a monopolist.

Mr. BAKER. I did not say that Judge Parker was himself a monopolist. I have no complaint to make of any man who voted the Democratic ticket after the nomination was made. My complaint is that you men were so anxious to get the offices that you went back on your principles, listened to the siren song of Ryan, Belmont, et al., and when the nomination was made there was nothing else to do but vote the Democratic ticket. [Great laughter and loud applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have the amendment reported again.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. SHERMAN having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. PARKINSON, its reading clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the following titles:

H. R. 17769. An act to grant certain lands to the Agricultural and Mechanical College of Oklahoma for college, farm, and experiment station purposes;

H. R. 15284. An act granting to the Keokuk and Hamilton Water Power Company rights to construct and maintain for the improvement of navigation and development of water power a dam across the Mississippi River; and

H. R. 14351. An act for the relief of the Gulf River Lumber Company, its assigns or successors in interest.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendment bill of the following title; in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

H. R. 10558. An act referring the claim of Hannah S. Crane and others to the Court of Claims.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed joint resolution and bills of the following titles; in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. R. 98. Joint resolution to print a second and revised edition of the Third Annual Report of the United States Reclamation Service;

S. 6818. An act for the relief of Hannah B. Sabiston;

S. 6757. An act to amend section 2288 of the Revised Statutes of the United States;

S. 6744. An act relative to the commissions of officers who are under the direction and control of the Postmaster-General and the Secretary of Commerce and Labor, respectively;

S. 6648. An act to establish a light and fog-signal station near Point Cabrillo, Cal.;

S. 6568. An act for the relief of the Richmond Locomotive and Machine Works;

S. 6514. An act for the relief of the Church of Our Redeemer, Washington, D. C.;

S. 6489. An act to amend section 9 of the act of August 2, 1882, concerning lists of passengers;

S. 6311. An act for the relief of James W. Jones;

S. 6244. An act to change the lunacy proceedings in the District of Columbia where the Commissioners of said District are the petitioners, and for other purposes; and

S. 5937. An act to amend an act to regulate the height of buildings in the District of Columbia.

Senate concurrent resolution 100.

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed and bound 1,100 copies of the report of the agent of the United States in the arbitration of the Venezuelan cases before The Hague Tribunal, with accompanying appendixes, referred to in the message of the President to the Senate and House of Representatives dated January 23, 1905, 200 for the use of the Senate, 400 for the use of the House of Representatives, and 500 for the use of the Department of State.

The message also announced that the Senate had insisted upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 16560) to authorize the registration of trade-marks used in commerce with foreign nations or among the several States or with Indian tribes, and to protect the same, disagreed to by the House of Representatives, had agreed to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. KITTREDGE, Mr. McCOMAS, and Mr. MALLORY as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had further insisted upon its amendment to the bill (H. R. 17094) making appropriations for fortifications and other works of defense, for the armament thereof, for the procurement of heavy ordnance for trial and service, and for other purposes, numbered 3, disagreed to by the House of Representatives, had agreed to the further conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. PERKINS, Mr. WARREN, and Mr. DANIEL as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

POST-OFFICE APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the pending amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 18, add after line 12: "And if the Postmaster-General shall expend that amount, or any part thereof, he shall state his reasons for the necessity for such expenditure to Congress."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

For continuing necessary and special facilities on trunk lines from Kansas City, Mo., to Newton, Kans., \$25,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended unless the Postmaster-General shall deem such expenditure necessary in order to promote the interest of the postal service.

Mr. BEALL of Texas. I make the point of order against the paragraph just read that it is not authorized by existing law.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas makes the point of order that this paragraph is not authorized by existing law. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. OVERSTREET. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry. What is before the committee?

The CHAIRMAN. The paragraph which the Clerk has just reported.

Mr. OVERSTREET. What is the motion?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BEALL] makes the point of order that the paragraph is not authorized by existing law. There is no amendment pending.

Mr. BEALL of Texas. Mr. Chairman, on page 351 of the Digest there is this paragraph:

An appropriation for an object in an annual appropriation bill makes law only for that year and does not become existing law to justify the continuance of the appropriation.

Referring to the third session of the Fifty-fifth Congress, where a ruling was made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL]; to the first session of the Fifty-seventh Congress, where a ruling was made by Mr. Loud of California, and to the second session of the Fifty-eighth Congress, where the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] ruled upon a similar point of order and held that it was well taken.

Mr. OVERSTREET. On behalf of the committee, I desire to say, Mr. Chairman, that this very appropriation, in the identical language which appears in this bill, was in the bill passed at the last session of Congress; was passed at previous sessions, and for many years has been the law. It has been held—I do not have the citation before me—that an item carried on an appropriation bill for the fiscal year for which that bill makes appropriation, when offered in the succeeding Congress, is existing law for that year. This is unquestionably existing law for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1905, and it is now offered as a part of the appropriation bill providing for the expenses of this same service for the succeeding fiscal year. I think the point or order is not well taken. I think there is a decision of that kind in the present session of this Congress on the District of Columbia appropriation bill.

Mr. BEALL of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I could not very clearly understand the remarks of the gentleman from Indiana. As I understood them, however, they were practically the argument that has always been made in opposition to this point of order, viz, that these provisions have been contained in previous appropriation bills. So it was in the Fifty-fifth Congress; the bill being considered then contained an item appropriating for an institution here in the District of Columbia a certain amount of money. The point of order was raised that it was not authorized by any existing law. The answer was made that an exactly similar appropriation was contained in the appropriation bill of the preceding year. The Chair held the point of order well taken.

So in the Fifty-seventh Congress the same point of order was made against an item which had been in the appropriation bill year after year; yet the Chairman of the committee in that Congress held that it was not authorized by any existing law.

So, in the Fifty-eighth Congress, in the session preceding this one, when the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] ruled upon the question. As I understand from the Digest, these are the latest and most authentic rulings upon the proposition.

Mr. OVERSTREET. Mr. Chairman, one further word. This identical provision has been carried for many years in the annual post-office appropriation bill. I think it can well be considered as a continuing service, and an appropriation for a continuing service is unquestionably free from the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. The Chair finds that the question of order raised against this paragraph has been more than once directly ruled upon by previous occupants of the chair in Committee of the Whole.

On several occasions the point of order has been made against this special provision that it was contrary to existing law, and the Chair finds that the rulings of former occupants of the chair have been—the Chair reads from Parliamentary Precedents, by Mr. Hinds—that “the continuation of special facilities for mail service on trunk lines of railroad has been held to be such public work or object as would justify provision on an appropriation bill.”

It has been held on several occasions that an appropriation for special facilities for mail service on trunk lines was in order because it was in continuation of a public work in progress.

The present occupant of the chair, while feeling that the ruling goes to the extreme limit as to what may be included as a continuing work, does not feel that he is authorized to upset a precedent so well established, and upon which Congress has acted again and again in making appropriations. The Chair therefore overrules the point of order.

Mr. MACON. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend by striking out the paragraph beginning at line 13 and ending at line 19.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

On page 18 strike out lines 13 to 19, inclusive.

Mr. MACON. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend the bill by striking out the paragraph beginning with line 13 and ending on line 19 on page 18, which reads as follows:

For continuing necessary and special facilities on trunk lines from Kansas City, Mo., to Newton, Kans., \$25,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be

expended unless the Postmaster-General shall deem such expenditure necessary in order to promote the interests of the postal service.

Mr. Chairman, this is another of “those things.” [Laughter.] I suppose the House has made up its mind to swallow this proposition too, judging by the vote we had on the last motion to strike out. While the appropriation proposed in this paragraph is much smaller than the one in the paragraph just voted upon, still it is the same kind of a subsidy; and being opposed to all subsidies, where the people are called upon to pay the fiddler while the corporations dance, I have decided to offer an amendment to every paragraph of the bill that proposes such a thing. In addition to my desire to defeat this particular subsidy I want a little information about Newton, Kans.

You will observe that special facilities are to be furnished for carrying the mails from Kansas City to Newton. I have asked several Members if they ever heard of the place before, and they have invariably replied that they had not; and I even looked at the weather map and failed to find it on it. Therefore I have come to the conclusion that it is a town something like Lula, Miss., which is situated in the district of my friend HUMPHREYS, and in order that you may know what kind of a place that is, I will relate an incident that a friend told me happened near it.

He said that a Methodist preacher was riding along the outskirts of the town and saw a teamster whose team had balked. The driver popped his whip fiercely and used language that would not be becoming to a Sunday-school teacher. The preacher rode up by the side of the teamster and said, “My friend, don’t you know you are using language that will send you to hell? Don’t you know that you are already on the road to hell?” The teamster replied, “No, I didn’t know that; but if I am on the road to hell, may I ask which road you are traveling?” To which the minister replied that he was traveling the road to heaven. “How long have you been traveling that road?” said the driver. The preacher replied that he had been traveling it for the past twenty years. “Well,” said the driver, “all I’ve got to say about that is if I had been traveling the road to heaven for twenty years and hadn’t gotten any farther than this damned hole [Lula, Miss.] I’d turn back.” [Laughter and applause.]

Now, Mr. Chairman, from what I have not been able to learn about Newton, Kans., I think it must be something like Lula, Miss. Therefore, I would like to have the chairman of the committee give some reason as to why we should appropriate \$25,000 a year for the purpose of giving to Newton, Kans., special mail facilities.

I am very sincere in wanting to know something about the place called Newton, Kans., in order that we may be able to determine whether it is of so much importance as that the people of the whole country should be called upon to pay \$25,000 a year in order that it might have extra mail facilities.

Mr. SCOTT. Let me say to the gentleman that Newton, Kans., is a central railroad location, at which trains are made up that go out in every direction toward the western part of the State. The fact that this fast train leaves Newton at a certain hour makes it possible for the people of Kansas to receive their daily papers twenty-four hours earlier than they otherwise would.

Mr. MACON. Then this appropriation is made for the purpose of getting the newspapers there earlier. I should think a place of so much importance as Newton, Kans., would have a metropolitan paper of its own. [Laughter.] They ought to get their news by wire.

Mr. SCOTT. The gentleman understands, of course, that a town may be an important railroad center without having such a business as to warrant the establishment of a metropolitan paper. It seems to me that the gentleman’s statement does not contradict the argument which I endeavored to suggest to justify this appropriation.

Mr. MACON. I am bound to conclude from what the gentleman from Kansas states to me about Newton, Kans., that it is just about such a railroad center as Lula, Miss. [Laughter.] There they have the Illinois Central Railroad running through it in one direction and a branch road running from Helena to Jonestown in another, which makes Lula a railroad center in about the same way that Newton, Kans., is a railroad center. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. This proposition seems to me to be very much like the preceding one. I am against it as I was against the preceding one, and I welcome this opportunity to go on record against the appropriation. The whole question seems to have settled itself down into this sort of a question, When is a subsidy not a subsidy? It seems to me that that particular conundrum in a very short time will rival that other famous

proposition concerning the age of Ann. The first question, however, seems to admit of this kind of an answer: A subsidy is not a subsidy when the money is going into the district of the Member to whom the proposition is put. What possible excuse is there for the United States Government transferring the people's money out of their pockets into the coffers of any railroad corporation, to increase the mail handling facilities out of proportion to the facilities for handling other matter?

If a community has not grown up to such an extent that its freight-handling facilities demand increase, that its passenger traffic facilities demand increase, that other railroad facilities demand increase, why should the United States Government step in and arbitrarily increase the mail facilities there? Gentlemen, I am sorry that this side of the House has consented to an extent to march under the banner of Republicanism. I am very sorry for that. I do not blame the gentlemen on that side of the House for voting for the subsidy. It is a part of their political creed, but unless I am mistaken in my notions of Democracy, there is nothing to differentiate this from any other subsidy, and I could not believe I was true and faithful to the principles of Thomas Jefferson if I voted for it. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment to strike out the paragraph.

The question was taken; and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend the paragraph by striking out, in line 14, page 18, the words "Kansas City, Mo., to Newton, Kans.," and insert in lieu thereof the words "Orleans, Nebr., to St. Francis, Kans."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

Mr. COWHERD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order on that amendment.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I always submit gracefully to a proposition when it is determined against me, and as gracefully as I know how I bow to the will of the majority of this House wherein they have just decided that these special facilities should be given by our Government to the Southern States and Kansas. But I want to appeal now to the membership of this House and say that inasmuch as favoritism to certain localities was the only argument that has been made in favor of the continuation of this appropriation for this item, you ought to let the people of some other locality get a peep into this pork barrel. Whenever you have a good thing of that kind you ought to be fair and pass it around.

Why, the argument made by the able gentleman from Indiana [Mr. OVERSTREET], the chairman of the committee, is that it increases the mail facilities in these instances, and no doubt it is true; but, Mr. Chairman, the gentlemen of Kansas and these other States have been enjoying this privilege for many years. Now, what is sauce for the goose ought to be sauce for the gander. Let me tell you of this country where I have made the motion to put the appropriation. A part of this line runs through the famous Beaver Valley. You have all heard of Beaver Valley in Nebraska, of course, and if there is any place on earth that needs better mail facilities, that is where we ought to put this extra money. These men that have had it so long ought to be willing to give it to us for a little while. Up that line, sir, they have only a triweekly service. The train goes up one week and tries to come back the next. [Laughter.] The only train is a long freight train, and on the tail end of it there is a dilapidated coach with the roof battered in and its sides bulging out and its bottom dragging the ground, where Uncle Sam is distributing his mail to a class of people that are as intelligent, as patriotic, as deserving as any people along the lines of any other railroad on earth. [Applause.]

Why, sir, in that valley, where they raise the alfalfa, known all over the world (you have all heard of alfalfa, of course), in that valley famous for its brave men and beautiful women [laughter and applause], where they only have a train pass up the line one week and back the next, imagine the benefit of this service, as far as the postal facilities would be concerned, if you gave us a part of this subsidy or whatever you might call it and permit us to enjoy the fruits of this extravagance for a while. Let us get our mail before it is rusty with age and worn out with long travel.

Mr. CROMER. Mr. Chairman, I would ask if there are any papers published in Omaha that could be distributed down through that valley.

Mr. NORRIS. There are papers published in Omaha, the best in the world except in my own district. They are distributed all through that valley, but they don't get up there until they are stale, worn out and weary, and wrinkled with age. If we had \$25,000 more money we could get them up there two weeks sooner. [Laughter.] Down here in Kansas and through the Southern States you only get them there twenty-four hours sooner by means of this subsidy. Why, if you want to scatter

money in the way of subsidies to increase the mail facilities of our people here is the golden opportunity. Give it to some one who has not before had a piece of this Government pie. Let it be passed around. Let us be harmonious and divide up this subsidy. Take your hands out of Uncle Sam's pocket. Let some one else milk this cow before she goes dry. If you want to be fair, now is your opportunity. If you want to be generous, do it quick before you change your mind. Ease up on your conscience and give somebody else a chance. Repent now before it is everlastingly too late and divide up with your brother.

Mr. OVERSTREET. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate upon this paragraph and amendments thereto be now closed.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana moves that all debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto be now closed.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is upon the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska. The point of order was reserved by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COWHERD].

Mr. COWHERD. Mr. Chairman, my point of order is that it changes existing law and is new legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri makes the point of order that the amendment is contrary to existing law. The Chair will state that the provision in the preceding paragraph was held to be in order because it was a continuation of a public work now in progress. This amendment provides for a new service which is not in progress, and consequently the Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

For transportation of foreign mails, \$2,725,000, including additional compensation to the Oceanic Steamship Company for transporting by its steamer sailing from San Francisco to Tahiti all mails made up in the United States destined for the island of Tahiti, \$45,000: *Provided*, That the sum paid the Oceanic Steamship Company shall not exceed \$1 per mile, as authorized by act of March 3, 1891, entitled "An act to provide for ocean mail service between the United States and foreign ports, and to promote commerce;" *And provided further*, That hereafter the Postmaster-General shall be authorized to expend such sums as may be necessary, not exceeding \$55,000, to cover one-half of the cost of transportation, compensation, and expense of clerks to be employed in assorting and pouching mails in transit on steamships between the United States and other postal administrations in the International Postal Union, and not exceeding \$40,000 for transferring the foreign mail from incoming steamships in New York Bay to the several steamship and railway piers, and for transferring the foreign mail from incoming steamships in San Francisco Bay to the piers.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Indiana make the point of order or reserve the point of order?

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I make the point of order, and I send a written statement to the Clerk's desk which can be read or incorporated in the Record, but for convenience I will state to the Chair—

Mr. OVERSTREET. Do I understand something is to be read before the gentleman states his point of order?

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. If the gentleman desires it to be read it can be read, but I thought I could state what it referred to. If the gentleman thinks it will take too long to read—

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read it in the gentleman's time.

The Clerk read as follows:

Point of order on the portion of section on page 18 relating to the additional compensation to the Oceanic Steamship Company for transporting by its steamers sailing from San Francisco to Tahiti, specifically stated, the words in lines 21, 22, 23, 24, and 25, on page 18, to wit: "Including additional compensation to the Oceanic Steamship Company for transporting by its steamers sailing from San Francisco to Tahiti all mails made up in the United States destined for the island of Tahiti, \$45,000;" and separately, the words: "*Provided*, That the sum paid the Oceanic Steamship Company shall not exceed \$1 per mile, as authorized by act of March 3, 1891, entitled 'An act to provide for ocean mail service between the United States and foreign ports, and to promote commerce,'" as contrary to existing law and not a continuing appropriation.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, it may be held, perhaps, that this point of order is similar to the one made upon the postal facilities for the railroads. I suggest that some years ago, prior to four years ago, as I recall it, we had a contract to carry mails twelve times a year for the sum of \$312 by sailing vessels to Tahiti. Subsequently a new law was passed whereby it cost about eleven hundred dollars. About four years ago this law was ingrafted on an appropriation bill and has been carried for several years, not under the law of 1891, whereby the Secretary advertises for bids and gives it to the lowest bidder, but it is borne only by reason of an annual appropriation bill and, I think, is contrary to the existing law, as its only virtue is borne on each appropriation bill and is not a continuing service under the rules, perhaps, of the House as determined by the Chair a few moments ago.

Mr. OVERSTREET. Mr. Chairman, in addition to my con-

tention that the point made by the gentleman is identical with the point upon which the Chair ruled a few minutes ago, relative to the so-called "southern facility." I call the Chair's attention to this fact. The law of March 3, 1901, known as the act to provide for ocean mail service between the United States and foreign ports and to promote commerce, customarily known as the "ocean mail act," fixes certain rates which may be paid by way of compensation. This provision against which this point is now made cites that law providing that the amount of pay shall not exceed the amount fixed by the law of March 3, 1891. In addition, therefore, Mr. Chairman, to the security of this provision from the point of order under the recent ruling of the Chair there is this additional security that it is linked with the law of March 3, 1891, and is therefore existing law, and this appropriation can not be contrary to existing law.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, does my colleague contend by reason of the fact that under the law which authorized the Department to provide subsidy for oceanic transit we may in this provision of the appropriation bill ingraft a single section of that law, but free it from the standing provision of the law that it must be advertised for by the Department? Hence upon that section of the gentleman's remarks I think he is clearly in error.

Mr. OVERSTREET. It must be in conflict with the existing law before the point is properly made.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. But it is in conflict in this regard in that they seek without advertisement, as by present law required, to warrant a steamship company to get a contract without conforming to the general law which requires it to be advertised for and to be granted to the lowest bidder.

Mr. BELL of California. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be heard for just one moment on this point of order, because it appears to me that one very important consideration has been entirely overlooked. The question is, are we to be permitted to go outside of this appropriation bill and find evidence that a contract has not been let by the Postmaster-General? Would not the presumption be in favor of this provision that he had let a contract, though I do not make that claim? Therefore the provision of the bill as it appears here is not subject to point of order because it may be that the other provisions of the law of 1891 have been fully complied with. There is nothing in this bill to show that they have not been complied with.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Does the gentleman from California [Mr. BELL] contend that an advertisement and letting of this contract to lowest bidder has been made by the Department, as warranted by the general law?

Mr. BELL of California. What I do claim is this: The gentleman raised a point of order to a specific provision in this bill, and I say that the specific provision does not divulge that it is subject to a point of order, and if the gentleman desires to make it subject to a point of order, then the proper way would be to incorporate in there such matters as would make it subject to his point.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. But the gentleman from California [Mr. BELL] misapprehended my contention, and that was that the chairman of the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads was in error when he stated that this was existing law, when it was only carried on the appropriation bill now piecemeal, and there is no presumption, I think, as contended for by the gentleman from California [Mr. BELL], that this bill is not following the general law giving the Postmaster-General power, for if it had been it would not be here in this form. I contend that under the form of the appropriation here proposed these people come to the House of Representatives to do something by another procedure than what is already authorized by the general law, which clothes the Postmaster-General with the authority to advertise for bids and directing a grant to the lowest bidder. We force this subsidy on the Postmaster-General without any authority of law save that borne in the appropriation bill, each session of Congress. I insist, Mr. Chairman, that that can not be done on an appropriation bill without running counter to existing legislation.

[Mr. GARDNER of New Jersey addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. STEENERSON. Right on that point, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is in error about the provisions of the law of 1891. The provision of the law of 1891 is not that \$1 per mile is the minimum that is to be allowed to a steamship. The minimum for fourth-class steamers is two-thirds of \$1 per mile for the outgoing voyage, whereas \$1 is for third-class steamers, which must have a speed of 14 knots and a tonnage of 2,000 tons; whereas the fourth class need not have a speed of more than 12 knots and a tonnage of 1,500 tons. So that this appropriation

does authorize a higher per-mile rate than the existing law of 1891, and is to that extent in conflict therewith.

Mr. OVERSTREET. A preliminary inquiry in connection with this point. Before the House went into Committee of the Whole this morning for the consideration of this bill there was an agreement by unanimous consent for debate upon this particular item. Did that agreement waive the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would say that it must have been intended to provide for debate of one hour on the merits of the question.

Mr. OVERSTREET. That would be free of the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; this will not be taken from the time.

The Chair would like to refer the chairman of the committee to section 4009 of the Revised Statutes, which reads:

For transporting the mail between the United States and any foreign port, or between ports of the United States touching at a foreign port, the Postmaster-General may allow as compensation, if by a United States steamship, any sum not exceeding the sea and United States inland postage; and if by a foreign steamship or by a sailing vessel, any sum not exceeding the sea postage, on the mail so transported.

The Chair understands that to be the general law. Now, is this provision in violation of that general law?

Mr. OVERSTREET. I did not hear exactly the language of the law; but my recollection is, Mr. Chairman, upon the information I have, that this particular service, as to the tonnage and speed of the boats, comes within the provisions of the act of March 3, 1891.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. The gentleman is certainly mistaken about that.

Mr. OVERSTREET. And the compensation limited by this proviso is the same rate fixed for vessels of that speed and tonnage in the act of March 3, 1891.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands that the contention is made that the act of 1891 does not apply.

Mr. OVERSTREET. Well, I have not so stated. If the Chair holds that—

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair wishes to call the attention of the chairman of the committee to the general law in the Revised Statutes, which specifies that rates shall not be in excess of a certain amount.

Mr. OVERSTREET. If that be true, I am not bound by the contention made by my friend from New Jersey. I have not stated that this was entirely free from the act of March 3, 1891. This provision reads into the statutes by way of a provision on a general appropriation bill the same provisions as required by the act of March 3, 1891, except freedom from advertisement. Upon the merits of the question, I would point out that there being but one line between these two terminals, there could be no competition even if advertisement were resorted to. For that reason I believe I am not in error. I do not agree with my colleague from New Jersey that this is entirely separate and apart from the act of March 3, 1891.

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Indiana is entirely mistaken about the construction of the law now under consideration. The Treasury Department has construed this provision in the last year's appropriation bill to mean absolutely nothing.

It gives the Oceanic Steamship Company \$1 per mile for the outgoing voyage for one steamer, ten trips a year, and it does not require that that steamer shall show that it has any speed whatever. They do not require that it shall have 2,000 or any other number of tons burthen. They require absolutely nothing except that they make the trip. That is the construction placed upon it by the Auditor for the Post-Office Department in the Treasury Department, and they are paying out this money without any single scrap of evidence that these boats comply in any way with the act of 1891.

Mr. FINLEY. I wish to ask the gentleman, does he not think that when the proviso in the bill attempts to relieve the Department of the necessity for advertising, as required by the act of 1891, that is a violation of the act of 1891?

Mr. STEENERSON. There is no question about that. It is in conflict with the act of 1891, because that act authorizes advertising for the letting of foreign mail contracts to the lowest bidder, and the vessels to be contracted with must comply with the provisions of that act, must be inspected by a representative of the Navy Department, must be fit for service as auxiliary cruisers in the Navy when required, and this dispenses with all those requirements; so that the provision, as construed by the authorities of the Post-Office Department, means that they can pay this dollar a mile to this Oceanic Steamship Company for these ten trips without showing that the boat is made of iron

or steel, or that it has a speed of 10 knots, or 20 knots, or any other speed, or that it can carry any number of tons.

It is clearly in violation of the act of 1891.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I will say to the gentleman that the very purpose of having this provision borne by the post-office bill is to evade the law.

Mr. STEENERSON. There can be no doubt about it. That is so understood among the minority members of the Post-Office Committee anyway.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. LAWRENCE). If no other Member wishes to be heard the Chair will rule. The Chair desires especially to call the attention of the committee to the language of the law of 1891, which says:

That the Postmaster-General is hereby authorized and empowered to enter into contracts for a term not less than five nor more than ten years in duration with American citizens for the carrying of mails on American steamships between ports of the United States and such ports of foreign countries, the Dominion of Canada excepted, as in his judgment will best subserve and promote the postal and commercial interests of the United States; the mail service on such lines to be equitably distributed among the Atlantic, Mexican, Gulf, and Pacific ports. Said contracts shall be made with the lowest responsible bidder for the performance of said service on each route, and the Postmaster-General shall have the right to reject all bids not in his opinion reasonable for the obtaining of the purposes named.

This law specifies clearly that said contracts shall be made after advertisement with the lowest responsible bidder for the performance of said service; and it seems to the Chair that the provisions of this paragraph to which objection is made are in conflict with the law of 1891.

The only way in which the appropriation can be justified is by construing it to be for a continuing work now in progress. It does not seem to the Chair that it is on the same plane with the appropriations authorized in the two preceding sections.

Mr. BELL of California. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair prefers not to be interrupted now.

The two preceding sections authorize appropriations for special facilities on trunk lines. This is not an appropriation for a special facility; it is simply an appropriation for additional compensation which, so far as the Chair can see, is not authorized by law.

The Chair therefore feels that he must sustain the point of order.

Mr. OVERSTREET. Mr. Chairman, in view of the ruling of the Chair, I move to strike out "\$2,725,000" and to insert "\$2,680,000," reducing the amount by the \$45,000 just eliminated under the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. That makes it conform to the \$45,000 reduction.

Mr. OVERSTREET. Yes.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. There is no objection to that.

Mr. BELL of California. I have an amendment which I desire to offer.

The CHAIRMAN. Let the Clerk first report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. OVERSTREET].

The Clerk read as follows:

In lines 20 and 21 strike out "seven hundred and twenty-five" and insert "six hundred and eighty;" so that it will read "\$2,680,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. OVERSTREET].

Mr. BELL of California. I desire to offer an amendment there. I move to amend by striking out all after the word "dollars," in line 21, page 18, down to and including the word "by," in line 2, page 19, and insert the following:

Of which sum \$45,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, shall be available for contracts for carrying the mails from San Francisco to Tahiti.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I make a point of order against that, Mr. Chairman, before I am cut off by discussion.

Mr. BELL of California. Then the section would read: "For transportation of foreign mails, \$2,725,000, of which sum \$45,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, shall be available for contracts for carrying the mails from San Francisco to Tahiti, in accordance with the act of March 3, 1891, entitled," etc. Now, upon that I would like to be heard.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I make the point of order on that, Mr. Chairman, or I will reserve it if the gentleman wishes to be heard.

Mr. BELL of California. It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that this amendment will avoid the point of order that has been made on this section and sustained by the Chair. Under the law of March 3, 1891, the Postmaster-General would be authorized, even to-day or to-morrow, to advertise for bids for carrying the mails from San Francisco to Tahiti. This amendment simply provides what amount of money may be available for that purpose. If the Postmaster-General has the power to make this contract, then Congress surely has the power to pro-

vide the necessary funds for carrying out the contract. The point that was most strenuously urged by the gentleman from Indiana was that in the provision of the bill as it stood before the proposed amendment no reference was made to the fact that under the law of 1891 the Postmaster-General would be compelled to advertise for contracts. So that this objection, which was held to be a good one by the Chair, is entirely obviated by the fact that we simply make \$45,000 at this time available for the purpose of carrying out a contract he may make.

Of course if he makes no contract under the law of 1891, that portion of that sum can not be used for that purpose, but if he proceeds to-morrow, or next week, or next month, to make a contract of that sort, surely Congress can so legislate as to appropriate the necessary funds for him to carry out such a contract.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I submit that that would change the discretion of the Postmaster-General. I was not able to catch the purport of the amendment except as the gentleman from California has stated it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will again report the amendment.

The Clerk again read the amendment.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Now, I want to suggest to the gentleman from California that this limits and restricts the discretion of the Postmaster-General. It in some sense forces him to the Pacific coast, and who knows, according to the gentleman's rule, but that the Pacific coast has its proportionate share under the law of 1891? What is the purpose of the gentleman's amendment if it does not change existing law? Does not existing law to-day authorize the Postmaster-General to give the relief?

Mr. BELL of California. Yes; but the Postmaster-General has not the funds, and we are now making available the necessary funds to carry on the business of the Post-Office Department. We simply lay aside \$45,000 for the purpose of enabling him to do an act that is clearly authorized by law. If the gentleman from Indiana will permit me, can he point out in this amendment a single syllable or a word that is in conflict with existing law?

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Certainly, I can, Mr. Chairman. Why does the gentleman name the Tahiti Steamship Line? Why not go under the general law? I submit to the Chair that the law already gives the Postmaster-General discretion and authority to provide relief.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understood the gentleman to restrict and limit his amendment to the law of 1891, but that does not seem to be in the amendment. It does not limit in any way the contract that the Postmaster-General is authorized to make.

Mr. BELL of California. Taking up the language of the bill with that of the amendment, and reading it in connection with the bill, it is limited by the terms of the act of 1891.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I concede the right of the gentleman to increase the appropriation by so many words, \$45,000, and take the chances with the Post-Office Department. But when he restricts that Department to a certain line it changes existing law. The very purpose of presenting this amendment—the Tahiti proposition—is to limit the discretion of the Postmaster-General and drive him to that proposition where he has unlimited discretion now. I admit the right of the gentleman to increase the appropriation by \$45,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is of the opinion that the amendment in its present form limits the discretion of an executive officer.

Mr. BELL of California. I would like to see, Mr. Chairman, if my amendment is clearly understood. In what particular does the Chair hold that it limits the discretion?

The CHAIRMAN. If the gentleman from California will couple with his amendment "in accordance with the law of 1891" I think he will obviate the difficulty.

Mr. BELL of California. Yes; I intended that. I desire to amend my amendment so as to conform to the suggestion of the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. Let the correction be made, and the Clerk will again report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 18, line 21, after the word "dollars," insert "of which sum \$45,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, shall be available for contracts for carrying mails from San Francisco to Tahiti, in accordance with the act of March 3, 1891, entitled 'An act to provide for ocean mail service between the United States and foreign ports, and to promote commerce.'"

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, to that I renew the point of order, for the same reason.

The CHAIRMAN. In the opinion of the Chair that amendment is not in conflict with the law of 1891, referred to by the

Chair in its former ruling, and the Chair will overrule the point of order. The question then is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

Mr. OVERSTREET. Mr. Chairman, I would assume that the gentleman from California would be entitled to the floor first in support of this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Certainly, if he claims it. Does the Chair understand the gentleman from California to ask the floor?

Mr. BELL of California. Mr. Chairman, I understand that there was some time set apart for debate of this proposition.

The CHAIRMAN. Points of order having been disposed of, the Chair will state that under the order of the House one hour is now set apart for debating this paragraph, to be controlled one-half by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. OVERSTREET] and one-half by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MOON]. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry. I understood the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. OVERSTREET] had proposed an amendment, which has not yet been submitted.

Mr. OVERSTREET. This amendment supersedes mine.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana was withdrawn.

Mr. OVERSTREET. Yes. Mr. Chairman, I yield ten minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BELL].

Mr. BELL of California. Mr. Chairman, in contending for the adoption of this amendment I am not going to make any plea particularly on behalf of the Pacific coast. I think that when we come down to the question of appropriating money sectional sentiment and sectional favoritism should have no place whatever in our consideration, and if this committee does not believe it to be of sufficient commercial importance, of sufficient importance to the convenience of the people of this country who are trading with the people of these islands, to provide this compensation for the carrying of mails strictly upon commercial grounds, and not upon sentimental grounds, then this committee should not adopt this amendment nor make this appropriation. The question came up before the House during the last session of Congress. At that time in the Committee of the Whole this item was stricken from the bill. Subsequently when the bill was brought before the Senate the item was restored, and upon the report of the conference committee the House concurred in the amendment of the Senate.

Now, the whole question is this, Is this service worth the amount of money we intend to pay? What are the present commercial advantages of this island of Tahiti and the near by islands? We find on looking at the statistics that during the year 1902 the total imports into the island of Tahiti amounted to \$755,272, and the total exports from this island amounted to \$829,460, making in all about a million and a half dollars. Now, during the year 1902 the imports from the United States into the islands aggregated \$384,299, and the exports to the United States \$448,819, making over \$800,000 worth of business done with the United States alone. In other words, the United States to-day is enjoying about one-half of the trade and commerce with these islands.

Now, something has been said by the United States consul in Tahiti upon this subject, which I shall read in a moment. Speaking of the Oceanic Steamship Company Line, I desire to state that this line, which plies between the Pacific coast and the south seas, is one of the few steamship lines of this country that have survived the general decadence of American shipping. That steamship company is a credit to the country, as it would be a credit to any other country in the world. This island of Tahiti, it will be remembered, is a French possession. In 1900 the French Government desired to provide mail facilities between this island and the American mainland. There were two competitors, the Union Steamship Company and the Oceanic Steamship Company.

The Union Steamship Company is a British company. The Oceanic Company is an American company, a California company, and it received the contract at 156,000 francs a year, about \$30,000 a year, for five years for carrying the mails for the French Government. Now, the idea is this: The Oceanic Steamship Company will not be able to renew its contract with the French Government on November 1 of this year unless it receives some compensation for this service performed for the United States, because it will be unprofitable for it to do so.

Mr. FINLEY. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from California yield?

Mr. BELL of California. Yes.

Mr. FINLEY. About what was the trade last year between the Pacific coast and Tahiti?

Mr. BELL of California. The entire American trade going

and coming from that island was about \$800,000, and its entire world trade was about a million and a half dollars. We enjoy about one-half of it.

Mr. SHERLEY. What was it before the subsidy went into effect?

Mr. BELL of California. Oh, it has been increasing.

Mr. SHERLEY. What is the ratio of increase?

Mr. BELL of California. It is difficult to tell. Since 1902 we are unable to get any separate statistics as to this island. The last year we have separate statistics for that island alone is 1902.

Mr. SHERLEY. Then, as I understand the gentleman, it is purely an assumption that this is the result of a subsidy?

Mr. BELL of California. For the last forty years sailing vessels have been carrying our mails there. Sailing vessels of our own plying back and forth between that island and this country have kept up the trade; but the point is this, if we are going to build up any trade with this island and neighboring islands—there is a great group of islands there—we must—

Mr. DOUGLAS. I would like to ask the gentleman if vessels running to this island under the Oceanic Steamship Company fly the American flag?

Mr. BELL of California. What is that? I did not catch the gentleman's question.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I would like to ask whether the vessels running to this island chartered or owned by the Oceanic Steamship Company fly the American flag?

Mr. BELL of California. Undoubtedly they do. There is no question about that.

Mr. FINLEY. One other question. Do they come within the act of 1891?

Mr. BELL of California. They come within the act of 1891.

Mr. FINLEY. Is my friend sure of that?

Mr. BELL of California. I do not think there is any question of doubt about that. I find that Senator PERKINS of California made that statement, that it came within the requirements of the act of 1891, and it was fully debated in the Senate and no question was raised as to that particular.

When the Oceanic Steamship Company took the contract from the French Government in 1900 there was a tacit understanding resulting from a conference between the owners of this steamship line and the President and the Postmaster-General that bids would be called for for this service, also for service from San Francisco to Australia, but afterwards this particular service was omitted from the advertisement for bids. The Postmaster-General has included this item in his last estimates and it therefore stands upon a different footing from any of the other items of special compensation that have been voted upon to-day. It is an estimated item of the Post-Office Department. Now, the trade of Oceania, that group of islands down in the South Seas, is a growing trade, a trade amounting to several million dollars, and if we abandon this, if we abandon this steamship line and carry our mail by sail to this island, we will certainly injure our trade in that part of the world.

Mr. CROMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman permit a question?

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

Mr. BELL of California. I yield.

Mr. CROMER. I would like to know where the gentleman gets his authority for saying there was a tacit understanding of the President and Postmaster-General with the steamship company for this appropriation.

Mr. BELL of California. I find that statement was made by the senior Senator from the State of California when this matter was before the Senate last winter, and was based upon a letter received from John C. Spreckels, of San Francisco, one of the owners of this line.

Mr. CROMER. But I desired to call the gentleman's attention to that telegram received from Spreckels, and ask him whether or not it was not with the Postmaster-General and the chairman of the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads of the House of Representatives?

Mr. BELL of California. I may be in error there. I thank the gentleman for the correction. I did not intend to make an error of that kind. I think the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CROMER] is right, and I will stand corrected as to that point.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to read what the consul says about the advisability and the wisdom of continuing this service. In a letter read to the Senate last winter when the subject was under discussion, he says:

The inauguration of this line will give great impetus to United States trade with Tahiti and, in general, with other islands of eastern Polynesia. The Pacific coast of the United States will be particularly benefited, as perishable goods—such as fruits, vegetables, and meats—

which are now received exclusively from New Zealand will then come from San Francisco.

There is a great item in itself. We have not a monopoly of the trade there. We are competing with Australia, New Zealand, and with other parts of the world. If we have this service, the Pacific coast, with its vegetables and meats and other articles of that kind, will have an opportunity to meet competition upon equal terms.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. BELL] has expired.

Mr. BELL of California. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent of the committee to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman [Mr. BELL of California] will have the privilege of extending his remarks in the RECORD.

There was no objection.

Mr. MOON of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield fifteen minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STEENERSON].

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Chairman, this is substantially the same proposition, as subsidy will be indirectly authorized for this service to Tahiti, or to what used to be called Otahiti. The Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads were nearly equally divided on this proposition, so much so that at a meeting of the full committee that item was stricken out, but afterwards, upon further consideration, it was put back into the bill again and reported as the bill came to this House.

I took occasion to investigate this matter especially, and I have done so for the last few weeks. The claim made in support of this subsidy or bonus is that it will encourage trade with Tahiti, and that it is in furtherance of the improvement of the postal service between the United States and these French possessions. Now, I deny that either object can be attained by this proposition. This proposition, it seems to me upon careful investigation, is utterly useless and of no benefit to the postal service, nor does it encourage trade with the United States.

Now, in order that we may understand the situation I ought to call the committee's attention to the situation in regard to the law. In the first place we have the section of the statute which was referred to by the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole, section 4009, which has been in the law for more than thirty years, providing that the Postmaster-General may allow for the carrying of foreign mails in American registered vessels all of the inland United States postage and the foreign postage—all that is received. If the mail is carried by the foreign vessels, he may allow the oversea postage in payment of this carriage. Under that provision the mail to Tahiti from San Francisco was carried for years and years in sailing vessels—French schooners. These vessels were three in number. They were the *Tropic Bird*, the *City of Papeete*, and the *Galilee*. They left on the first day of every month in the year, and it cost the Government—and the volume of mail is just the same now as it was then—from \$370 to \$400 every year. It took about three or four weeks to carry the mail to its destination. No complaint was ever made to the Post-Office Department that this service was not sufficient, and presumably it was satisfactory. Then came the year 1901, when this provision was inserted in the post-office appropriation bill, giving \$45,000 to the Oceanic Steamship Company directly by name. In September of that year the new service was inaugurated. And in what does that new service consist? It consists in the service of one steamer. They call it a line, but it is one steamer, and its name is the *Mariposa*, and it makes ten trips, and that is all it can make, under this appropriation of \$45,000.

It is 4,212 miles, and it makes ten trips a year—one trip every thirty-six and one-half days.

It carries about 400 pounds of letter postage and about 5,600 pounds of printed matter in the mail, making in round numbers 6,000 pounds a year. That is the weight of the mail that has been carried for many, many years from the United States to Tahiti and the other islands there. In other words, if you take and divide it between the outgoing and incoming mail, it amounts to about 20 pounds of letters for every trip. That is, 20 pounds going to Tahiti and 20 pounds of letters coming back from Tahiti and 250 pounds of print going and 250 pounds coming. The total weight that this particular steamer carries is about 270 pounds on each journey, which is about as much as a good strong man could carry on his back. For these ten trips we pay them \$42,212.

Now, then, they say that this is wonderful benefit to the Tahitans. These Tahitans at one time, you know, were cannibals, and there are about 10,000. In the whole of the French Oceanic Isles, including the Marquesas and Society Islands, there are about 25,000 people, according to Rand-McNally's Atlas. The total trade with these islands they say has been increased.

How much of that increase can be due to the fact that one steamer, the *Mariposa*, during the last two years, goes to Papeéti, the capital of Tahiti, ten times a year? It does not seem to me that any of the increase could have been due to that cause; it could not have been the cause of the increase, if there was one. The mail has not increased. The mail that goes now is practically the same, as shown by the report of the Superintendent of Foreign Mails, which I hold in my hand, as it was when it went by schooner.

Now, how is it about the commerce that they speak of? It is true we would like to encourage commerce; and one of the indirect objects of the mail is to encourage commerce; and this act of 1891 that has been spoken of was an act reported from the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads to encourage commerce as well as to improve mail facilities between this and foreign countries. But it had another object. That act provided that the steamships must be built in accordance with specifications of the Navy Department. They must be inspected by them. The first-class steamers, to receive pay of \$4 a mile, must have a speed of 20 knots; the next class, to receive \$2 per mile for the outgoing voyage, must have a speed of 16 knots, I believe; the third class must have a speed of 14 knots, and the fourth class must have a speed of 12 knots. The first must have a tonnage of 8,000, the next a tonnage of 5,000, the next a tonnage of 2,000, and the next a tonnage of 1,500. The last, or fourth class, steamers under that act are entitled to two-thirds of a dollar per mile; not a full dollar.

Now as to the actual extent of the commerce between these French Oceanic islands. I desire to call attention to the figures I have the figures here, showing that as a matter of truth the commerce is not increased by this wonderful subsidy—\$45,000—for one old played-out steamship that originally ran to the Hawaiian Islands, but was superseded by first-class boats, which this same Oceanic Steamship Company put in service there. They put on three boats there, and we pay them \$283,000 a year as a bonus or subsidy under the act of 1891—properly so—for carrying the mails to Hawaii and Australia. That is a legitimate subsidy; but they were not satisfied. This Oceanic Company, of which Mr. John D. Spreckles is president—three Spreckles, in addition to John D., seem to be interested in the contracts—Claus Spreckles, and A. B. Spreckles sign the contract for the Australian service. They are the men who are supposed to constitute the western section of the sugar trust.

I have examined the contract of that steamship company for the Australian service and they appear to be new steamers. They receive to-day \$283,000 for doing about \$80,000 worth of service. They put this played-out steamship—the *Mariposa*—on the Tahiti service after she was discarded on the Australian Line.

Mr. GILLETT of California. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman if he ever saw the *Mariposa*?

Mr. STEENERSON. I have seen the contract whereby it formerly performed this service.

Mr. GILLETT of California. Do you know what its tonnage is?

Mr. STEENERSON. Yes, sir; I do.

Mr. GILLETT of California. How much?

Mr. STEENERSON. It is 3,158 tons, according to the United States registry of the Treasury Department.

Mr. GILLETT of California. Do you know how many knots an hour it makes?

Mr. STEENERSON. No; I wish I did, because I think they are drawing too much now.

Mr. GILLETT of California. Its speed is 15 knots an hour, and it is a first-class vessel. I have seen it many times. The gentleman ought not to refer to it as a played-out vessel.

Mr. STEENERSON. Very well; it does not come up to the specifications of the act of 1891, and therefore they have asked for this special subsidy. It makes only ten trips a year anyway.

Mr. GILLETT of California. Will the gentleman yield for another question?

Mr. STEENERSON. Certainly.

Mr. GILLETT of California. The amendment as it now stands, as I understand it, provides that this service may be advertised for, and the vessel must comply with the provisions of the act of 1891. The Oceanic Company may never get the contract at all. It is the pending amendment that we are talking about.

Mr. STEENERSON. I am speaking of the service which it is proposed to establish between this country and Tahiti.

Mr. BELL of California. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. STEENERSON. If it is brief.

Mr. BELL of California. I should like to know what the sugar trust has to do with carrying mails?

Mr. STEENERSON. It seems to have a great deal to do with carrying the mails, because the sugar trust owns the Oceanic Steamship Company, which to-day gets more bonus under the act of 1891 than any other institution in the world. It gets 51 per cent of all the bonus given for transoceanic mail service.

Mr. BELL of California. What has sugar to do with the mails? What possible connection is there?

Mr. STEENERSON. I do not know what it has to do with the mails, but I know that the representative of the Oceanic Steamship Company, which, I assume, is owned by the sugar trust, has been around this Capitol here, and he seems not only to control the Post-Office and Post-Roads Committee on this matter, but he seems to be able to get himself appointed to foreign lands besides, where I, for one, wish he would stay.

Mr. BELL of California. The gentleman is letting us into the secrets of that side.

Mr. STEENERSON. I am not revealing any secrets whatever; what happened in the meeting of the committee was in open session and is a public record. But assuming that it is true that this one steamer, the *Mariposa*, by making ten trips a year, can bring commerce amounting to so much, let us see what the effect of this subsidy has been. Has trade increased? I have here a report from the Department of Commerce and Labor, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE AND LABOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D. C., January 18, 1905.

Hon. H. STEENERSON, M. C.,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

SIR: In compliance with your request, dated January 16, I take pleasure in inclosing herewith table showing the total imports into and exports from Tahiti and dependencies, as well as the imports into these possessions from the United States and the exports from these possessions to the United States for the calendar years 1897 to 1902, the only years for which this Bureau has any official records. The figures of trade apply to French Oceania as a whole and not merely to the port of Tahiti.

Respectfully,
V. H. METCALF, Secretary.

Imports into and exports from Tahiti and dependencies during the calendar years 1897 to 1902.

[From returns of the French colonial office.]

IMPORTS.

Year.	Total.	From France.	From United States.
1897.....	\$722,812	\$75,292	\$333,813
1898.....	573,045	36,907	246,469
1899.....	552,256	63,463	255,402
1900.....	677,628	111,665	318,785
1901.....	879,318	132,827	375,431
1902.....	755,272	118,789	384,299

EXPORTS.

Year.	Total.	To France.	To United States.
1897.....	\$1,330,891	\$60,060	\$293,846
1898.....	1,143,232	19,716	197,311
1899.....	1,233,244	83,369	286,490
1900.....	1,371,918	103,105	294,454
1901.....	1,463,338	157,297	205,588
1902.....	1,584,732	124,575	441,819

Summing this up so as to find the total trade with French Oceania we have these totals of exports and imports:

1897.....	\$627,659
1898.....	443,780
1899.....	541,892
1900.....	613,239
1901.....	581,019
1902.....	826,118
1903.....	778,335

Thus we see that the very first year, 1901, that the special subsidy took effect the trade fell from \$613,239 in 1900 to \$581,019 in 1901. In 1902 there was, no doubt from other causes, an increase to \$826,118, but the next year, 1903, it fell off \$47,783. The decrease for 1904 is estimated by the consul at one-third.

I quote from a communication from the State Department, as follows:

In a supplemental report, inclosed in the same dispatch, the consul states that for the period from January 1, 1904, to September 16, 1904, "it is now quite well established that the volume of trade during this period is less by at least one-third." No statistics are given, as they were not available.

The weight of the mail actually fell off during the last year from 6,411 pounds in 1903 to 6,374 in 1904, as shown by the report of the Superintendent of Foreign Mails. So this is the net result of this much-vaunted encouragement to our

commerce! It has no claim to merit, either as an encouragement of commerce or advancing our postal service.

It is such abuses as this that make ship subsidies unpopular, and I warn the friends of genuine, bona fide measures to encourage shipping and commerce not to besmirch their cause by joining hands with this unholy scheme to plunder the Treasury for private profit. If you do, your cause, however meritorious, will suffer in the esteem of the public mind and conscience. You, who are seeking to advance the interests of the merchant marine of the United States by public subvention, will be the greatest sufferers if you allow your cause to be confounded with the cause of men who are simply trying to get their hands into the public Treasury for their own enrichment.

I want to speak plainly. This Tahiti subsidy has no justification either in present or future prospects of trade or commerce. It is a palpable fraud and swindle on its face, and I am astonished that anyone has the gall to even excuse it. I hope it will be utterly annihilated.

Mr. FINLEY. I will ask the gentleman if, when the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads struck out this item, there was any protest?

Mr. STEENERSON. When the item was stricken out in the meeting of the full committee, there was afterwards a protest whereby it was put back in again, and I understand it was a loud protest, spelled with a capital L.

I have here the report of the Superintendent of Foreign Mails, which shows the service under contracts by authority of the act of March 3, 1891, as well as this Tahiti service.

CONTRACT OCEAN MAIL SERVICE.

The contract mail service upon the seven routes now in operation has been performed to the satisfaction of the Department and of the contractors.

The distance traversed, the amount paid as mileage, the weights of the mails, and the amount which would have been paid for the same service at the allowance of the full sea and United States inland postage upon the seven routes in question are as follows, viz:

Route 36, New York to La Guaira, 25 trips; statute miles traveled, 60,880; mileage paid, at \$1 a mile..... \$60,880.00
Weights of the mails conveyed: Letters and post cards, 14,919 pounds; other articles, 196,862 pounds; amount of the full sea and inland postage thereon..... 39,619.36

Excess of cost of contract service on route 36..... 21,260.64

Route 37, New York to Maracaibo, 25 trips; statute miles traveled, 63,667½; mileage paid, at 66½ cents a mile..... 42,445.00
Weights of the mails conveyed: Letters and post cards, 2,654 pounds; other articles, 41,893 pounds; amount of the full sea and inland postage thereon..... 7,597.84

Excess of cost of contract service on route 37..... 34,847.16

Route 57, New York to Southampton, 47 trips; statute miles traveled, 172,620.8; mileage paid, at \$4 a mile..... 690,483.20
Weights of the mails conveyed: Letters and post cards, 350,810 pounds; other articles, 2,384,406 pounds; amount of full sea and inland postage thereon..... 752,048.48

Excess of sea and inland postage over cost of contract service on route 57..... 61,565.28

Route 69, New York to Tuxpan, 53 trips; statute miles traveled, 132,606; mileage paid, at \$1 a mile..... 132,606.00
Weights of the mails conveyed: Letters and post cards, 5,226 pounds; other articles, 80,961 pounds; amount of the full sea and inland postage thereon..... 14,838.48

Excess of cost of contract service on route 69..... 117,767.52

Route 70, New York to Habana, 52 trips; statute miles traveled, 73,476; mileage paid, at \$1 a mile..... 73,476.00
Weights of the mails conveyed: Letters and post cards, 592 pounds; other articles, 13,710 pounds; amount of the full sea and inland postage thereon..... 2,044.00

Excess of cost of contract service on route 70..... 71,432.00

Route 74, Boston and Philadelphia to Port Antonio, Jamaica, 78 trips; statute miles traveled, 139,122; mileage paid, at 66½ cents a mile..... 92,748.00
Weights of the mails conveyed: Letters and post cards, 3,580 pounds; other articles, 46,928 pounds; amount of the full sea and inland postage thereon..... 9,482.24

Excess of cost of contract service on route 74..... 83,265.76

Route 75, San Francisco, Cal., to Sydney, New South Wales, 17 trips; statute miles traveled, 141,601½; mileage paid, at \$2 a mile..... 283,203.00
Weights of the mails conveyed: Letters and post cards, 25,860 pounds; other articles, 567,802 pounds; amount of the full sea and inland postage thereon..... 86,800.16

Excess of cost of contract service on route 75..... 196,402.84

Aggregate excess of cost of contract service..... 463,410.64

The service from San Francisco to Tahiti performed by the Oceanic Steamship Company is not, strictly speaking, a "contract" service. But as the compensation is at the rate of \$1 for each mile traveled from San Francisco to Tahiti, it is on the same basis (a mileage) and may appropriately be mentioned here. By special authority of Congress the sum of \$45,000 is available for payment of the service at the rate of \$1 a mile from San Francisco to Tahiti for at least ten trips during

the year, the distance from San Francisco to Tahiti being 4,212 statute miles.

During the year 10 trips were made, covering 42,120 miles; mileage paid, at \$1 a mile..... \$42, 120. 00
Weights of the mails conveyed: Letters and post cards, 412 pounds; other articles, 5,964 pounds; amount of full sea and inland postage thereon..... 1, 136. 32

Cost in excess of postage collected..... 40, 983.68

The ocean mail contract service should be credited also with the carriage of the closed mails of foreign origin forwarded during the year from this country by means of steamers under contract with this Department.

The weights of said closed mails amounted to 31,675,153 grams (69,844 pounds) of letters and post cards and 203,714,638 grams (449,191 pounds) of other articles, for the conveyance of which steamers not under contract would have been entitled to compensation at the rate of 5 francs per kilogram of letters and post cards and 50 centimes per kilogram of other articles, or to a total sum of \$50,224.98. Deducting that sum from the "aggregate excess of cost," we find as the net excess of cost of the contract service \$413,185.66.

Route 75—to Australia—is by the Oceanic Steamship Company, the same as the one having this one boat in the service to Tahiti. They received \$283,203 for that service and \$42,120 for the Tahiti service. It is seen that the United States lost over and above all passage on the mail carried on these routes \$463,410.64. But the loss on the two routes of this Oceanic Company was \$196,402.84 and \$40,983.08, or \$237,387.52, nearly one-half of the whole loss on all ocean mail carried. The Pacific coast people as here represented insist on having half of all the "subsidy" going, even if they have to compel steamboats to run to Cannibal Island, where no business exists.

Mr. OVERSTREET. I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER].

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Minnesota who has just taken his seat [Mr. STEENERSON] seems to have leveled his lance at a man of straw. I was with him in his opposition to the original provision in the bill; but that was taken out on a point of order, and the pending amendment simply authorizes the Postmaster-General to make a contract, under the provisions of the law of 1891, for the carriage of mails between this country and Tahiti.

I can see no possible objection to that amendment. The contract will have to be let strictly in accordance with the provisions of that law, and all the safeguards contained in the law must be observed. If it be the policy of this Government to extend its mail facilities to foreign governments in order to increase the commerce of the United States with foreign countries, the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. BELL] is strictly in conformity with that policy.

As has been said, the amendment does not involve the Oceanic Transportation Company at all. The contract is to be let to the lowest bidder. It must be let under the provisions of the law. There is considerable trade in the Society Islands, and there is no question that our trade with those islands will be promoted by the extending of mail facilities between the United States and that locality. I am not an advocate of what is generally known as tonnage ship subsidies, but I do believe in extending the mails from the United States to all parts of the world where we do not have adequate mail facilities now.

If there were no boats running between the United States and Tahiti, there could of course be no trade between them at all. There is no question that trade in that part of the world is capable of great development, and it seems to me that under the safeguards of the provisions of the law of 1891 this money could not be illy expended. It is strictly in conformity with the policy of the Government in extending mails into foreign countries.

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

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Certainly.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Do I understand the gentleman to say that if this special—I will not call it a "subsidy," as it seems to be an offensive word—facility is withdrawn that the steamers themselves will be withdrawn and there will be no direct commerce between that island and the United States?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I think that would probably follow. There would be no regular line, because the commerce is not sufficient to justify a regular line of steamers between the United States and that part of the world.

Mr. SLAYDEN. One other question. What is the amount of the appropriation to be expended?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. The amount which the Postmaster-General may expend is limited to \$45,000 a year.

Mr. SLAYDEN. And \$45,000 a year is the margin between no steamship line and a steamship line?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. As much of the \$45,000 as is necessary to induce a regular line of transportation between this country and Tahiti. It may not require more than \$15,000, or it may require \$20,000 or \$25,000 or \$30,000.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Oh, it will require all of the \$45,000. [Laughter.]

Mr. CRUMPACKER. It is possible; but it seems to me it is good business policy to use enough of this fund in connection with the value of the trade between the two islands to secure a regular line of steamers, even if they do not run oftener than thirty-six days, between the United States and that part of the world.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. CROMER. Mr. Chairman, there may be some reason why we should vote the appropriation for special facilities to the railroad companies for carrying mail, for the reason that in this country there are people everywhere along the lines of these railroads and the mail trains carry a large mail. But there is no reason why this appropriation of \$45,000 should be given to the Oceanic Steamship Company or to any other steamship company for carrying the mail to Tahiti, for the reason that there is but little mail to carry and for the further reason that there are but few people living on the island to which it is proposed to carry the mail by this appropriation. During the fiscal year ending with June 30, 1903, it cost our Government \$6.56 for every pound of letter mail and every pound of newspaper mail carried by this Oceanic Steamship Company to this island, which was an average cost to our Government of \$3.75 for every man, woman, and child living upon the island, and many of them could not read. Will you tell me that it is good legislation, and that it is right that we should appropriate to this steamship company or any other steamship company such a large amount for carrying so small a quantity of mail?

What is the history of this legislation? How did it get here? Where did it come from? Under the law of 1891 it is made the duty of the Postmaster-General to look out for trade, to advertise for contracts for the carrying of mail by steamship to foreign countries. When he finds that there is mail to carry, when he finds that trade may be built up with the people to whom the mail is to be carried, then under that law he advertises for bids with a view of making a contract for carrying the mail. That has never been done in this case. For two years this item crept into the post-office appropriation bill without ever a word of notice to the members of the Post-Office Committee or the Members of this House, and it was never recommended by the Postmaster-General.

The post-office bill making appropriations for the fiscal year ending with June 30, 1902, for the first time carried this item of \$45,000 to the Oceanic Steamship Company as additional compensation for carrying the mail between the port of San Francisco and Tahiti. No one now seems to know how this appropriation got into the post-office bill. It did not appear in the estimates sent to Congress in 1901 by the Department. It was not embraced in the report of the Postmaster-General nor in the report of any other officer of the Post-Office Department. So unnecessary was this large appropriation of money to this steamship company, in the opinion of the Postmaster-General, that he refused to advertise for bids and enter into a contract for carrying the mail under the act of March 3, 1891.

The post-office bill making appropriation for the fiscal year ending with June 30, 1903, again carried this item of \$45,000 to the Oceanic Steamship Company for carrying the mail to Tahiti. It was not contained in the estimates of the Department sent to the Congress in 1902. The Postmaster-General did not recommend it. It was not embraced in the report of the Postmaster-General nor in the report of any other officer of the Department for that year. There was no notice to the members of the Post-Office Committee nor to the Members of this House. There was no debate in the House on this subject, nor had there ever been any debate upon it in Congress up to this time.

This item for the first time was found in the estimates of the Department asking appropriations for the fiscal year ending with June 30, 1904, sent to Congress in 1903. It has appeared in the estimates of the Department since that time, but the Postmaster-General has never yet made any recommendation to the Congress on this subject and has never advertised for bids with a view of entering into a contract for the carrying of this mail under the act of March 3, 1891.

Mr. BELL of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CROMER. Yes.

Mr. BELL of California. Is it not a fact that this item is included in the last estimate of the Post-Office Department?

Mr. CROMER. Yes.

Mr. BELL of California. Then why does the gentleman say that it has crept in here without knowledge of the Post-Office Committee or without action upon the part of the Postmaster-General?

Mr. CROMER. I said originally, in 1901, it crept in when there was no estimate and no recommendation by the Department. In 1902 it again crept into this bill. There was no estimate by the Department and no recommendation. After Congress had appropriated for two years this subsidy to the Oceanic Steamship Company, then, for the first time, the Post-Office Department placed this item in its estimate, but no Postmaster-General nor any officer of the Department has ever yet recommended to the Congress, except by an estimate, that this appropriation should be made.

Mr. SMITH of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CROMER. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Illinois. In reference to the appropriation originally made I want to ask the gentleman if he was not at the time this appropriation was originally made a member of the Post-Office Committee?

Mr. CROMER. Yes; and so was the gentleman, and he was also a member of the legislative subcommittee.

Mr. SMITH of Illinois. Well, I know that.

Mr. CROMER. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Illinois. Of the Post-Office Committee.

Mr. CROMER. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Illinois. I want to ask another question. Before the subcommittee evidence was heard, and when the subcommittee made up the appropriation bill, which contained this appropriation for the first time, and reported it to the full committee, was the gentleman not present in the full committee—

Mr. CROMER. No; I was not present.

Mr. SMITH of Illinois. I will say then that I think the gentleman ought not to assert that it crept in without a word being said when we reported it to the members of the committee.

Mr. CROMER. Mr. Chairman, I understand that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SMITH] has some time allotted to him.

Mr. SMITH of Illinois. None whatever.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I want to suggest to my colleague from Indiana [Mr. CROMER] that an inquiry had at the last session disclosed that there never had been a syllable of evidence before the Post-Office Committee on the subject at all. I challenge anybody to produce any evidence, if it was ever presented on the subject.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. Does the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROBINSON] mean to say that there never was any evidence?

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Printed evidence.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. Oh, that is a different proposition.

Mr. SMITH of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I want to deny the assertion absolutely.

Mr. CROMER. Mr. Chairman, during the first year, ending June 30, 1902, under this subsidy this Oceanic Steamship Company carried 347½ pounds of letter mail and 5,587½ pounds of newspapers or prints, and received for their services in carrying this large bundle of mail to this prosperous people of Tahiti the sum of \$37,908. During the second year, ending June 30, 1903, under this subsidy this Oceanic Steamship Company carried 423 pounds of letter mail and 5,988 pounds of newspapers or prints, and received from our Government for carrying this great quantity of mail to this business people living on the island of Tahiti \$42,120. During the third year, ending June 30, 1904, this steamship company carried 412 pounds of letter mail and 5,964 pounds of newspapers or prints to the people of this island, and received for this service \$42,120. The mail for fiscal year ending with June 30, 1904, was less than the mail for fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, by 11 pounds of letter mail and 24 pounds of newspaper mail.

Mr. WILSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, what kind of mail was it, papers or letters?

Mr. CROMER. As I said, 412 pounds were letters and 5,964 pounds were newspapers, and every pound of these newspapers that was carried to these people cost this Government \$6.56, and many of them could not read.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. Do the ships carry anything but newspapers and letter mail? Do they carry commerce?

Mr. CROMER. Well, it seems not, for they say that the owners lost money in running the line.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. Well, they could carry commerce and still lose money.

Mr. CROMER. Yes; they carry passengers if there are any to go, and they claim there is much business with the people living down there.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I would like to ask the gentleman how he proposes to get the mails over there if this steamship company does not carry them?

Mr. CROMER. Before November 1, 1900, this mail was carried in French steamers and schooners. The service was satisfactory. There were no complaints that ever reached the Department. The sailing vessels gave the people of this island

twelve mails per year, at a cost to the Government of less than \$400.

Mr. GILLETT of California. Why was not that service continued?

Mr. CROMER. Simply because the Oceanic Steamship Company voluntarily undertook to carry this mail under the statutory allowance of \$1.60 per pound for letter mail and 8 cents per pound for newspapers. The sailing vessels were anxious to continue the business of carrying the mail, but the Oceanic Steamship Company having, on March 9, 1900, entered into a contract with the general council of this French colony to carry the mail between Tahiti and San Francisco, began the business of carrying this mail on November 1, 1900. It was not long after entering into this contract until the Oceanic Steamship Company began its efforts to secure a subsidy from our Government.

Mr. GILLETT of California. Is it not a fact that that service on sailing vessels ceased and that they attempted then to carry the mail by steam schooners—the merchants of San Francisco—and failing in that the Oceanic Steamship Company then took the matter up?

Mr. CROMER. I beg the gentleman's pardon. A steamship was sailing on this route before this time. I forget whether it was a French or a German vessel, and it was burned. It had carried the mail for a short time; but French sailing vessels and French steamers had carried this mail satisfactorily since 1870 at a cost to our Government of about \$350 to \$400 per year. The service by sailing vessels ceased because the Oceanic Steamship Company took it away from them. They never grew tired from carrying the mail and were anxious to continue the service, but the Oceanic Steamship Company voluntarily entered upon the service for the statutory allowance of \$1,150 per year. I understand that these same sailing vessels are still running between San Francisco and this island and would be glad to resume the business of carrying the mails. Gentlemen should not forget that the Oceanic Steamship Company entered upon the business of carrying the mail to Tahiti, and did carry it from November 1, 1900, until July 1, 1901, at the consideration of \$1,150 per year or about that amount.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I would ask the gentleman if he advocates going back and carrying the mails by sail instead of by steamers?

Mr. CROMER. Oh, sailing vessels are sufficient to carry the few pounds of mail that are carried to the people of Tahiti, who do but little business with us. Under the sailing vessels they had twelve mails a year. Under this Oceanic Steamship Company they have had ten mails a year. It takes longer, of course, to make the trip, but there were more sailing vessels plying between these two points than there are steamships now plying between them. I am informed that there is only one steamer engaged in making voyages between the island and San Francisco.

Mr. BELL of California. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CROMER. Yes, sir.

Mr. BELL of California. You did not mean to imply that when we had sailing vessels we got our mail over sooner than we do by steamship?

Mr. CROMER. I did not say so. It takes a sailing vessel ninety days to make the round trip. Gentlemen, that island is so far away that it can hardly be reached. It takes the steamer *Mariposa* thirty-six days to make the round trip to that island.

Mr. BELL of California. Will the gentleman from Indiana yield for one question?

Mr. CROMER. Well, yes.

Mr. BELL of California. So far you have confined your remarks to this one island. Now, I ask you if it is not one of a large group, and while you are giving statistics you will not see some possibility with a large group of islands—

Mr. CROMER. Oh, there are some other small islands there, but the trade with Tahiti is the principal trade of this group. Now, with reference to the trade. What are the statistics? We enjoyed 50 per cent or more of this trade when the sailing vessels carried our mails. We do not now enjoy any more of their trade. The balance of trade was in our favor then; the balance of trade is in their favor now. It is true that this French colony does furnish us a small market for bread stuff, lumber, manufactures of iron and steel, muslin, prints, and musical instruments. It is also true that it affords a market in which we can buy tropical fruits, cocoanuts, chocolate, coffee, cotton, copra, pearl shells, and sugar.

Friends of this appropriation seek to justify it upon the ground that it increases our business with the people of that island. But our business with the people of Tahiti is very inconsequential. It is a small island of about 400 square miles, having less than 15,000 inhabitants. Many of the natives of this island live in bamboo houses, with dirt floors.

The history of our trade with the people of this island is that

the balance has been in favor of the people living there since the commerce has been carried by the Oceanic Steamship Company under this subsidy. When our trade with the people of this island was carried by sailing vessels the balance was often in our favor. They live so simply and with so little extravagance that they do not largely consume our goods. They send us more of their products than they take of ours.

Our trade with this island has been increasing for years, almost as rapidly before this subsidy was granted for carrying the mail as it has since.

During the year 1898 we sold to them £51,612 out of a total of £117,332 all told imported by them, and during the same year we bought of them £39,281 of a total £109,323 all told exported by them.

During the year 1899 we sold to them £57,202 of the £113,324 all told imported by them, and during the same year we bought from them £58,543 of the £137,516 all told exported by them.

During the year 1900 we sold to them £65,417 of the £139,051 all told imported by them, and during the same year bought of them £69,169 of the £141,007 all told exported by them.

During the year 1901 we sold to them £77,038 of the £180,438 all told imported by them, and during the same year bought of them £60,252 of the £148,908 all told exported by them.

During the year 1902 we sold to them £78,859 of the £154,983 all told imported by them, and during the same year we bought of them £89,570 of the £167,934 all told exported by them.

During the year 1903 we sold to them £79,519 of the £155,975 all told imported by them, and during the same year we bought of them £83,769 of the £183,656 all told exported by them.

The average amount sold to them for the five years from 1899 to 1903, inclusive, was £148,754, and the average amount bought from them during this same time was £155,804, or a balance of trade in their favor of £7,050 for this period of five years.

The average amount sold to them for the preceding five years, from 1894 to 1898, inclusive, was £115,231, and the average amount bought from them during the same time was £109,566, or a balance of trade of £5,715 in our favor. It seems from these statistics that while the volume of trade with the people of this island when sailing vessels were used for transportation was not so great as it afterwards became when a steamer was used for transportation, yet the balance of trade was then in our favor, whereas now the balance of trade is in their favor.

The Chair, by sustaining the point of order of my colleague from Indiana [Mr. ROBINSON] to this item, because it is contrary to existing law, and admitting the amendment of the gentleman from California [Mr. BELL], which makes this item available only when a contract is entered into under the act of March 3, 1891, has removed the most serious objections to this appropriation. This subsidy has been granted year after year without any of the benefits enumerated in the act of March 3, 1891, accruing to our Government.

Advocates of this item heretofore, without right, have sought to justify it under the act of March 3, 1891. But this act requires a contract between the owners of a steamship company and the Department, which contract must be let to the lowest and best and most responsible bidder after three months of advertisement in the newspapers of San Francisco, Tacoma, and Portland. The steamer in which the mail is to be carried under this act must be built upon plans agreed upon by the owners and the Secretary of the Navy out of iron and steel, and must be constructed with particular reference to prompt and economical conversion into an auxiliary naval cruiser or transport. Under this contract, authorized by act of March 3, 1891, the Government may at any time take such steamer and convert it into a cruiser or transport, paying the owners thereof what it is reasonably worth.

In order to entitle the contractors to \$1 per mile for each outward voyage they must carry this mail on a steamer constructed out of iron and steel, having a gross registered tonnage of not less than 25,000 tons and be capable of maintaining a speed of not less than 14 knots per hour, and shall be sufficiently strong and stable to carry and sustain the working and operation of four effective rifled cannon, having a caliber of not less than 6 inches, and be built after the latest improved methods and with the latest improved machinery; and before entering upon the service of carrying the mail must be inspected by a naval officer or constructor, whose report of inspection must have been filed with the Postmaster-General.

The steamer performing this service under this act must be American built, owned and officered by American citizens; and upon each departure from the United States for the first two years of service must have at least one-fourth of its crew citizens of the United States; and during the next three succeeding years one-third of its crew American citizens; and during the remaining time of the continuance of such contract at least one-half of its crew American citizens.

Under this act our Government is entitled to have a mail messenger transported free of charge, for whom a room shall have been provided for the accommodation of himself and the mails.

Under this act officers of the United States Navy may volunteer for service on such steamer and when accepted by the contractors may be assigned to duties appertaining to the merchant service by the Secretary of the Navy, and may receive from the contractors such compensation as may be agreed upon between the parties.

Under this act such steamer shall take as cadets or apprentices one American-born boy under 21 years of age for each 1,000 tons gross register, or majority fraction thereof, who shall be educated in the duties of seamanship, rank as petty officers, and receive reasonable pay for their services, from the contractors.

Unless a contract is entered into by the Department and the owners of the steamer carrying the mail under this act none of the benefits herein mentioned can be enjoyed by our Government.

Mr. OVERSTREET. May I inquire how much time is yet remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana has seventeen minutes remaining.

Mr. OVERSTREET. All the time on the other side has been exhausted?

The CHAIRMAN. All the time on the other side has been consumed.

Mr. OVERSTREET. I yield fifteen minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. GILLETT].

Mr. GILLETT of California. Mr. Chairman, I hope that this amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. BELL] will be adopted. It takes away the question of subsidy, which has been argued here several times, and it leaves the matter now with the Postmaster-General to advertise for bids under the act of March 3, 1891. Now, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the remarks of the gentleman from Minnesota, and also to the remarks of the gentleman from Indiana, and I can not agree with what they say concerning the possibilities of the great Pacific Ocean, the islands that are there, and the commerce some day which will come from those islands to our own port. I want to say at the very beginning the Oceanic Company, and that seems to be the company now on trial, though as a matter of fact they may never be considered when the bids are let; but that company, composed of enterprising business men on the Pacific slope, at a great expense have built and maintained magnificent steamers, and they have been carrying for years the American flag south of the Equator when no other vessels from our country went there, and doing it, sir, at a great loss. They have been on the high seas of the Pacific Ocean while the gentleman has been riding in palace cars in the State of Indiana over its magnificent prairies.

Mr. CROMER. Will the gentleman permit a question there? Have not they been receiving the principal portion of this money?

Mr. GILLETT of California. They have had a contract for carrying the mail, and they have lost nearly \$200,000 a year in doing it, and it is only because they hope to build up a trade with the islands lying in the south Pacific Ocean that these men have been persistently expending their money for that purpose, notwithstanding the fact that their ventures have met with steady losses.

Now, look at it. To-day the Government of the United States is seeking in some way to extend its commerce. This act of 1891 is for the purpose of promoting commerce. If you listen to the gentlemen you would think it is only a question of how much per pound it ought to pay for carrying the mail. Behind it all is the great intent upon the part of the American people to extend their commerce to continents and to islands.

There lies south of the equator a group of islands known as the Society Islands. Tahiti is the largest island there. It is 120 miles around it. It is fertile and rich in its resources. It is capable of great development; it is capable of supporting a large population, and white people can live there, and that is true of many islands in this particular locality. And now we have one steamer going there and carrying our products, taking our woolen goods and our cotton goods, and bringing back their products. And this Government ought to support this enterprise. It ought to be at least as liberal as the French Government. I want to say to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CROMER] and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STEEN-ERSON] that the French Government pays to this company \$30,000 a year for carrying the mail in an American vessel and under the American flag, and I want to say to the credit of this company that they have the best sailors in the world—union sailors, well trained—that they pay from \$30 to \$40 per month. It is a high class of service, maintained by our

best business men on the Pacific slope, in their great endeavors to introduce commerce south of the equator. And their flag is the only flag that goes there.

Now, then, a few days ago a report was made by Mr. GROSVENOR, from the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, showing what other nations are doing for their commerce. Austria pays \$1,288,000 for mail subsidies; France \$5,019,000; Germany pays nearly \$2,000,000; Great Britain pays over \$6,000,000; Japan pays nearly \$3,000,000, and these great nations all around us are subsidizing their ships and driving the American flag from the ocean because the American Congress has not sand enough to stand up and vote a subsidy to see that American commerce is extended right alongside of theirs. [Applause.]

How are we ever going to build up our trade if we do not do something for our shipping interests? How are we ever going to find our vessels in foreign ports flying the American flag unless we follow the same policy adopted by other nations? Why, take Japan, a heathen country, we call it. See what she is doing. This is what the report filed by Mr. GROSVENOR says:

Close alongside these heavily subsidized British steamers, out of the American ports of Tacoma and Seattle, a few miles southward, now run two large and three smaller American steamships, competing with the British line for freight and passenger traffic to and from the Orient. These American steamers received last year for carrying the United States mails the munificent sum of \$4,935. Close alongside the American steamers, right out of Puget Sound, runs a Japanese line, the Nippon Yusen Kaisha, which receives an annual subsidy of \$330,000 from the Japanese Government, and was given last year \$4,857 for carrying the United States mails.

Last year Japan gave a mail subsidy to her steamers plying between her ports and ours amounting to \$330,000, and our Government also paid them \$4,857 for carrying its mails, nearly as much as it paid American steamers, and we are hoping to maintain commerce in the Pacific Ocean with that kind of competition. Japan pays \$330,000 subsidy, and we pay a little over \$4,000 to vessels running in competition with them. And England is also paying to its ships on this same route large sums of money.

Now, here comes a proposition where we ask our steamers to go into the south seas where are rich islands, where coffee, where sugar, and where such things may be grown at a profit, where capitalists will go whenever the pioneers open up the way, and here is a bill which will permit a company to continue to develop and open up that trade, and we are asked to vote it down for the small sum of \$45,000.

I do not believe there is another nation in the world that stands as a first-class or second-class power that would ever be guilty of voting down anything of this kind when it went to develop their trade abroad, and I do not believe this House, having in mind all these things, will do it.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Chairman, I did not get all that the gentleman said, but I understand that he has made a very strong argument in favor of this subsidy on the ground that France has made enormous payments along similar lines. Is the gentleman aware that as a result of nearly twenty years of subsidy in France the French parliament in 1888 reported as follows:

We do not hesitate to say, without fear of contradiction, that our merchant marine is in such a state of decadence that there is reason to be uneasy about our naval fleet.

Mr. GILLETT of California. I say that this is the policy which has been adopted by France, this is the policy which Germany is pursuing, and this is the policy which is making Japan a power on the seas of the world, and it is something that we have got to meet. This is only a small beginning. It is a small favor to grant the people of the Pacific coast, that the Postmaster-General be authorized to advertise for bids, not giving to a company, but advertising for bids under the act of March 3, 1891, to carry the mail to the Society Islands and bring it back again. I sincerely trust and hope that this House will see the justice of our cause, and that it will vote in favor of the amendment offered by my colleague from California [Mr. BELL], which, I understand, the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads favors and will support. I yield the rest of my time to the gentleman from Indiana.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has eight minutes remaining.

Mr. OVERSTREET. Mr. Chairman, the amendment now before the committee does not in any way specify the Oceanic or any other steamship company as the beneficiary of this appropriation. It merely carries enough money, together with authority for advertising under the act of March 3, 1891, for a service between San Francisco and the Society Islands. This item of appropriation which we have reached in the bill, carrying something over \$2,000,000, covers all the appropriations for the for-

eign mail service, and if no additional sum was carried than this under the contract now in operation there would be no opportunity for the Department to advertise, because if it did it would carry out the contract.

But if \$45,000 additional money should be carried in this bill for foreign mail service, authorizing the Department to advertise for that service, then if there were bids by the Oceanic Steamship Company or any other company, the Department could carry out the contract, provided the bids came within the provision of 1891.

Now, Mr. Chairman, right or wrong, wise or unwise, we have an act authorizing practically subsidy for the foreign mail service for the purpose of promoting commerce. There are in operation to-day seven contracts under that authority. These contracts in no instance make any money to the Government except by the stimulus given to commerce between this country and those with which the contracts have been made.

There is a loss upon each one of these seven contracts when you compare the amount of expenditure with the amount of postage received in the ordinary way.

Mr. CROMER. May I interrupt the gentleman?

Mr. OVERSTREET. I must decline to yield.

Mr. Chairman, on route 36, between New York and La Guaira, Venezuela, the appropriation is \$60,880, while the post-office receipts is under \$40,000, a loss on the postage alone of \$21,260. With Maricopa, Venezuela, on route 37, the net loss as between expenditures and postal receipts is over \$30,000, with Southampton on route 37 we lose \$34,000. With Habana we lose \$71,000, with Sydney and the South Sea Islands we lose \$196,000.

Now, on these seven contracts, when comparing the postal receipts with the actual expenditures, we suffer a net loss of \$463,410.64. The difference between the expenditure of \$45,000 in the Tahitan service and the actual postal receipts results in a loss of \$40,983.68.

It is a plain proposition of whether or not the appropriation under the act of 1891 is justified by the effort to stimulate commerce between the two countries. My colleague [Mr. CROMER] is in error when he stated that the commerce has not increased. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STEENERSON] is in error when he says there was a decrease in the commerce last year of over one-third of the total of the preceding year.

I quote from a letter received from the Secretary of State transmitting a copy of an extract from a copy of a letter from our consul at Tahiti. In 1902 the imports into the Society Islands from the United States were \$378,324.96. In 1903 the same importations were \$539,631.34, a material increase of \$161,306.38.

For the same period of time there was a decrease in the amount of exports from that island to the United States of \$18,202.57. The commerce which the law of 1891 sought to promote was the commerce from this country to others and not from them to us. The increase has been in the exportations from the United States and the decrease has been in the importations to the United States. There is a net balance of more than three times the amount of this appropriation.

I hope the committee will separate the question whether there shall be an appropriation directly to the Oceanic Steamship Company, or whether the law of 1891 shall be followed, and authority given, with a sufficient sum appropriated to meet the requirements under the advertisements which the law provides for.

I trust, therefore, Mr. Chairman, that we may at once have a vote, and that the vote will sustain the amendment.

Mr. STEENERSON. I should like to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. OVERSTREET. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. STEENERSON. I should like to ask if the law of 1891 does not, without any provision whatever in this bill, authorize the Postmaster-General to make a contract for the service to Tahiti or any other place?

Mr. OVERSTREET. Yes; but there is no money appropriated unless it is appropriated in this item.

Mr. STEENERSON. Does not this amendment provide for a specific route to Tahiti? As I understand it, that is what it does. Therefore you control the discretion of the Postmaster-General and require him—

Mr. OVERSTREET. He would have to advertise under that law, and if the advertisements did not bring bids within the provisions of the law, then this money could not be used. If they did, then it would be.

Mr. STEENERSON. But it was not the intent of the law of 1891 to leave it entirely to the discretion of the Postmaster-General to let contracts wherever he saw fit?

Mr. OVERSTREET. No.

Mr. STEENERSON. Whereas this appropriation compels him to adopt the route to Tahiti, whether he wants to or not.

Mr. OVERSTREET. Just the reverse. The law of 1891 explicitly directs that there shall be an equitable distribution of these contracts—

Mr. STEENERSON. To that extent.

Mr. OVERSTREET. To the Atlantic, Pacific, and Gulf ports.

The CHAIRMAN. The time for debate has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. BELL].

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

Mr. CROMER demanded a division.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 63, noes 43.

Mr. CROMER and Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana demanded tellers.

Tellers were ordered; and the Chairman appointed Mr. BELL of California and Mr. CROMER.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 76, noes 54.

Accordingly the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Chairman, I wish to call the attention of the gentleman from Indiana to the fact that he made an error in his statement in regard to the receipts from these contracts. There has been a profit of \$61,000 instead of a loss.

Mr. OVERSTREET. Mr. Chairman, I want to correct the statement I made a moment ago, and I am obliged to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STEENERSON] for calling my attention to the error. I stated that there was a loss on route 57, between New York and Southampton. It was a profit, instead of a loss, of \$61,000.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I move to amend, in line 7, page 19, by striking out "fifty" and inserting "seventy," so that it will read "seventy-five thousand dollars."

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 19, line 7, strike out "fifty-five" and insert "seventy-five."

Mr. OVERSTREET. Mr. Chairman, this was an error, and my attention was called to it by the Postmaster-General.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

I should like to ask the chairman of the committee [Mr. OVERSTREET] one question. The gentleman was called upon the other day to state what contracts were entered into with steamship companies, so as to show how this item of \$2,725,000 was distributed. In the RECORD the gentleman has accounted for the contracts for \$1,204,862. I should like to know what disposition is made of the other \$1,109,000.

Mr. OVERSTREET. Mr. Chairman, I call the gentleman's attention to page 12 of the Report of the Superintendent of Foreign Mails, where appear the seven contracts referred to the other day. The sum total of those seven contracts as given in this report appears to be \$1,475,138. Of course the total carried in this item of \$2,725,000 is not intended solely for those seven contracts. That makes the difference.

I ask the Clerk to continue the reading of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

For pay of agent and assistant to distribute stamps, and expenses of agency, \$12,000.

Mr. OVERSTREET. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend line 6, page 20, by striking out the words "twelve thousand" and inserting "eleven thousand two hundred and eighty."

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

The Clerk read as follows:

On line 6, page 20, strike out the words "twelve thousand" and insert "eleven thousand two hundred and eighty."

Mr. OVERSTREET. Mr. Chairman, this is to eliminate an item which has been taken care of in the legislative appropriation bill.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

For pay of agents and assistants to distribute postal cards, and expenses of agency, \$15,000.

Mr. OVERSTREET. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend by striking out the words "fifteen thousand," in line 15, and inserting "seven thousand six hundred and forty."

The Clerk read the amendment, as follows:

On page 20, line 15, strike out the words "fifteen thousand" and insert "seven thousand six hundred and forty."

Mr. OVERSTREET. Mr. Chairman, this is for the same

reason. The clerks have been taken care of on the legislative appropriation bill.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

The appropriation for the fiscal year 1905 of \$25,000 for the employment of special counsel to prosecute and defend suits affecting the second-class mailing privilege is hereby reappropriated and made available for the fiscal year 1906.

Mr. RANDELL of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I offer the amendment that I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

After line 8, page 21, insert the following: "That in order to promote the cause of free public education in the States and Territories in the United States, the Post-Office Department shall transmit free through the mails, under such regulations as the Postmaster-General may from time to time prescribe, all annual and biennial reports published by the State or Territorial departments of education where the same as addressed to any school or school official."

Mr. OVERSTREET. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against that.

Mr. RANDELL of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, this is a measure which I explained rather fully in a speech two days ago. It is to extend the franking privilege to the State departments of education in sending out their annual and biennial reports to schools and school officials. It is not a general franking privilege, and is not one that could cost the Government very much. The Commissioner of Education, Doctor Harris, estimates that at the present time there are something like 36,000 of these reports sent out annually, and if this privilege is given to the departments of education it is possible that one hundred or one hundred and fifty thousand reports may be sent out. The present number sent out would probably cost, according to Doctor Harris, \$2,200 a year; and if it increased enough to amount to 100,000 or 150,000 it would not cost the Government exceeding \$10,000 a year, which we must all admit is a pitiful sum to be given to the great cause of education.

All of the school superintendents in the country are interested in this matter and desire to have their reports scattered around the country, so that all that is good in any part of the Union may immediately be made known to other parts of the Union.

Mr. Chairman, this is along the line of furthering education, such as Congress has already done. We have contributed considerably to aid education. We are now giving to the agricultural and mechanical colleges something like \$1,200,000 a year. The value of the lands we donated to schools and colleges is fully \$103,000,000, so that, if you capitalize it at 5 per cent interest, you will find that we are contributing annually to education something like six and a half million dollars a year. What I ask is to carry it a little further, to extend this franking privilege to the State departments of education in sending out their annual and biennial reports, not all over the land, but simply to schools and school officials.

I do not propose to give them a general privilege; I do not propose that. I do not wish them to send out circulars and bulletins and everything of that kind, but simply their annual and biennial reports, and those only to schools and school officials. It will be productive of great good to education, and I sincerely hope that this measure will pass.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment is offered by the gentleman from Louisiana, to which the gentleman from Indiana makes the point of order that it is contrary to existing law and not in order on an appropriation bill. It seems to the Chair that the amendment clearly proposes new legislation, and the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. DRISCOLL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I do this for the purpose of taking this opportunity to formally call the attention of the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads, the Members of this House, the Post-Office Department, and others, to a nuisance which has for some time existed in connection with the postal service, and continues to exist and to grow, in my judgment.

Wisely or unwisely, members of Congress receive from time to time from the Government allotments of books, pamphlets, maps, and other publications, garden and flower seeds, and occasionally a few vines, plants, and shrubs. They belong not to us, but to the people of our respective districts, but we control their distribution. It is our privilege to send them to whom we please, and it is our right that they be delivered to whom they are directed. Many of mine have not been so delivered. They have been either lost, destroyed, or stolen in transit. You who send books or documents without notice to the parties that you have done so can not learn what proportion is not received by the persons to whom they are directed.

I have taken at least average pains and care in sending out my quotas of publications and other allotments received from the Government. I write each person a letter, stating that I have sent, or am about to send, him a book or other publication, giving the title or name and requesting him to acknowledge its receipt. I do the same with reference to plants, shrubs, and practically everything except seeds and farmers' bulletins. I do not receive acknowledgments in all cases, nor do I expect them. Some people are careless about such matters and look upon the writing of a letter as quite a task. But the person who does not receive the promised publication or plant is apt to write or remind me of his disappointment when we meet at home. I have received many such letters and reminders, and the number seems to be increasing.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman permit an interruption?

Mr. DRISCOLL. Yes.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. I think that I lost fully one-third of the horse books I sent out at the last session of Congress. The persons to whom I sent them notified me they had not received them. I am satisfied fully one-third were lost.

Mr. DRISCOLL. When I state my own case, Mr. Chairman, I think I express the experience of nearly every Member of this House; that our publications are not received by the people to whom they are directed, and that we are irritated and annoyed from time to time by their loss. I have conferred with other Members and their secretaries about this matter. They all have told me that much of their matter is lost in transit; that is, that it never reaches the people to whom it is directed, and that they have devised ways and means by which it may pass through the mails undisturbed. Some register valuable books to insure their safe transmission. Others place the franks or other pasters over the title to avoid detection.

About a year ago, during the last session of Congress, fifteen Syracuse gentlemen visited Washington and appeared before the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds in behalf of a Federal building for that city. I promised each of them a copy of the Lincoln, Garfield, and McKinley Memorial Addresses. I sent to the folding room for fifteen copies of that book. They were brought to my committee room. On the fly leaf of each I wrote the name of the person to whom it was directed, a few words of presentation, and my own name.

Those books were then done up in separate wrappers; a frank was placed on each over the title; the name and address of each person was written on the envelope; they were all then put into one mail sack, which was closed and directed to Hon. Dwight H. Bruce, P. M., Syracuse, N. Y. They were delivered at the House post-office by the janitor. I arranged with Mr. Bruce to distribute them on their arrival in Syracuse. I thought that method would insure their safety and that they would run the gantlet. But only nine of them were received by the gentlemen to whom they were directed. Six were lost and have never been found. I made special inquiries at the Syracuse post-office and was assured that only nine arrived there. I also conferred with the Fourth Assistant Postmaster-General, but he was unable to trace them. That experience about exhausted my patience. I prepared a statement then for presentation to the House, but many other important investigations were on and I cooled down and did not submit it. Those are beautiful books, the choicest in our allotment. They are listed at \$1.50 each by the Superintendent of Documents. They are very desirable acquisitions to libraries. Those six volumes were not thrown into the waste basket or the fire. They were too valuable for that. The owner's name of each book was written on the fly leaf, also my name.

I do not wish to use language overharsh, and I am not inclined to be uncharitable, but my settled conclusion is that those volumes are now in the possession of some person or persons to whom they do not belong. They were wrongfully taken by those who abstracted them from the mails, and are stolen property in the hands of those who hold them. Garden and flower seeds are permitted to pass through the mails fairly well. Only a small percentage is exacted as toll or salvage. This is also true of farmers' bulletins. They are not a great temptation. In the case of shrubs, vines, and plants my percentage of loss in transit has been large, although I can not give the exact figures. A fair percentage of yearbooks and horse books has been lost between the folding room and their destination as directed. Many of my maps and other publications have failed of delivery, and, to cap the climax, after special care and pains, I lost six out of fifteen of those memorials at one time.

The Postmaster-General and heads of bureaus and divisions of that Department are doubtless anxious to render efficient

and satisfactory service. The responsibility seems to rest with the men who handle this mail matter. There is carelessness or crookedness somewhere, else better work would be done.

The people who handle those documents between the folding room and the places of their destination must be guilty either of negligence or larceny, or a larger proportion would reach the people to whom they are directed. It is true that these documents are published and printed at public expense. The word "Free" appears on the envelope or wrapper. But it does not follow that they are public property or subject to public plunder, and the sooner this fact is understood and appreciated the better. They are the property of the parties whose names appear in the superscriptions. The Government frank should answer the same purpose as the Government stamp, and should insure for those documents the same care, attention, and protection from the cupidity of employees and outsiders. The frank is not properly respected, for it should guarantee immunity from spoliation and appropriation. This disregard of the frank and tampering with this class of mail matter can and should be stopped. When letters are abstracted from the mails detectives are set at work. Investigations follow. When the thieves are apprehended, whether employees or others, they are visited with condign punishment.

Let the Post-Office Department pay the same attention to this nuisance and it would be speedily abated. Currency, as a rule, is not easily identified. The envelopes may be destroyed and the money put in circulation. Those books can not be eaten; they can not well be secreted. If sold, they can be easily traced to the seller. It would be a comparatively easy matter to run down this class of kleptomaniacs. A few examples would protect our mail matter and insure reasonably safe transmission.

I do not believe that either Senators or Representatives sell their books, nor do they give them away. Yet I am told that several book handlers in this city always have on hand large stocks of Government publications for sale or barter. It would be a pertinent inquiry for our post-office detectives to determine where they get them. Nothing is further from my desire and intention than to wound the feelings of any honest and careful post-office employee. But the honest and careful man never fears an investigation and prefers the strict enforcement of wholesome regulations, which he, from choice, observes.

When we deliver a parcel to an express or railroad company we expect and exact safe transportation and delivery. Common carriers are responsible and must deliver the goods or respond in damages. This Government is a common carrier of mail matter and does this business through the agency of the Post-Office Department. Postal employees are as well paid and should be as careful, competent, and honest as the employees of any private business concern, and the Department has the power to make them so.

In conclusion, let me say that I do not accuse any particular individual or class of employees in the post-office service. I have not taken, nor do I intend to take, the part of a detective. It is not for me to fix the responsibility. I simply state the facts, and the conclusion necessarily follows that there is negligence or dishonesty somewhere.

In behalf of many Members of this House, as well as on my own account, I call attention to these facts, and make this public statement in the hope that this vicious and annoying practice may cease, and that no further notice or investigation of the subject may be necessary. And I now serve notice on the people who are guilty of pilfering the mails that if this vicious practice continue further action will be taken and a Congressional investigation will follow if necessary. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

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

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

Mr. OVERSTREET. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to recur to line 5, page 19, and that the words "and" and "further" be stricken out.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana asks unanimous consent to revert to line 5, page 19, in order that the words "and" and "further" may be stricken out. Is there objection?

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

The Clerk read as follows:

Salaries of post-office inspectors.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I do it for the purpose of making a statement not exactly germane to this portion of the bill. The chairman of the

Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. OVERSTREET], in closing his remarks in reference to the "Tahiti subsidy," so called, or subvention, spoke of Cuba, and that we had lost \$71,000 in the last year on account of the amount paid for carrying the mail to Cuba, in excess of postage received.

Mr. OVERSTREET. Mr. Chairman, I simply said that was the difference between the actual postage and the amount paid.

Mr. PAYNE. That is what I said.

Mr. OVERSTREET. Well, the gentleman's statement was not quite as I stated it.

Mr. PAYNE. I accept the correction, that the difference between the actual amount received for postage and the amount paid for carrying the mail was \$71,000. Now, that was not altogether a loss, nor was the Cuban reciprocity altogether a loss. Cuban reciprocity went into effect on the 27th day of December, 1903. For the first time the Bureau of Statistics to-day has available the statistics of our trade with Cuba, both for the year 1903 and the year 1904, and for the periods of six months in those two years, so that we can make a comparison. There has been much loose talk about the effect of this treaty. One gentleman stated in my hearing the other day at a hearing before the committee that the increase was only 1½ per cent on our exportation to Cuba. Another gentleman stated it was trivial. So I thought it was my duty to put into the Record the figures as they actually exist. Now, we have from Cuban sources the total exports to Cuba for the year 1903 and the year 1904. For the calendar year 1904 they amount to \$32,644,345.

For the calendar year 1903 they were only \$23,504,417, showing a gain of \$9,139,922, equivalent to 38.9 per cent gain for 1904 over and above the total exports to Cuba in 1903, while there were imported from Cuba into this country in 1904 \$74,960,992, as against an importation of \$57,228,291 in 1903, showing eighteen millions increase in the imports into the United States, or about 31 per cent. In other words, the increase of importations from Cuba showed a gain of 31 per cent as against nearly 39 per cent gain of exports into Cuba from the United States. A comparison for the six months of exports from the United States of merchandise to Cuba is still more favorable. This is taken from the statistics of our own country and not from the statistics of Cuba. The other statement I made is from the Cuban statistics purely. For the first six months of 1903 ending June 30 our exports of merchandise to Cuba were \$10,851,467. During the corresponding period of 1904 the exports were \$14,413,595, showing a gain of over 32 per cent in that six months.

During the last six months ending December 31, 1903, for that year the total exports to Cuba were \$12,963,870, while during the last six months of 1904 the total exports were \$18,287,348, showing a gain in our exports during the last six months, as compared with the previous year, of \$5,323,476, which is an increase of over 41 per cent for the past six months. So that it appears that our merchants have learned to take advantage of the difference in rates which we gave them in the Cuban reciprocity treaty and we are increasing our trade there, and we are increasing it very rapidly, so that some of the anticipations made when this treaty was agreed to have been realized. If the House bill on this subject had been passed, which made a much greater reduction on goods going from the United States to Cuba, in some cases four or five times as much reduction—if that had been passed and our merchants had had the advantage of that we should have made a better showing during the past year that would have amply justified the bill as it was originally reported in the House and failed of passage. I thought it was my duty, Mr. Chairman, these statistics being available, to give them to the House at the first opportunity.

Mr. McMORRAN. Will the gentleman explain to the House what percentage of the last year's exports from Cuba to this country, were expended by the Cubans in this country?

Mr. PAYNE. I suppose the gentleman refers to our trade compared with other countries. I have not those figures for the last six months' comparison. The table was made for the first six months and not for the past six months, so I am unable to state now. I gave the figures so far as I had them. When those come in I will be glad to bring them before the House.

Mr. McMORRAN. Have you read Squiers's report, showing what the relations—

Mr. PAYNE. I have read several reports, all of them, in fact, and I want to say to the gentleman from Michigan that for the first six months some other countries got a larger percentage of increase on their exports into Cuba than did the United States, but when you come to compare the whole thing and the amount of trade we are having it shows an increase in favor of the United States.

I have no doubt in getting this foothold in the trade of Cuba it is going to increase in the future, notwithstanding the fact that since this treaty was enacted and became binding between the two countries laws have been passed in Cuba that have been inimical to the trade of the United States and favorable to the trade of some of the South American countries.

Mr. McMORRAN. Is that the result of the reciprocal advantage we gave Cuba?

Mr. PAYNE. That is the result of the Cuban tariff. I have shown the gentleman all there is of it, so far as I have any information, and he may draw his own conclusion. I draw a different conclusion looking at it from a different standpoint.

Mr. McMORRAN. Will the gentleman give us the information? Does he know the amount of revenue the Government has lost?

Mr. PAYNE. I do not know. I have never figured it up.

Mr. HINSHAW. Do the researches of the gentleman indicate whether the Cuban reciprocity treaty has caused any loss or injury to the beet sugar industry in this country under its operations?

Mr. PAYNE. It has not. I find on investigation that the price of sugar has not been affected by it, while there has been a great increase in price both abroad and here. I have a comparison of the reports of the price of sugar in Hamburg and in the city of New York for each year commencing with the first week in January, 1903, and continuing during the year 1903 and 1904. And while it shows that during the year 1904 sugar was sold at a lower price in New York during some of the time than it was in Hamburg, at other times it was at the same price. And I find that sugar sold at the lower price in 1903 as in 1904, 1903 being the last year immediately previous to the Cuban reciprocity treaty.

Mr. FINLEY. I would like to ask the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] if, in his opinion, like reciprocity treaties with other countries would result in a like increase in trade?

Mr. PAYNE. The gentleman's question is a question that we will meet when the matter of reciprocity with other countries comes up. I am simply showing that this treaty that we were bound to make because of the engagements that were made during the adoption of the Platt amendments, has not resulted so disastrously to the United States as gentlemen have tried to prove in their dealings with figures.

Mr. FINLEY. Is the distinguished gentleman, the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee [Mr. PAYNE], in a position to help along the time when we will meet that question?

Mr. PAYNE. I do not know of any country in the world that is willing to make to-day a fair and equitable reciprocity treaty with the United States. I have not seen any such proposed treaty, and do not know of any other country that proposes to make one. When that time comes I will be very glad to meet the question.

Mr. FINLEY. Quite a number of those treaties have been made by the agents of this Government with other countries, and does the gentleman mean to say that all of those treaties were bad?

Mr. PAYNE. I mean to say that all of those treaties were jug-handled—that is, if they went on our people would get the worst end of it.

Mr. FINLEY. I believe it is true that President McKinley sent a number of them to the Senate?

Mr. PAYNE. What President McKinley did is a matter of record. I am not going to quarrel with that.

Mr. FINLEY. And in his opinion they were not all bad.

Mr. GROSVENOR. It does not follow that because the President, in the discharge of his duty, sent to the Senate those treaties, he ever recommended their ratification.

Mr. PAYNE. The President of the United States appointed an agent to negotiate those treaties, and when the treaties were negotiated it became the duty of the President to send them to the Senate.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I say he never asked for Senate action in favor of those treaties.

Mr. PAYNE. Well, the gentleman from Ohio probably recollects better than I do the messages sending those treaties to the Senate. But he sent the treaties to the Senate of the United States, and they never have been ratified, and investigation has shown that they were unfair to the United States, and they ought not to be ratified.

Mr. OVERSTREET. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HUGHES] desired to have unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record. I ask for him that that consent be granted.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, consent will be granted.

There was no objection.

Mr. OVERSTREET. 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 bill H. R. 17865, and had come to no resolution thereon.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. WACHTER, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the following titles; when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 14626. An act to quiet titles to land in the city of Mobile, State of Alabama;

H. R. 7869. An act in relation to bonds on contracts with the District of Columbia;

H. R. 17749. An act authorizing the Kensington and Eastern Railroad Company to construct a bridge across the Calumet River;

H. R. 7296. An act for the protection of the public forest reserves and national parks of the United States;

H. R. 16567. An act to authorize the Decatur Transportation and Manufacturing Company, a corporation, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Tennessee River at or near the city of Decatur, Ala.;

H. R. 14906. An act for the relief of H. B. Wise;

H. R. 9493. An act to amend the act of February 8, 1897, entitled "An act to prevent the carrying of obscene literature and articles designated for indecent and immoral use from one State or Territory into another State or Territory," so as to prevent the importation and exportation of the same;

H. R. 3947. An act for the relief of holders and owners of certain District of Columbia special-tax scrip;

H. R. 18035. An act to amend section 552 of the Code of Laws for the District of Columbia relating to incorporations;

H. R. 15011. An act to open to homestead settlement and entry the relinquished and undisposed of portions of the Round Valley Indian Reservation, and for other purposes;

H. R. 17789. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize W. Denny & Co. to bridge Dog River, in the State of Mississippi;"

H. R. 9758. An act for the relief of the heirs of George McGehey for services rendered as mail contractor;

H. R. 14710. An act authorizing the use of earth, stone, and timber on the public lands and forest reserves of the United States in the construction of works under the national irrigation law; and

H. R. 14623. An act to amend an act approved July 1, 1902, entitled "An act temporarily to provide for the administration of the affairs of civil government in the Philippine Islands, and for other purposes," and to amend an act approved March 8, 1902, entitled "An act temporarily to provide revenue for the Philippine Islands, and for other purposes," and to amend an act approved March 2, 1903, entitled "An act to establish a standard of value and to provide for a coinage system in the Philippine Islands," and to provide for the more efficient administration of civil government in the Philippine Islands, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the following titles:

S. 6094. An act granting an increase of pension to Ephraim W. Harrington;

S. 6092. An act granting an increase of pension to Elijah W. Gordon;

S. 6085. An act granting an increase of pension to Leonard Delamater;

S. 6091. An act granting an increase of pension to William Welch;

S. 6116. An act granting an increase of pension to Francis M. Sams;

S. 6584. An act to incorporate the trustees of the Grand Encampment of Knights Templar of the United States of America;

S. 69. An act granting an increase of pension to Francis C. Brown;

S. 104. An act granting an increase of pension to Abner Taylor;

S. 5727. An act granting an increase of pension to Jesse Woodruff;

S. 5757. An act granting an increase of pension to William A. Luther;

S. 5766. An act granting an increase of pension to Andrew S. Graham;

S. 5802. An act granting an increase of pension to Luther M. Bartlow;

S. 5808. An act granting an increase of pension to William Steel;

S. 5809. An act granting an increase of pension to Cyrus Wetherell;

S. 5812. An act granting an increase of pension to William T. Graham;

S. 5815. An act granting an increase of pension to James McKim;

S. 5841. An act granting an increase of pension to Nelson P. Smith;

S. 5842. An act granting an increase of pension to Thomas G. Parish;

S. 5856. An act granting an increase of pension to William V. Morrison;

S. 5868. An act granting an increase of pension to Mary C. Buck;

S. 5892. An act granting an increase of pension to James McAuliff;

S. 5938. An act granting an increase of pension to Owen A. Willey;

S. 5939. An act granting an increase of pension to George W. Hall;

S. 5940. An act granting an increase of pension to Jason R. C. Hoyt;

S. 5941. An act granting an increase of pension to Alma Yohum;

S. 5943. An act granting an increase of pension to Jared Prindle;

S. 5953. An act granting an increase of pension to Charles P. Thurston;

S. 5958. An act granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Bartlett;

S. 5961. An act granting an increase of pension to Warren P. Tenney;

S. 5971. An act granting a pension to Cordelia Bird;

S. 5975. An act granting an increase of pension to Lucy Lytton;

S. 6004. An act granting an increase of pension to James Hulme;

S. 2913. An act granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth F. Given;

S. 6196. An act granting an increase of pension to William Dickinson;

S. 6268. An act granting an increase of pension to Adria M. S. Moale;

S. 6321. An act granting a pension to Hattie F. Davis;

S. 6195. An act granting an increase of pension to Frederick Feigley;

S. 6130. An act granting an increase of pension to Charles L. Harmon;

S. 6194. An act granting an increase of pension to William S. Moorhouse;

S. 6193. An act granting a pension to Jacob O. White;

S. 6192. An act granting an increase of pension to James McGinnis;

S. 6191. An act granting an increase of pension to Charles R. Van Norman;

S. 6074. An act granting an increase of pension to William Smith;

S. 6085. An act granting an increase of pension to Leonard Delamater;

S. 6092. An act granting an increase of pension to Elijah W. Gordon;

S. 141. An act granting an increase of pension to James W. Kinkead;

S. 184. An act granting an increase of pension to John Bartlett;

S. 355. An act granting a pension to Sarah Jane Simonds;

S. 826. An act granting an increase of pension to John C. Bertolette;

S. 825. An act granting an increase of pension to Jesse Collins;

S. 1420. An act granting an increase of pension to Gustavus S. Young;

S. 830. An act granting an increase of pension to Thomas H. Muchmore;

S. 1794. An act granting an increase of pension to Joseph C. Walkenshaw;

S. 2074. An act granting an increase of pension to James A. Harper;

S. 2189. An act granting an increase of pension to Joseph K. Armstrong;

S. 2419. An act granting an increase of pension to Jane M. Black;

S. 2572. An act granting an increase of pension to Thomas J. Lucas;

S. 2707. An act granting an increase of pension to James M. Clemens;

S. 2828. An act granting an increase of pension to Phoebe E. Lyda;

S. 3074. An act granting an increase of pension to Isaac Davisson;

S. 3435. An act granting a pension to Mazilla Lester;

S. 3517. An act granting an increase of pension to John B. Hammer;

S. 3635. An act granting an increase of pension to John M. Godown;

S. 3939. An act granting an increase of pension to James Miller;

S. 4075. An act granting an increase of pension to Charles M. Shepherd;

S. 4121. An act granting an increase of pension to James D. Beasley;

S. 4135. An act granting an increase of pension to Jane Frances;

S. 4159. An act granting an increase of pension to George W. Gray;

S. 4239. An act granting an increase of pension to William H. McCann;

S. 4392. An act granting an increase of pension to Samuel Hyatt;

S. 4660. An act granting an increase of pension to Nellie B. Newlon;

S. 4691. An act granting an increase of pension to Leonard L. Lancaster;

S. 4722. An act granting an increase of pension to Martin V. Trough;

S. 4760. An act granting an increase of pension to Ezekiel Riggs;

S. 4825. An act granting an increase of pension to Mary Martin;

S. 4888. An act granting an increase of pension to Pierpont H. B. Moulton;

S. 4897. An act granting an increase of pension to Reuben Allred;

S. 5426. An act granting a pension to Henry O. Kent;

S. 5432. An act granting an increase of pension to Elias Stillwell;

S. 5550. An act granting an increase of pension to Martin Mack;

S. 5451. An act granting an increase of pension to George W. Benedict;

S. 5455. An act granting an increase of pension to Jeanie G. Lyles;

S. 5509. An act granting an increase of pension to Susie C. G. Seabury;

S. 5523. An act granting an increase of pension to James Minnick;

S. 5527. An act granting an increase of pension to John A. Kingman;

S. 5540. An act granting an increase of pension to Jerome Bradley;

S. 5568. An act granting an increase of pension to Flora B. Bonham;

S. 5670. An act granting an increase of pension to James W. Stickle;

S. 5678. An act granting a pension to Margaret McKee Pentland, formerly Margaret McKee;

S. 5712. An act granting an increase of pension to Sally Dickinson;

S. 5698. An act granting an increase of pension to Martin Schubert; and

S. R. 88. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of War to furnish a condemned cannon to the board of regents of the University of Minnesota, at Minneapolis, Minn., to be placed on campus as a memorial to students of said university who served in the Spanish war.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED.

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

S. 6799. An act granting a pension to Ezra Walker Abbott—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 6025. An act granting an increase of pension to Belle K. Theaker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 6311. An act for the relief of James W. Jones—to the Committee on Claims.

S. 6757. An act to amend section 2288 of the Revised Statutes of the United States—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. 6568. An act for the relief of the Richmond Locomotive Works, successor of the Richmond Locomotive and Machine Works—to the Committee on Claims.

S. 6648. An act to establish a light and fog-signal station near Point Cabrillo, California—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 6744. An act relative to the commissions of officers who are under the direction and control of the Postmaster-General and the Secretary of Commerce and Labor, respectively—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 6818. An act for the relief of Hannah B. Sabiston—to the Committee on Claims.

S. R. 98. Joint resolution to print a second and revised edition of the third annual report of the United States Reclamation Service—to the Committee on Printing.

Senate concurrent resolution 100.

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed and bound 1,100 copies of the report of the agent of the United States in the arbitration of the Venezuelan cases before The Hague tribunal, with accompanying appendixes, referred to in the message of the President to the Senate and House of Representatives dated January 23, 1905, 200 for the use of the Senate, 400 for the use of the House of Representatives, and 500 for the use of the Department of State—

to the Committee on Printing.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT FOR HIS APPROVAL.

Mr. WACHTER, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that this day they had presented to the President of the United States for his approval the following bills:

H. R. 15895. An act making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1906, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7606. An act granting a pension to Joel W. Nye;

H. R. 17646. An act to extend certain provisions of the Revised Statutes of the United States to the Philippine Islands;

H. R. 3619. An act for the relief of David V. Howell; and

H. R. 17784. An act to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Arkansas River at or near Vanburen, Ark.

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

The motion was agreed to; and accordingly (at 5 o'clock p. m.) the House adjourned.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting, in response to the inquiry of the House as to delay in delivery of materials for the construction of the *Connecticut*, copies of reports of bureau officers of the Department covering said inquiries—to the Committee on Naval Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, with a copy of a communication from the Attorney-General, amended estimates of appropriations for guards in certain penitentiaries—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce and Labor, transmitting a detailed statement of the number of documents received and distributed by the Department in 1903 and 1904—to the Committee on Printing, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting estimates of appropriations required to complete the service of various Departments of the Government for the current fiscal year—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. GROSVENOR, from the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 17998) to amend section 9 of the act of August 2, 1882, concerning lists of passengers, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4197); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. HOUSTON, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 5662) for the relief of Julia Nolan, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4152); 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. 8791) granting a pension to Mae H. Tyler, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4153); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DRAPER, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 9059) granting an increase of pension to Cephas W. Parr, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4154); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. WILEY of Alabama, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 9458) granting an increase of pension to Martha A. Harper, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4155); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. LONGWORTH, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 10804) granting an increase of pension to Sarah Kearney, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4156); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. PATTERSON of Pennsylvania, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 12093) granting an increase of pension to Sarah A. McMurtrie, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4157); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BROWN of Pennsylvania, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 12724) granting an increase of pension to R. L. Davis, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4158); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. PATTERSON of Pennsylvania, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 13316) granting a pension to Phebe Damoth, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4159); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. AIKEN, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 13999) granting a pension to Charles S. Abney, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4160); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 14759) granting a pension to Minnie C. O'Connor, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4161); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. WILEY of Alabama, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 15884) granting a pension to Julia R. Jones, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4162); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. LONGWORTH, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 16505) granting a pension to Frances F. Mower, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4163); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. McLAIN, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 16394) granting a pension to Sarah C. Johnson, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4164); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BROWN of Pennsylvania, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 17408) granting an increase of pension to Charley Franklin, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4165); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. AMES, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 17564) granting a pension to Martha L. H. Spurgin, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4166); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. LONGWORTH, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 17621) granting an increase of pension to George H. Barrows, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4167); 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. 17627) granting an increase of pension to Michael D. Kernan, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4168); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. McLAIN, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 17691) granting an increase of pension to Andrew J. Brann, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4169); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BROWN of Pennsylvania, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 17832) granting an increase of pension to Malinda Peak, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4170); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. AMES, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 17877) granting a pension to Joseph E. Green, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4171); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 18086) granting an increase of pension to James Eastland, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4172); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. McLAIN, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 18101) granting an increase of pension to S. A. Demarest, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4173); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. AMES, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 18220) granting an increase of pension to Mary Cushing Hall, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4174); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. WILEY of Alabama, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 18310) granting an increase of pension to Sinnett A. Duling, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4175); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. McLAIN, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 18319) granting an increase of pension to Green B. Waller, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4176); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. LONGWORTH, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 18453) granting an increase of pension to Jacob C. Ryan, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4177); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. McLAIN, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 16464) granting an increase of pension to Austin Handy, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4178); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 3372) granting a pension to Mary A. O'Brien, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4179); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 4208) granting an increase of pension to Bessy Forsyth Bache, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4180); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 4492) granting a pension to Joseph F. Kelly, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4181); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 4508) granting an increase of pension to John M. Bybee, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4182); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5233) granting an increase of pension to Susan A. Reynolds, reported the same without amendment, ac-

accompanied by a report (No. 4183); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5499) granting a pension to Matilda J. Henderson, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4184); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5518) granting a pension to Bernard J. Boldermann, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4185); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5705) granting a pension to Mary L. Faunt Le Roy, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4186); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 6042) granting an increase of pension to James V. Williams, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4187); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 6155) granting an increase of pension to Matthew F. Locke, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4188); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 6171) granting an increase of pension to Fannie C. Avis, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4189); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 6289) granting a pension to Charles Norris, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4190); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 6344) granting an increase of pension to Richard B. Dickinson, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4191); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 6348) granting an increase of pension to Richard E. Hyde, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4192); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 6402) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Lewis, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4193); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 6438) granting a pension to Cyrell Boutiette, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4194); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 6550) granting a pension to Jane Johns, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4195); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 6654) granting an increase of pension to Stephen Dampier, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4196); 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. 18446) granting a pension to Ebbie Wells—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 16469) for the relief of James C. Blair—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (H. R. 15151) granting an increase of pension to Rebecca C. Goodson—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 15715) granting a pension to Horace G. Robin-

son, alias Frank Cammel—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. JENKINS: A bill (H. R. 18674) to regulate the taking of appeals or writs of error from the United States district courts in the Indian Territory, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOOCH: A bill (H. R. 18675) to amend "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, as amended by the acts approved January 31 and June 30, 1902—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. POWERS of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 18676) to amend the seventh section of an act entitled "An act to establish circuit courts of appeals, and to define and regulate in certain cases the jurisdiction of the courts of the United States, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1891, and amended June 6, 1900—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAYNARD: A bill (H. R. 18677) making provision for a memorial to Matthew Fontaine Maury—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi: A bill (H. R. 18678) to amend an act entitled "An act temporarily to provide revenue for the Philippine Islands, and for other purposes," approved March 8, 1902—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORGAN: A bill (H. R. 18679) increasing the limit of cost of public building at Ironton, Ohio—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. UNDERWOOD: A bill (H. R. 18680) to add certain counties in Alabama to the southern district therein, and to divide the said southern district, after the addition of said counties, into four divisions, and to prescribe the time and places for holding courts therein, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CALDERHEAD: A bill (H. R. 18681) fixing the rate of pension for persons eligible under the act of June 27, 1890, and acts amendatory thereof, who require the frequent and periodical or regular and constant aid and attendance of another person—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. VANDIVER: A bill (H. R. 18682) providing for the erection of a public building at Cape Girardeau, Mo.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. COUSINS: A bill (H. R. 18722) authorizing the appointment of dental surgeons in the Navy—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. SHIRAS: A resolution (H. Res. 482) for the addition of a Committee for the Protection of Game and Fish—to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HILDEBRANT: A resolution (H. Res. 483) to pay J. M. McKay, George E. Printy, and P. L. Coultry for extra services rendered—to the Committee on Accounts.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARTHOLDT: A bill (H. R. 18683) granting an increase of pension to John Schneider—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BRADLEY: A bill (H. R. 18684) granting an increase of pension to Margaret L. Hance—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CALDWELL: A bill (H. R. 18685) granting an increase of pension to N. J. Buchanan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 18686) granting an increase of pension to Henry W. Higley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COWHERD: A bill (H. R. 18687) granting an increase of pension to Sarah Hall Johnston—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18688) authorizing the President to appoint S. J. Call surgeon in the Revenue-Cutter Service—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CROWLEY: A bill (H. R. 18689) to correct the record of Allen Byers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18690) for the relief of A. and A. Pictor, as "Pictor Brothers"—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 18691) granting a pension to William P. Knowlton—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GRIFFITH: A bill (H. R. 18692) granting an increase of pension to William H. Oatman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18693) for the relief of David F. Collins—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. GROSVENOR: A bill (H. R. 18694) granting a pension to Mary D. Sill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HEFLIN: A bill (H. R. 18695) granting an increase of pension to M. E. Lewis—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 18696) granting an increase of pension to John T. Stone—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MIERS of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 18697) granting an increase of pension to Jordan Freeman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOON of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 18698) granting an increase of pension to W. A. Pryor—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. OLMSTED: A bill (H. R. 18699) granting a pension to Henry S. Matter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18700) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Benner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PATTERSON of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 18701) granting a pension to Caledonia Alston—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. REEDER: A bill (H. R. 18702) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Dunn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18703) granting an increase of pension to George W. Husted—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama: A bill (H. R. 18704) granting a pension to Martha E. Gilbreath—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SULLIVAN of New York: A bill (H. R. 18705) granting a pension to Henrietta Sherman—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TALBOTT: A bill (H. R. 18706) granting an increase of pension to William H. Stiffler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 18707) granting an increase of pension to William M. Coleman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WEISSE: A bill (H. R. 18708) granting an increase of pension to John Rohrer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18709) granting an increase of pension to Henry Stocks—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18710) granting an increase of pension to Albert Bacon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18711) granting an increase of pension to Charles Graefe—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18712) granting an increase of pension to William Bennett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18713) granting an increase of pension to Edward Tucker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18714) granting an increase of pension to Hiram Pray—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18715) granting an increase of pension to Christopher Pletzke—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18716) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Albright—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18717) granting an increase of pension to William G. Thorp—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18718) granting an increase of pension to Henry Braun—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GOOCH: A bill (H. R. 18719) granting a pension to Charles W. Taylor—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COCKRAN of New York: A bill (H. R. 18720) for the relief of Henry F. Barta—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18721) for the relief of Henry F. Barta—to the Committee on War Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. BADGER: Paper to accompany bill for relief of John S. Gill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BASSETT: Petition of the Merchants' Association of New York, against bill H. R. 17752—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BISHOP: Petition of Harmony Grange, No. 1075, against repeal of the Grout oleomargarine bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BURKETT: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Moss C. Davis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of citizens of Falls City, Nebr., against license to sell liquor in Indian Territory—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. BURLEIGH: Petition of citizens of the State of Maine, against any change in the Grout oleomargarine law—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CASTOR: Petition of Patriotic Order Sons of America, of Philadelphia, Pa., favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. COCKRAN of New York: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Henry F. Barta—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Henry F. Barta—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. COOPER of Pennsylvania: Petition of citizens of Fayette County, Pa., favoring bill H. R. 13778—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota: Paper to accompany bill for relief of John Haack—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DEEMER: Petition of citizens of Williamsport, Pa., against passage of the parcels-post bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. DRAPER: Petition of the Merchants' Association of New York, favoring bill H. R. 17752—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GOOCH: Petition of Daniel Boone Division, No. 489, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers of the United States, Canada, and Mexico, at Covington, Ky., in convention, favoring bill H. R. 7041—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRIFFITH: Paper to accompany bill for relief of David F. Collins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAUGEN: Petition of Norwood (Iowa) citizens, against passage of the parcels-post bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. HEMENWAY: Petition of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen of Terre Haute, Ind., favoring bill H. R. 7041—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HENRY of Connecticut: Petition of the Chamber of Commerce of New Haven, Conn., against members of the Board of Appraisers being removed from office unless convicted before a judge of United States circuit court, on charges constituting grounds for removal, as per act of June 10, 1890—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KETCHAM: Petition of the manufacturing companies of Hudson, N. Y., against the Jenkins anti-injunction bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLINE: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Norman H. Cole—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LAFEAN: Petition of Washington Camp, Patriotic Order Sons of America, of Davisburg, Pa., favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. LINDSAY: Petition of Cigar Makers' Union No. 132, of New York, against reduction in tariff between the Philippine Islands and the United States—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Denver Chamber of Commerce and Board of Trade, protesting against reduction of tariff on raw or refined sugar—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolution of the National League of Business Men, of Chicago, as to what should be done to regulate transportation throughout the country—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Merchants' Association of New York, favoring bill H. R. 17752—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen of New York, favoring passage of bill H. R. 7041—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LITTLEFIELD: Petition of citizens of Maine, against any change in the Grout oleomargarine law—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of citizens of Maine, favoring passage of the parcels-post and postal currency bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. MIERS of Indiana: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Jordan Freeman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. OLMSTED: Petition of Washington Camp, No. 584, Patriotic Order Sons of America, of Lees Crossroads, Pa., fa-

favoring a law restricting immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Camp No. 500, Patriotic Order Sons of America, of Harrisburg, Pa., for more stringent laws regarding immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of the Harrisburg Burial Case Company, favoring bill H. R. 9302—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Washington Camp, No. 171, Patriotic Order Sons of America, of Carlisle, Pa., for regulation of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of the Patriotic Order Sons of America, of Fredericksburg, Pa., for a law restricting immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of the Patriotic Order Sons of America, of Annyville, Pa., favoring a law restricting immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of the Patriotic Order Sons of America, of Richland, Pa., for a law restricting immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. RAINEY: Petition of Lincoln King Post, Grand Army of the Republic, No. 410, of Kane, Ill., favoring bill H. R. 13986—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RUPPERT: Petition of the New York Board of Trade and Transportation, relative to rebate and discrimination on private-car systems—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SCUDDER: Petition of the Order of Railway Conductors, Long Island Division, No. 391, favoring bill H. R. 7041—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Order of Railway Conductors, Division No. 54, favoring bill H. R. 7041—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Merchants' Association of New York, favoring bill H. R. 17752—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SPERRY: Petition of Woman's Christian Temperance Union No. 2, of New Haven, Conn., and the Loyal Temperance Legion, against sale of liquor in all Government buildings—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

Also, petition of the Chamber of Commerce of New Haven, Conn., relative to removal of Board of General Appraisers—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SULLIVAN of New York: Petition of the National Board of Trade, thirty-fifth annual meeting, at Washington, D. C., relative to interstate commerce—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WALLACE: Petition of citizens of Garrard, Ky., against bill H. R. 4072—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE.

FRIDAY, February 3, 1905.

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

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Journal will stand approved, there being no objection.

BALTIMORE AND WASHINGTON TRANSIT COMPANY.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the annual report of the Baltimore and Washington Transit Company, of Maryland, for the year ended December 31, 1904; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and ordered to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. C. R. MCKENNEY, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had passed with an amendment the bill (S. 6312) providing for the construction of irrigation and reclamation works in certain lakes and rivers; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

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

H. R. 9298. An act granting the right of way for the construction of a railroad and other improvements over and on that part of the Hot Springs Reservation known as West Mountain, Hot Springs, Ark.;

H. R. 11061. An act to provide an American register for the steam lighter *Pioneer*;

H. R. 16646. An act to amend section 2787 of the Revised Statutes of the United States;

H. R. 16906. An act to amend section 12, chapter 1495, Statutes of the United States of America, entitled "An act for the survey and allotment of lands now embraced within the limits

of the Flathead Indian Reservation, in the State of Montana, and the sale and disposal of all surplus lands after allotment;"

H. R. 17350. An act declaring Grand River to be not a navigable stream;

H. R. 17935. An act authorizing the Louisa and Fort Gay Bridge Company, of Louisa, Ky., to erect a bridge across the Tug and Levisa forks of the Big Sandy River; and

H. J. Res. 184. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of War to furnish a condemned cannon to the armory at St. Paul, Minn., to construct a memorial tablet.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3109) for the relief of Noah Dillard.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills and joint resolution; and they were thereupon signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 69. An act granting an increase of pension to Francis C. Brown;

S. 104. An act granting an increase of pension to Abner Taylor;

S. 141. An act granting an increase of pension to James W. Kinkead;

S. 184. An act granting an increase of pension to John Bartlett;

S. 355. An act granting a pension to Sarah Jane Simonds;

S. 825. An act granting an increase of pension to Jesse Collins;

S. 826. An act granting an increase of pension to John C. Bertolette;

S. 830. An act granting an increase of pension to Thomas H. Muchmore;

S. 1420. An act granting an increase of pension to Gustavus S. Young;

S. 1794. An act granting an increase of pension to Joseph C. Walkenshaw;

S. 2074. An act granting an increase of pension to James A. Harper;

S. 2189. An act granting an increase of pension to Joseph K. Armstrong;

S. 2419. An act granting an increase of pension to Jane M. Black;

S. 2572. An act granting an increase of pension to Thomas J. Lucas;

S. 2707. An act granting an increase of pension to James M. Clemens;

S. 2828. An act granting an increase of pension to Phoebe E. Lyda;

S. 2913. An act granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth F. Given;

S. 3074. An act granting an increase of pension to Isaac Davison;

S. 3435. An act granting a pension to Mazilla Lester;

S. 3517. An act granting an increase of pension to John B. Hammer;

S. 3635. An act granting an increase of pension to John M. Godown;

S. 3939. An act granting an increase of pension to James Miller;

S. 4075. An act granting an increase of pension to Charles M. Shepherd;

S. 4121. An act granting an increase of pension to James D. Beasley;

S. 4135. An act granting an increase of pension to Jane Frances;

S. 4159. An act granting an increase of pension to George W. Gray;

S. 4239. An act granting an increase of pension to William H. McCann;

S. 4392. An act granting an increase of pension to Samuel Hyatt;

S. 4660. An act granting an increase of pension to Nellie B. Newton;

S. 4691. An act granting an increase of pension to Leonard L. Lancaster;

S. 4722. An act granting an increase of pension to Martin V. Trough;

S. 4760. An act granting an increase of pension to Ezekiel Riggs;

S. 4823. An act granting an increase of pension to Mary Martin;

S. 4888. An act granting an increase of pension to Pierpont H. B. Moulton;

S. 4897. An act granting an increase of pension to Reuben Allred;