

By Mr. WADSWORTH: Petition of members of the Independent Order of Good Templars of Jeddo, Orleans County, N. Y., in favor of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of patrons of rural free-delivery routes Nos. 1 and 9, of Lockport, N. Y.; No. 27, of Newfane, N. Y., and No. 19, of Lyndonville, N. Y., in regard to salaries and privileges of rural free-delivery mail carriers—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of Lake Seamen's Union, in favor of bill H. R. 12230, to prohibit the employment on board vessels holding American registers of Chinese persons not entitled to admission to the United States—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. WANGER: Petition of the Presbyterian Church, Rev. J. F. Sheppard, pastor, of Conshohocken, Pa., in favor of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE.

SATURDAY, *March 5, 1904.*

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. EDWARD EVERETT HALE.

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Journal will stand approved, there being no objection.

PUBLIC BUILDING AT SEATTLE, WASH.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, calling attention to the fact that the contract for the construction of the court-house and custom-house and post-office building at Seattle, Wash., is based upon the use of granite for facing the lower portion of the building and sandstone for the superstructure, and that an additional appropriation of \$60,000 will be necessary for the purchase of granite to be used for this building; which was referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON SHIPPING BILL.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 4th instant, a stenographic report of the hearing held before him February 25, 1904, on the Philippine shipping bill pending before Congress; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

SLOOP RALPH.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting the conclusions of fact and of law and the opinion of the court filed under the act of January 20, 1885, in the French spoliation claims set out in the findings by the court relating to the vessel sloop *Ralph*, Moses Montague, captain; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

EDWARD M. CRAIG.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a certified copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of Edward M. Craig, administrator of George W. Craig, deceased, v. The United States; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. C. R. MCKENNEY, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 3317) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to grant right of way for pipe lines through Indian lands.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the resolution of the Senate authorizing the cancellation of the signatures of the Speaker of the House and the President pro tempore to the enrolled bill (S. 2323) relating to ceded lands on the Fort Hall Indian Reservation and to correct an inaccuracy stated in the bill.

MEMORIAL ADDRESSES ON THE LATE SENATOR HANNA.

Mr. FORAKER. Mr. President, I desire to give notice to the Senate that at the close of the routine morning business on Thursday, March 31, I shall ask the Senate to consider resolutions commemorative of the life and character of my late colleague, the Hon. Marcus A. Hanna.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. HANSBROUGH presented petitions of the congregation of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Larimore; of the Plymouth Congregational Church, of Fargo, and of the Roberts Street Methodist Episcopal Church, of Fargo, all in the State of North Dakota, praying for the enactment of legislation to regulate the interstate transportation of intoxicating liquors; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. FAIRBANKS presented a petition of the congregation of the Meridian Street Methodist Episcopal Church, of Indianapolis, Ind., praying for the enactment of legislation to regulate the interstate transportation of intoxicating liquors; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. KEAN presented a petition of the Woman's Club of Elizabeth and East Orange, N. J., praying for an investigation of the charges made and filed against Hon. REED SMOOT, a Senator from the State of Utah; which was referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Dividing Creek and Burrsville; of the congregation of the Baptist Church of Burrsville; of the congregation of the First Reformed Church of Somerville; of the congregation of the First Methodist Episcopal Church of Millville; of the congregation of the Presbyterian Church of Lamington; of the congregation of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Gladstone; of the congregation of the Asbury Methodist Episcopal Church, of Long Branch, and of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Rahway, all in the State of New Jersey, praying for the enactment of legislation to regulate the interstate transportation of intoxicating liquors; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. DRYDEN presented a petition of William B. Hatch Circle, No. 2, Department of New Jersey, Ladies of the Grand Army of the Republic, of Camden, N. J., praying for the enactment of a service-pension law; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented a memorial of the Mercer Pottery Company, of Trenton, N. J., and a memorial of Fisher & Averis, of Trenton, N. J., remonstrating against the passage of the so-called "eight-hour bill" and also the "anti-injunction bill;" which were referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented petitions of the congregation of the First Baptist Church of Bloomfield; of the congregation of the First Methodist Episcopal Church of Bayonne; of the congregation of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Gladstone; of the congregation of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Alpine; of the Society of Friends of Moorestown; of the congregation of the Montgomery Street Methodist Episcopal Church, of Newark; of the congregation of the Lake View Presbyterian Church, of Paterson; of the congregation of the First Reformed Church of North Paterson; of the congregation of the First Methodist Episcopal Church of Hightstown; of the congregation of the German Pilgrim Baptist Church of Jersey City; of the congregation of the Baptist Church of Medford; of the congregation of the First Reformed Church of Somerville; of the congregation of the First Presbyterian Church of New Brunswick; of the congregation of the Swedish Baptist Church of Montclair, and of the congregation of the Baptist Church of Columbus, all in the State of New Jersey, praying for the enactment of legislation to regulate the interstate transportation of intoxicating liquors; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. OVERMAN presented petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Burlington, of the Pastors' Association of Burlington, and of sundry citizens of Greensboro and Advance, all in the State of North Carolina, praying for the enactment of legislation to regulate the interstate transportation of intoxicating liquors; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. GALLINGER presented a memorial of the Mark Flather Planer Company, of Nashua, N. H., remonstrating against the passage of the so-called "eight-hour bill;" which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a petition of the Meyer Brothers' Drug Company, of St. Louis, Mo., praying for the adoption of certain amendments to the so-called "pure-food bill;" which was referred to the Committee on Manufactures.

Mr. QUAY presented a petition of the Eastern Pennsylvania Conference of the Evangelical Association, praying for an investigation of the charges made and filed against Hon. REED SMOOT, a Senator from the State of Utah; which was referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

He also presented a petition of the Evangelical Church of West Washington, Pa., praying for the enactment of legislation to regulate the interstate transportation of intoxicating liquors; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. BURROWS presented a petition of Local Lodge No. 166, Brotherhood of Boiler Makers and Iron Ship Builders, of Wyandotte, Mich., praying for the enactment of legislation to develop

the American merchant marine; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. BLACKBURN presented petitions of the congregation of the Baptist Church of Pineville, and sundry citizens of Newport and Pineville, all in the State of Kentucky, praying for the enactment of legislation to regulate the interstate transportation of intoxicating liquors; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CLAPP presented a petition of sundry citizens of Red Wing, Minn., praying for the enactment of legislation to regulate the interstate transportation of intoxicating liquors; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. LONG presented a petition of Leavenworth Circle, No. 5, Ladies of the Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Kansas, of Leavenworth, Kans., praying for the enactment of a service-pension law; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented petitions of sundry patrons of rural free-delivery routes No. 2 and No. 4, of Burlington, and of rural route No. 5, of Lyons, all in the State of Kansas, praying that an appropriation be made to increase the salaries of rural letter carriers; which were referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Grenola, Kans., praying for the enactment of legislation to regulate the interstate transportation of intoxicating liquors; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. BACON presented a petition of the Blue and Gray Association of Fitzgerald, Ga., praying that an appropriation of \$20,000 be made for the completion of the park at that city; which was referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. DANIEL presented a petition of sundry citizens of Solarville, Va., 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 Brookland Citizens' Association, of the District of Columbia, praying that an appropriation be made for the erection of a monument in the city of Washington to Thomas Jefferson, author of the Declaration of Independence, and John Morton, a distinguished signer of the same; which was referred to the Committee on the Library.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. BLACKBURN, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 4083) for the relief of Payton Shields, submitted an adverse report thereon; which was agreed to, and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

Mr. HEYBURN, from the Committee on Mines and Mining, to whom was referred the bill (S. 4413) to authorize the location of coal lands upon unsurveyed public lands in the District of Alaska, and for the survey, entry, and patenting of the same, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. SIMMONS, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2879) to amend the law relating to taxation in the District of Columbia, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. HANSBROUGH, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to whom was referred the amendment submitted by himself on the 26th ultimo, proposing to appropriate \$5,000 for the improvement of Twenty-second street from Decatur place to S street NW., in the city of Washington, D. C., intended to be proposed to the District of Columbia appropriation bill, submitted a favorable report thereon, and moved that it be referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and printed; which was agreed to.

Mr. HEYBURN, from the Committee on Manufactures, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 6295) for preventing the adulteration or misbranding of food or drugs, and for regulating traffic therein, and for other purposes, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

TENNESSEE RIVER BRIDGE.

Mr. BERRY. I am directed by the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (S. 4387) to authorize the Chicago, St. Louis and New Orleans Railroad Company to construct a bridge across the Tennessee River near Gilbertsville, Ky., to report it with amendments.

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill. I am sure it will provoke no debate. It is indorsed by the Department, recommended and reported unanimously by the Committee on Commerce, and it simply authorizes the construction of a steel bridge in lieu of an old defective wooden one there on this important railway.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Kentucky asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of a bill, which will be read to the Senate for information.

The Secretary read the bill; and by unanimous consent the

Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration.

The first amendment of the Committee on Commerce was to add at the end of section 1 the following proviso:

Provided, That upon completion of the bridge herein authorized the said company shall promptly remove the present bridge.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 2, page 2, line 13, after the word "under," to insert "and subject to;" so as to read:

That the said bridge shall be located and built under and subject to such regulations for the security of navigation as shall be prescribed by the Secretary of War, etc.

The amendment was agreed to.

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.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. DILLINGHAM introduced a bill (S. 4816) to provide for the appointment, duties, compensation, and inspection of accounts of commissioners in Alaska, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Territories.

Mr. PERKINS introduced a bill (S. 4817) granting a pension to Cornelia A. Thompson; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. DEPEW introduced a bill (S. 4818) for the relief of James T. Barry and Richard Cushion, executors of the last will and testament of Martin Dowling, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. BURROWS introduced a bill (S. 4819) to amend an act entitled "An act to further promote the efficiency of the Navy," approved December 24, 1861, as amended by an act approved July 16, 1862; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. MONEY introduced a bill (S. 4820) for the relief of the legal representatives of Andrew Brown, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. COCKRELL introduced a bill (S. 4821) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Walley; which was read twice by its title.

Mr. COCKRELL. To accompany the bill I present the petition of Mary E. Walley, widow of Irvin Walley, of Company B, Cass County (Mo.) Home Guards, for an increase of pension, together with sundry affidavits. I move that the bill and accompanying papers be referred to the Committee on Pensions.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. COCKRELL introduced a bill (S. 4822) granting a pension to Jeremiah H. Milroy; which was read twice by its title.

Mr. COCKRELL. I present the petition of Jeremiah H. Milroy, together with affidavits of J. M. Haley, W. F. Suda, and Dr. T. Guy Hetherlin, and the military and hospital records of the petitioner. I move that the bill and accompanying papers be referred to the Committee on Pensions.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. CARMACK introduced a bill (S. 4823) granting an increase of pension to Mary Martin; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. FOSTER of Louisiana introduced a bill (S. 4824) to provide for building an annex to the court-house and post-office at Shreveport, La.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. DANIEL introduced a bill (S. 4825) to provide for celebrating the first permanent settlement of English-speaking people by holding an international exhibition of arts, industries, manufactures, and the products of the soil, mines, forests, and the sea, in the vicinity of Jamestown, and on and near the waters of Hampton Roads, in the State of Virginia, and to authorize an appropriation in aid thereof; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Select Committee on Industrial Expositions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 4826) to provide for enlarging the public building at Roanoke, Va., in order to accommodate the United States courts; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also introduced a bill (S. 4827) granting an increase of pension to John S. Burkholder; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 4828) for the relief of George Killen; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

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

A bill (S. 4829) for the relief of the estate of J. C. Bailey, deceased (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 4830) for the relief of the vestry and wardens of St. Stephen's Protestant Episcopal Church, of Cedar Run parish, Fauquier County, Va.;

A bill (S. 4831) for the relief of Algernon L. Wilkinson, Kate E. Wilkinson, and Laura M. Powell, sole heirs of Laura E. Wilkinson, deceased;

A bill (S. 4832) for the relief of the estate of Catharine R. Moore, deceased;

A bill (S. 4833) for the relief of the estate of Mary Ann Goodwyn, deceased;

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

A bill (S. 4834) for the relief of William Foy and H. B. Lane, executor of Mrs. H. B. Lane, of North Carolina;

A bill (S. 4835) for the relief of D. S. Barrus and others; and

A bill (S. 4836) for the relief of the heirs of D. W. Morton.

AMENDMENTS TO APPROPRIATION BILLS.

Mr. GALLINGER submitted the following amendments intended to be proposed by him to the District of Columbia appropriation bill; which were ordered to be printed, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia:

An amendment providing for a fourth assistant corporation counsel, instead of a law clerk, in the office of the corporation counsel of the District of Columbia;

An amendment proposing to increase the salary of the two judges of the police court of the District of Columbia from \$3,000 to \$4,000 each; and

An amendment proposing to appropriate \$50,000 for constructing a bridge across Piney Branch on the line of Sixteenth street extended, in the District of Columbia.

Mr. QUAY submitted an amendment removing the restriction of existing law limiting the cost for the purchase of a site for a public building at Oklahoma City, Okla., and making the amounts heretofore appropriated available for the purchase of such site and the erection of a building thereon, intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, and ordered to be printed.

He also submitted an amendment providing for the holding of court in the western judicial district of the Indian Territory at Wetumka, in the Creek Nation, fixing the recording district for said court, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the Indian appropriation bill; which was ordered to be printed, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. DEPEW submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$100,000 for grading and improving Sixteenth street extended, with its present width, from Piney Branch northward, in the District of Columbia, intended to be proposed by him to the District of Columbia appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. TELLER submitted an amendment proposing that field, line, and staff officers of the Army below the grade of major-general, with creditable records, who served during the civil war, and who have been or may hereafter be retired, shall be placed on the retired list with the rank and retired pay of the next higher grade, intended to be proposed by him to the army appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

SALMON RIVER (IDAHO) IMPROVEMENT.

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

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to cause a survey to be made and estimates to be submitted of the cost of removing the obstructions to navigation in the Salmon River between Salmon, Idaho, and the mouth of said river.

ARANSAS PASS AND CORPUS CHRISTI BAY.

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

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed, at the earliest date practicable, to cause a survey to be made of the channel from Aransas Pass through what is known as Turtle Cove to Corpus Christi Bay, Texas, and to submit an estimate for the improvement of said channel to meet the demands of commerce.

PRESIDENTIAL APPROVALS.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. B. F. BARNES, one of his secretaries, announced that the President had on the 3d instant approved and signed the following acts:

An act (S. 2596) granting a pension to Frances S. Hopkins; and

An act (S. 2809) granting an increase of pension to Jesse J. Finley.

NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. HALE. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the naval appropriation bill.

Mr. HEYBURN. If the Senator from Maine will permit me, I should like to ask that a bill be taken up about which there is no controversy. It is to amend the practice in courts.

Mr. HALE. If the Senator will wait until I get the appropriation bill up, there are two or three Senators who have bills, and I will yield to them. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. CULLOM] has a privileged report to present. I want to get up the appropriation bill first.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Maine moves that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the naval appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

LEGISLATIVE, EXECUTIVE, AND JUDICIAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. CULLOM submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9480) making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1905, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 42, 47, 56, 57, 74, 93, 130, 131, 132, 133, 140, 141, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 156, 159, 161, 162, 168, 174, 175, 176, 185, 211, 212, 214, and 228.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 43, 44, 45, 46, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 66, 67, 68, 70, 71, 72, 73, 76, 78, 79, 80, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 142, 143, 144, 148, 150, 151, 153, 154, 155, 157, 160, 163, 164, 165, 166, 169, 172, 173, 177, 178, 179, 180, 181, 182, 183, 184, 186, 187, 188, 189, 194, 195, 196, 197, 198, 200, 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 213, 217, 218, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227, 229, 230, 231, 232, and 233, and agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 41, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out by said amendment insert the following: "One clerk of class 4;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 65, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Insert after the word "otherwise" in said amendment the words "hereafter specifically;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 69, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$10,000;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 75, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the number proposed insert "three;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 77, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$42,710;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 81, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "Two bookkeepers, at \$1,500 each;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 82, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$25,580;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 91, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, and in lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert, after the word "dollars," in line 10, page 65, of the bill, the following: "Provided, That whenever the Secretary of the Treasury shall determine that it is necessary for the proper operations of the mint at Denver, Colo., the following force may be appointed in lieu of the foregoing, at the yearly compensation herein stated, namely: Superintendent, at \$4,500; assayer, melter and refiner, and coiner, at \$3,000 each; chief clerk, at \$2,500; weigh clerk, at \$1,600; clerk, at \$1,400; two calculating clerks, at \$1,400 each, and two clerks, at \$1,200 each; and any unexpended balance of the foregoing appropriation shall be available for payment of this latter force;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 92, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "For wages of workmen, including not exceeding six thousand six hundred and twenty dollars for other clerks and employees, twenty-two thousand dollars."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 108, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "three hundred and sixty thousand dollars;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 109, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Add after the word "assistants," at the end of the matter inserted by said amendment, the following: "said estimates not to exceed the number employed and rates of compensation then actually paid;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 152, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "two hundred and sixteen thousand nine hundred and forty dollars;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 153, and agree to the same with amendments as follows: In line 5 of said amendment strike out the words "law clerk, two thousand dollars;" in line 6 strike out the words "clerk of class two;" and in lieu of the sum named in lines 7 and 8 insert "eight thousand one hundred and forty dollars;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 167, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "one hundred and thirty-two thousand seven hundred and twenty dollars;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 170, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In the last line of said amendment strike out the words "five hundred;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 171, and agree to the same with amendments as follows: In line 2 of said amendment strike out the word "fifteen" and insert in lieu thereof the word "twelve;" in line 3 strike out the word "fifteen" and insert in lieu thereof the word "twelve;" in line 5 strike out the word "sixteen" and insert in lieu thereof the word "twelve;" and in line 10 strike out the word "fifty-six" and insert in lieu thereof the word "forty-six;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 191, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the number proposed insert "two hundred and seventy-two;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 192, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the number proposed insert "212;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 193, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the number proposed insert 44; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 199, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert \$711,760; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 215, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert \$77,570; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 216, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert \$4,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 224, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out the word "permanently," inserted by said amendment, and on page 151 of the bill, in line 7, after the word "incapacitated," insert the words: "otherwise than temporarily;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 235, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Insert after the word "personal," in line 10, page 151 of the bill, the words "or official;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 236, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Add to the end of the amended paragraph, after the word "President," the following:

"Provided, That this provision shall not apply to officials outside of the District of Columbia in the performance of their public duties. This paragraph shall not take effect until July 1, 1904."

And the Senate agree to the same.

S. M. CULLOM,
F. E. WARREN,
H. M. TELLER,
Managers on the part of the Senate.
L. N. LITTAUER,
L. F. LIVINGSTON,
Managers on the part of the House.

The report was agreed to.

INDIAN RESERVATION LANDS.

Mr. HALE. There are a few Senators who have short bills that have been kept out by the appropriation bills, and I will hold up the consideration of the naval appropriation bill for fifteen or twenty minutes, in order that Senators may call them up.

I shall object to any bill that gives rise to debate, but not to short bills that are unopposed to.

Mr. LONG. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 3205) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to acquire the title to lands within certain Indian reservations.

The Secretary read the bill.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment.

Mr. QUARLES. I should like to make an inquiry in regard to the bill. I see it provides for an exchange of railroad lands for other lands. I inquire whether that is going to increase the amount of scrip that is issued?

Mr. LONG. The bill provides that no land scrip shall be issued.

Mr. QUARLES. Let me further inquire, if the Government needs lands that belong to those railroads in the Indian reservation, why should not the Government negotiate and pay for that land instead of providing for an exchange of other lands? It would seem to me that our history in connection with the land laws in this country has been quite persuasive on that subject, that if the Government needs land belonging to a railroad company it ought to condemn it or buy it.

For one, without knowing anything about this particular bill, I am opposed to any further provision in the way of legislation for an exchange of lands.

Mr. LONG. This bill relates only to Indian reservations in Arizona and New Mexico. The bill was drawn in the Interior Department and contains safeguards which amply and fully protect the interests of the Government.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

Mr. NELSON. I think the bill ought to go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is made, and the bill goes over.

MINERAL LANDS.

Mr. HEYBURN. I ask unanimous consent to call up the bill (S. 3526) to amend section 2327 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, concerning mineral lands.

The Secretary read the bill; and by unanimous consent the Sen-

ate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration. It proposes to amend section 2327 to read as follows:

SEC. 2327. The description of vein or lode claims upon surveyed lands shall designate the location of the claims with reference to the lines of the public survey, but need not conform therewith; but where patents have been issued for claims upon unsurveyed lands, the surveyors-general, in extending the public survey, shall adjust the same to the boundaries of said patented claims so as in no case to interfere with or change the true location of such claims as they are officially established upon the ground. Where patents have issued for mineral lands, those lands only shall be segregated and shall be deemed to be patented which are bounded by the lines actually marked, defined, and established upon the ground by the monuments of the official survey upon which the patent grant is based, and surveyors-general in executing subsequent patent surveys, whether upon surveyed or unsurveyed lands, shall be governed accordingly. The said monuments shall at all times constitute the highest authority as to what land is patented, and erroneous calls in the patent description shall give way thereto.

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

INDIAN ALLOTMENTS.

Mr. QUAY. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (S. 1974) amending the act of Congress approved January 26, 1895, entitled "An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to correct errors where double allotments of land have erroneously been made to an Indian, to correct errors in patents, and for other purposes."

The Secretary read the bill; and by unanimous consent the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Indian Affairs with amendments.

The first amendment was, in page 2, line 13, after the word "thereof," to strike out the words "or for the best interests of the Indians;" so as to read:

"That the act of Congress approved January 26, 1895 (28 Stat., 641), entitled "An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to correct errors where double allotments of land have erroneously been made to an Indian, to correct errors in patents, and for other purposes," be, and the same is hereby, amended so as to read as follows:

"That in all cases where it shall appear that a double allotment of land has heretofore been, or shall hereafter be, wrongfully or erroneously made by the Secretary of the Interior to any Indian by an assumed name or otherwise, or where a mistake has been or shall be made in the description of the land inserted in any patent, said Secretary is hereby authorized and directed, during the time that the United States may hold the title to the land in trust for any such Indian, and for which a conditional patent may have been issued, to rectify and correct such mistakes and cancel any patent which may have been thus erroneously and wrongfully issued whenever in his opinion the same ought to be canceled for error in the issue thereof, and if possession of the original patent can not be obtained, such cancellation shall be effective if made upon the records of the General Land Office; and no proclamation shall be necessary to open to settlement the lands to which such an erroneous allotment patent has been canceled, provided such lands would otherwise be subject to entry."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, line 20, after the word "entry," to strike out the proviso in the following words:

Provided, That no conditional patent excepting in cases hereinbefore authorized, and excepting in cases where the conditional patent is relinquished by the patentee or his heirs to take another allotment that shall have been heretofore or that may be hereafter executed in favor of any Indian allottee, shall be subject to cancellation without authority of Congress.

And in lieu thereof to insert the following proviso:

Provided, That no conditional patent that shall have heretofore or that may hereafter be executed in favor of any Indian allottee, excepting in cases hereinbefore authorized, and excepting in cases where the conditional patent is relinquished by the patentee or his heirs to take another allotment, shall be subject to cancellation without authority of Congress.

The amendment was agreed to.

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.

ELECTRIC WIRING IN THE DISTRICT.

Mr. GALLINGER. I ask for the consideration of the bill (S. 3) to regulate electric wiring in the District of Columbia. I will state that the bill has been read and the first two amendments of the Committee on the District of Columbia were agreed to.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill has been read in Committee of the Whole, and two amendments proposed by the committee have been agreed to.

Mr. GALLINGER. Concerning the third amendment a little controversy arose, and I have had an amendment prepared which is entirely satisfactory to all parties. I ask leave to withdraw the committee amendment at the bottom of page 1 and to substitute for that proviso what I send to the desk.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Hampshire withdraws the amendment of the committee at the bottom of page 1 and offers an amendment, which will be read.

Mr. GALLINGER. It is a substitute for the proviso in the bill, striking out after the word "Provided," in line 7, the rest of the page.

The SECRETARY. Strike out the word "Provided," in line 7,

and the following lines down to and including line 14, on page 1, and insert:

Provided, That nothing in this act shall be construed to apply to the buildings and grounds of the United States, or to the generation of power by incorporated companies engaged in the production of electrical current for public service or use.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The committee also reports the following amendments, which will be stated in their order.

The next amendment of the Committee on the District of Columbia was, in section 4, page 2, line 15, after the word "government," to strike out "one" and insert "at least two;" and in line 16, after the word "power," to strike out "and who" and insert "and one of whom;" so as to read:

That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia be, and they are hereby, authorized and empowered to appoint an electrical board, to be composed of three employees of the District government, at least two of whom shall have knowledge of electrical lighting and power, and one of whom shall be the secretary of said board and act as chief inspector of electrical work.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 5, page 3, line 8, after the word "afford," to strike out the word "greater;" so as to read:

As in their judgment will afford safety and convenience to the public.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 6, page 3, line 24, after the word "three," to insert "satisfactory;" in the same line, after the word "or," to strike out "by" and insert "of;" on page 4, line 2, before the word "District," to insert "Commissioners of the;" and in line 3, after the word "Columbia," to strike out the words "and upon the District being kept harmless from the consequence of any or all acts of the licensee during the period covered by said bond;" so as to make the section read:

SEC. 6. That in addition to such advisory duties as said Commissioners shall assign them, it shall be the duty of said electrical board to examine all applicants for license as electrical contractors and to report to said Commissioners, who, if satisfied from such report that the applicant is a fit person to engage in the business of electrical construction, shall issue a license to such person to engage in such business as an electrical contractor. Before obtaining this license he shall file in the office of the Commissioners a bond, with three satisfactory sureties or of an approved surety company, in the sum of \$2,000, conditioned upon the faithful performance of all work in compliance with the regulations of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was to strike out section 7 of the bill, in the following words:

SEC. 7. That it shall be the duty of said electrical board to examine all applicants for license as electrical wiremen and to report to said Commissioners, who, if satisfied from such report that the applicant is a person competent to do expert work of wiring for electrical lighting, heating, and power, shall issue a license to such person to engage in such business as electrical wireman.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 7 [8], line 14, after the word "contractors," to strike out "and as electrical wiremen;" and in line 15, after the word "in," to strike out "their own handwriting" and insert "writing;" so as to make the section read:

SEC. 7. That applicants for license as electrical contractors must be not less than 21 years of age, must make application in writing, and must accompany such application with a certificate as to good character and of experience in electrical work as said electrical board may require; said certificate to be approved by at least three citizens of the District of Columbia, themselves of reputable standing.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 8 [9], page 4, line 22, after the word "persons," to strike out "contracting for supplying and;" and in line 24, after the word "power," to strike out the remainder of the section, in the following words:

And the term electrical wiremen shall include all persons employed in the skilled work of construction and putting in place any of said electrical apparatus: *Provided*, That, under such rules as the said Commissioners shall prescribe, apprentices and unskilled helpers may be employed at work appropriate to their years and capacity, and under the immediate supervision of a licensed wireman or contractor.

So as to make the section read:

SEC. 8. That the term electrical contractor shall include all persons putting in place wiring and apparatus necessary for the production and utilization of electrical current for lighting, heating, or for power.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 9 [10], page 5, line 8, after the words "per annum," to strike out "and for a license as an electrical wireman, \$1 per annum; all fees;" so as to make the section read:

SEC. 9. That the fee for a license as an electrical contractor shall be \$5 per annum, to be paid to the collector of taxes of the District of Columbia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 10 [11], page 5, line 14, after the word "contractor," to strike out "or an electric wireman."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 11 [12], page 6, line 1, before the word "inspector," to insert the word "chief;" in line 16, before the word "inspector" to insert the word "chief;" and

in line 18, after the word "shall," to strike out "be fined not less than \$1 nor more than one hundred" and insert "pay a fine of not more than twenty-five;" so as to make the section read:

SEC. 11 [12]. That the chief inspector of electrical work and his assistants are hereby empowered, under the direction of the Commissioners, to inspect any building in course of erection and during reasonable hours, upon application of the owner or occupant, or upon complaint, under oath, of any reputable citizen, to enter into and examine any building where electrical current is produced or utilized for lighting, heating, or for power, for the purpose of ascertaining violations of any of the provisions of this act; and upon finding any devices aforesaid defective or dangerous he may deliver a written notice of any violation of any provisions of this act, or of any regulation of said Commissioners duly adopted, to remove or amend the same within a period to be fixed in said notice; and in case of neglect or refusal on the part of the party so notified to remove or amend the same within the time and in the manner prescribed by the chief inspector of electrical work, and approved by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, the party so offending shall pay a fine of not more than \$25 for each and every day's failure or neglect to remove or amend the same after being so notified, and in default of payment of such fine such person shall be confined in the workhouse of the District of Columbia for a period not exceeding one month; and all prosecutions under this act shall be in the police court of said District, in the name of the District of Columbia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 12 [13], page 7, line 3, after the first word, "That," to insert "in the place of the present electrical engineer now carried on the per diem roll;" so as to make the section read:

SEC. 12. That in the place of the present electrical engineer now carried on the per diem roll there be, and is hereby, established, under the direction of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, the office of electrical engineer, and the Commissioners of said District are hereby authorized and directed to appoint an electrical engineer, at a salary of \$2,500 per annum, and said electrical engineer shall be an expert electrician, possessing a thorough knowledge of the most modern methods for the production, use, and control of electricity, as well as such executive ability and adaptability to office work as is requisite for the efficient management of the said office; and the said Commissioners are authorized and directed to appoint an assistant electrical engineer of said office, at a salary of \$2,000 per annum, with such qualifications as are required for the said electrical engineer; and in case of the absence or disqualification of the electrical engineer to perform the duties of his office, said duties shall be performed by the assistant electrical engineer. And the Commissioners are authorized and directed to appoint two electrical inspectors to assist in the work required by the authority of this act, at a salary of \$1,200 per annum each.

And the Commissioners are authorized and directed to appoint a clerk, at a salary of \$1,200 per annum, who shall perform the clerical duties attending the work required by the authority of this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was to insert, on page 8, after line 4, as a new section, the following:

SEC. 13. That it shall be unlawful for any person, company, or corporation generating current for electric light, heat, or power in the District of Columbia to connect its system and furnish current for electrical purposes to any building or premises the wiring of which shall not have been inspected and approved by the chief inspector of electrical work.

Any person, company, or corporation violating the provisions of this section shall, upon written notice from the chief inspector of electrical work to do so, immediately remove said connection and cut off the current, and shall not again supply said current until authorized by the said inspector. For failure to comply with said notice the offending person, company, or corporation shall be fined not less than \$5 nor more than \$100 for each and every day's failure or neglect to remove said connection and to cut off the current.

The chief inspector of electrical work is hereby authorized and empowered, with the approval of the Commissioners, to cause said connection to be removed and the current cut off upon such failure of the offending person, company, or corporation, and to refuse to permit said connection to be replaced and the current to be used until the wiring shall be put in proper and safe condition.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 13 (14), page 9, line 3, after the word "effect," to strike out "on its passage" and insert "ninety days from and after the approval thereof;" so as to make the section read:

That this act shall take effect ninety days from and after the approval thereof.

The amendment was agreed to.

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.

INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS OF HYGIENE AND DEMOGRAPHY.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. I ask for the present consideration of the joint resolution (S. R. 48) authorizing the President to extend an invitation to the International Congress of Hygiene and Demography to hold its thirteenth congress in the city of Washington.

The Secretary read the joint resolution; and by unanimous consent the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. Mr. President, I wish to make a brief statement in support of the joint resolution.

Mr. HALE. I can not—

Mr. FAIRBANKS. I will say just a word.

Mr. HALE. I do not object to that. I am pressed by Senators on the other side who are desirous of speaking on the appropriation bill, and after the pending joint resolution is through I shall be constrained to ask the Senate to go on with the appropriation bill.

Mr. SCOTT. Oh, no.

Mr. HALE. I interpose no objection to the consideration of the joint resolution.

Mr. FORAKER. There are two or three small matters that might be disposed of yet.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. Mr. President, the delegates to the Eleventh International Congress of Hygiene and Demography, in session at Brussels in September, 1903, requested of the State Department, through the United States legation there, authority to invite the congress to hold its thirteenth session at Washington in 1909.

The State Department gave its sanction to the proposed invitation, subject to the requisite legislation of Congress to make the invitation effective.

Agreeably to the sanction of the Department of State the invitation was extended and was provisionally accepted by the committee on invitation, which announced its purpose to recommend at the next session, to be held at Berlin in 1906, the formal acceptance of the invitation, provided the Congress of the United States should seasonably take the necessary action upon the subject.

The International Congress is a most important one. It will bring together at the national capital a large number of delegates from European countries and the United States—men eminent in matters concerning sanitation and the public health.

Charles Harrington, of the Harvard medical school and one of the delegates from the United States to the Eleventh International Congress of Hygiene and Demography, in a letter to the Secretary of State, among other things, says:

I would add that Sir Patrick Manson, the leading authority on tropical diseases and colonial hygiene, suggested that I bring the matter to the notice of our Government—the advisability of an international conference concerning the possibility and prevention of the spread of yellow fever to our own possessions and those of Great Britain and other countries in the Pacific Ocean through vessels infected during passage through the Panama Canal when that waterway shall have been completed.

The joint resolution which is now before the Senate simply authorizes the President to formally and officially extend the invitation which was provisionally extended by the delegates of the United States at the Brussels Congress. The benefits to flow from such a congress held in the city of Washington are obvious and far reaching.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A joint resolution authorizing the President to extend an invitation to the Twelfth International Congress of Hygiene and Demography to hold its thirteenth congress in the city of Washington."

NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. SCOTT, Mr. LONG, and Mr. HEYBURN addressed the Chair.

Mr. HALE. The Senator from Georgia [Mr. CLAY] substantially had the floor last night, and when we adjourned I stated that I would call up the naval appropriation bill at once this morning, so that Senators upon the other side might speak in this hour. I rather good-naturedly this morning, in which I made a mistake, agreed to hold off for fifteen or twenty minutes, which have expired, and it is not fitting treatment to Senators upon the other side who are ready to speak and desire to speak, and do not want delay, for me to consent further to the time being taken, however much Senators may desire it. I suppose I made a mistake in letting anyone in, Mr. President, but the pressure was very great. Therefore I must ask for the regular order.

Mr. HEYBURN. I should like to say—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The regular order is demanded.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 12220) making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1905, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The pending question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. QUARLES] to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. President, it is my purpose to occupy the time of the Senate but a short while this morning. I do not desire to discuss the amendment which was discussed yesterday evening. That amendment carries only \$250,000 and is a very small item. I shall vote in favor of it, but I do not care to discuss it.

I desire to say a few words in regard to the position of the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] and the junior Senator from New York [Mr. DEPEW] in a speech which each made day before yesterday in regard to this measure.

I understood the junior Senator from Massachusetts to take three positions. The junior Senator from Massachusetts said that there will be no relaxation in the future in regard to the building up of our Navy, that a great, strong, and powerful navy and that a great, strong, and powerful fighting force are absolutely essential to keep peace in this country and to prevent us from

having war with foreign powers. The distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts also contended that a strong fighting force is absolutely essential in order to enable us to maintain the Monroe doctrine.

Mr. President, I do not desire to say anything against the course we have pursued in building up our Navy heretofore. I do not desire to say anything against the completion of the ships that we now have in process of construction. I do, however, say that when this plan is carried out and these ships are completed, in point of tonnage we will have a navy the third strongest in the world and in effectiveness the second strongest in the world. There will be no navy in point of effectiveness stronger than ours, except the navy of Great Britain.

I do not agree, however, with the junior Senator from Massachusetts in regard to the future. He not only approves the course which we have pursued in the past, during the last six or seven years, for the purpose of building up our Navy, but my distinguished friend tells us that in the future there shall be no relaxation.

Neither do I agree with the distinguished Senator that a great, strong, and powerful fighting force is essential to keep this country out of war. I know the idea has prevailed during the last two or three years that in all probability we shall be engaged in war with a foreign power. This country is over 125 years old; yet, Mr. President, we have never had but two wars with foreign powers, except the small skirmish which we had with Spain. I ask to-day what country in the world desires war with the Government of the United States? When we went to war with Spain it was predicted that many foreign powers would combine against us; that we would be likely to have trouble with foreign powers. I ask, What was the result? Instead of foreign powers joining with Spain against us, most of the foreign powers, and especially Great Britain, sympathized with the Government of the United States.

Not only that, but take our action in Panama. We recognized Panama in three days after that Republic was born, and it is true that fourteen nations in less than two weeks followed our example and recognized Panama. We have been allowed to go any course that we wanted to pursue without any interference from any one of the nations on the face of the earth. I desire to say that in my opinion no nation to-day desires to engage in war with the people of the United States.

The distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts tells us that it is absolutely essential to have a great fighting force, a strong and powerful navy, in order to maintain the Monroe doctrine. I ask what nation to-day is contesting the supremacy of the Monroe doctrine in this country? I ask what nation to-day denies our right to enforce the Monroe doctrine? What country to-day denies that the Western Hemisphere has been dedicated to free republican institutions?

Not many years ago a foreign power came across the water seeking to enforce the collection of a debt against a republic on this side of the ocean. We know she was told here that there should be no violation of the Monroe doctrine, and she immediately acquiesced.

I contend that the best way for the Government of the United States to maintain peace and to prevent war is to live an honest, just, and righteous life, to deal fairly with all the nations of the earth, to cultivate and maintain friendly relations, and to show a proper regard for the rights of other nations. Then, Mr. President, we shall always be able to avert war. In my opinion, instead of a strong fighting force, a great and powerful army, and a great and powerful navy preventing war, in nine cases out of ten they will get us into war.

We know we see it frequently stated in our naval journals that our naval officers say we are likely to have war with Germany. I do not believe it. A great and powerful navy and a great and powerful army, in charge of ambitious officers, anxious to advance their own ambition, anxious to make a great reputation, easy to take offense, are more likely to get us into war than to prevent war.

Mr. President, my distinguished friend from Massachusetts tells us there is to be no relaxation in regard to expenditures for our Navy in the future. Let us see. If we will not have a navy second to any country in the world when the programme now set forth in this bill is carried out, then ought there not in the future to be relaxation? If there shall be no relaxation, I ask the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts whether are we drifting?

Mr. President, I notice—and the statements have been published before—that in the year 1881 we spent \$13,000,000, in round numbers, on our Navy; in 1883, \$15,000,000; in 1887, \$15,000,000; in 1891, \$22,000,000; in 1895, \$25,000,000; in 1896, \$29,000,000; in 1897, \$30,000,000; in 1898, \$33,000,000; in 1899, \$56,000,000; in 1900, \$48,000,000; in 1901, \$61,000,000; in 1902, \$78,000,000; in 1903, \$72,000,000; in 1904, \$97,000,000, and there is to be appropriated for 1905 ninety-seven and a quarter million dollars.

My friend the junior Senator from Massachusetts says that for

the next six or seven years there is to be no relaxation in our expenditures in regard to the Navy. During the last seven years we have spent \$500,000,000, and the Senator tells us that for the future there is to be no relaxation, which means that we are to spend seven or eight hundred million dollars for a navy during the next five or six years.

Mr. President, if you will turn to the total expenditures in the Army and Navy, you will find that \$200,000,000 are spent every year for the purposes of war. I hold in my hand a statement of war expenditures for the last several years. I will say that our war expenses have increased during the last eight or ten years from \$25,000,000 to \$114,000,000. As has well been said, \$2 out of every \$5 which we are spending to-day is being spent for purposes of war. If you will take the expenditures of the entire civil department of the Government, you will find they amount to \$126,000,000. We spend \$100,000,000 for our Navy and nearly \$100,000,000 for our Army. If the programme is to be continued in the future and we are to spend more money than we have spent for our Navy, such expenditures, in my judgment, can not be justified.

We all agree that when we went to war with Spain our Navy was in a dilapidated condition, and on both sides of the Chamber we have indorsed the expenditures up to this time; but when the junior Senator from Massachusetts lays down the proposition that in the future there is to be no relaxation, because we need a large fighting force to maintain the Monroe doctrine and to prevent this country from being compelled to go to war, then I do not agree with the junior Senator from Massachusetts.

Again, the distinguished junior Senator from New York [Mr. DEWEY] told us the other day in his magnificent speech that it was absolutely necessary to have a great, a strong, and a powerful navy, and a great and a strong and powerful army in order to maintain civil government in the Philippine Islands. The Senator told us that we had twenty-four ships in those waters and that in the future it will be absolutely essential that we shall keep a large navy in the Philippine Islands. I have before me the Senator's exact words. What did he say? I read:

Mr. President, I have the greatest respect for my lifelong friend and now constituent, the late Secretary of War, and have the profoundest respect for his opinions on all questions; but if he has given as his judgment that the United States would at some time surrender and give up the Philippine Islands to an independent nation, in the line with Cuba, I do not believe that that condition will ever come about.

The Senator goes on in that speech and takes the position that we are to hold the Philippine Islands for all time to come, and that we are to govern them from the city of Washington as American colonies. I want to read exactly what Secretary Root did say about that subject. I have a copy of that interview in my hands. We all know that Secretary Root has been regarded as a very strong imperialist, and we all recognize the fact that he is a man of distinguished ability. No man has ever questioned his great ability. This question was asked Mr. Root after he had retired from the great office of the Secretary of War:

And the Philippines, Mr. Root, what is to be their future?
I believe that we shall in time grant a practical independence to the Philippines; that they will have the same relationship to this country that Cuba has.

Again this question was asked Mr. Root:

Have the Filipinos shown sufficient understanding of the requirements and obligations of civilized government and sufficient administrative and political ability and stability to prove their capacity for self-government?
I believe that a sufficient number of Filipinos have shown those qualities to warrant the prediction that the body of the people will develop them in time.

Has your experience as Secretary of War convinced you that they are adaptable to republican institutions?
It has.

Mr. President, there is the great ex-Secretary of War, who had dealt with the people of the Philippine Islands for four or five years, who tells us that civil government has been established in all the provinces in the Philippine Islands, and that those people ought to enjoy their independence on the same line that we have dealt with the people of Cuba.

I do not believe that the American people will ever consent that the people of the Philippine Islands shall be held in perpetual subjection. I do not believe that the American people will consent that the Filipinos shall be governed by the Army, and governed from the city of Washington; but I believe that our people, when the Filipinos are capable of carrying on the functions of a government and maintaining law and order, will be in favor of granting to them the same liberty and independence which we have given to the people of Cuba.

If we intend to hold the people of the Philippine Islands in subjection, under military law, for all time to come, we shall need a large navy for that purpose, but I do not believe that the intelligent and good people of the United States will consent to that new departure. We may keep guard over their international relations; we may see that they are not swallowed up by any other nation, but I believe that the good sense of the American people will demand that we shall respect the rights of the people of the Philippine Islands.

It does seem to me as if the great ex-Secretary of War, in giving out the interview from which I have quoted, after he had retired from that high office, now holds the same views in regard to the Philippine Islands which the Democratic party has held since we have acquired them.

When the question of the ratification of the Paris treaty was pending before this body a resolution was introduced by my colleague [Mr. BACON] providing that so soon as a stable government should be established in the Philippine Islands, capable of maintaining law and order, it was our purpose to leave those people to govern themselves, and that we would deal with them just as we have dealt with the people of Cuba. That resolution came to a vote in this Senate, and there were, I believe, 43 votes in favor of it and 43 against it; and the resolution was defeated by the casting vote of the Vice-President. I believe to-day that if that resolution had been adopted, if we had set forth that as the policy we intended to pursue toward the people of the Philippine Islands, a gun never would have been fired, and a single drop of blood never would have been shed, and the great expenses that we have incurred by a failure to do so could, in my judgment, have been absolutely saved.

I took the trouble to write to the War Department to find out something about our expenditures in those islands. What did I find?

WAR DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE ADJUTANT-GENERAL,
Washington, February 19, 1904.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Agreeably with your verbal request, I beg to hand you herewith the following memorandum relative to affairs in the Philippine Islands:

Average number of troops each year, 1898 to 1903: ^a	
1898	14,745
1899	34,090
1900	64,252
1901	50,361
1902	27,304
1903	17,112
Number of deaths from all causes:	
May, 1898, to June 30, 1899	735
May, 1899, to June 30, 1900	1,442
May, 1900, to June 30, 1901	1,313
May, 1901, to June 30, 1902	885
May, 1902, to June 30, 1903	470
June 30, 1903, to December 31, 1903	87

Total 4,232
Senate Document 416, Fifty-seventh Congress, first session, which contains the last data that have been compiled, shows that the expenditures in connection with the Philippine Islands from May 1, 1898, to June 30, 1902, which was practically the close of hostilities, was \$79,609,993.30.

Very truly, yours,
W. P. HALL,
Acting Adjutant-General.

Hon. A. S. CLAY,
United States Senate.
(Mailed February 19, 1904.)

It is estimated by the Department that the expenditures in connection with the Philippine Islands from May 1, 1898, to June 30, 1902, amounted to \$170,609,993.30. In fact, the expense of our army in the Philippine Islands during the last six years has been about \$270,000,000, and this does not take into consideration our expenditures in regard to the Navy, which amount to fully two hundred and thirty millions.

Mr. President, I believe that if we had followed the line of policy mapped out by the Democrats, assuring those people that so soon as they qualified themselves for self-government, promising them in the event they did, placing natives in office in every instance where we could, and teaching those people that they could expect at our hands the same justice that we administered to the people of Cuba, these expenditures could have been saved.

I rose simply for the purpose of discussing the future of our country in regard to the American Navy. This side of the Chamber has supported most zealously the building up of the Navy as far as we have gone; but during the last nine years we have seen the expenditures of this Government leap from \$242,000,000 to \$560,000,000 a year. Seven, eight, or ten years ago we maintained this Government by expending \$250,000,000 per year, and to-day we have gone to the enormous sum of over \$500,000,000.

I believe that good government demands at the hands of both political parties the strictest economy in public expenditures; I believe that the great Departments of a government like ours, including its Treasury Department, its Navy Department, its War Department, its Post-Office Department, ought to be investigated both as to receipts and expenditures every year by a committee of Congress to see how an Administration is run. Take the case of a State. It is the duty of a State to watch carefully and closely its receipts and its expenditures. But during the last seven years we have not had an investigation of a single Department, except the Post-Office Department investigating itself.

I do not apply this to anyone. I say I do not criticize any Department, I know of no wrong; but if the Democratic party were in power and had been in power for a period of four years or eight years I should contend that it was the duty of Congress to

^aThis does not include the Philippine Scouts, about 5,000 in number.

investigate, by a committee of Congress, every Department of this Government, to see where our money went to and how our contracts for expenditures were made.

Go to the War Department and you will find that \$14,000,000 were spent for transportation. It is the duty of Congress to know what companies receive the money and if the best possible contracts were made.

Go to the Post-Office Department, where they spend \$140,000,000, and a like investigation ought to be had. Go to the Navy Department, where large amounts are to be paid out for coal, for supplies, and for different items. A committee of Congress ought to know how the money was expended on each item and to see if the best contracts possible for our Government were made.

Would any business man permit any employee of his to expend hundreds and thousands and millions of dollars without making an annual investigation as to how those expenditures were made? Where are we drifting? I state, regardless of any political party, that we ought to know every year, or every two years, how each item of expenditure has been spent and what kind of a contract was made.

I know it was said at the time when an investigation was demanded in the Post-Office Department that there was nothing wrong, that every single dollar of the money had been honestly expended. I do not doubt that the Postmaster-General thought he was absolutely correct; but an investigation showed a condition of affairs not even dreamed of, Mr. President.

You may take a State government, you may take this Government, and let it run in the hands of one political party, either Democratic or Republican, for a long number of years, without making any investigation and going through the accounts of your public officials, and you do not know where it will drift.

Turn to the Treasury Department and you will find items embracing one million, five million, or six million dollars. That may be all right, but I say it is the duty of Congress to know with whom we dealt, with what firms we dealt, with what transportation companies we dealt, and the men with whom we had contracts, and to see that they were in accordance with our best interests.

Mr. President, I want it distinctly understood that my remarks in regard to the Navy apply to the language used by the junior Senator from Massachusetts, that "there shall be no relaxation in the future." Great Britain was building vessels on January 1, 1904, aggregating 351,000 tons; France, 150,000 tons; Russia, 142,000 tons; Germany, 118,000 tons; the United States, 322,000 tons; Italy, 70,000 tons; Japan, 10,000 tons, and Austria, 56,000 tons.

I now quote from a speech made by Mr. RILEY in the House of Representatives. He said:

For years past it has been a favorite topic for the Navy expansionist to insist that we should keep abreast of Germany. Now, France and Germany are building six battle ships each; we are building twelve. Germany is building three armored cruisers; we are building eight. Germany is building no protected cruisers; we are building eight. We have under construction of these great ships 100,000 tons more than Germany. We are building more rapidly than any other nation on earth except Great Britain, as the following table, taken from the report of the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs, shows—

Referring to the figures I have just given.

I have here a list of the ships that we are building, and you will find by carefully examining this report that more than 50 per cent of these ships will soon be completed. We are building 12 first-class battle ships. The *Missouri* is practically done, only 5 per cent of the work on her not being completed. The *Ohio* and *Virginia* both are nearly done. We are building, in addition to these, the *Nebraska*, the *Georgia*, the *New Jersey*, the *Rhode Island*, the *Connecticut*, the *Louisiana*, the *Vermont*, the *Kansas*, and the *Minnesota*. That makes 12 first-class battle ships we are building. We are also building 8 armored cruisers and 8 protected cruisers, 2 gunboats, 2 training ships, 1 training brig, 6 torpedo boats, and 2 steel tugs, and this report of the Secretary of the Navy shows that when these ships now in process of construction are completed we will have a tonnage greater than any nation except Great Britain and France, and, in point of effectiveness, the Navy Department says that our Navy will be more effective than that of France.

I ask to have inserted as a part of my remarks the table in the

report of the House Committee on Naval Affairs, headed "Vessels under construction, United States Navy, February 9, 1904," including page 22 and page 23. I also ask to have included as a part of my remarks a table, which I hold in my hand, showing our naval strength at present and our naval strength when the ships now in process of construction shall have been completed. I also desire to have inserted as a part of my remarks a table showing the sea strength of the principal naval powers, which I will hand to the Reporter. I desire also to insert as a part of my remarks a statement of the expenditures of the Government from 1856 to 1903.

The matter referred to is as follows:

FEBRUARY 9, 1904.

Vessels under construction, United States Navy.

No.	Name.	Speed.	Where building.	Degree of completion.	
				Jan. 1, 1904.	Feb. 1, 1904.
<i>Battle ships.</i>					
		<i>Knots.</i>		<i>Per cent.</i>	<i>Per cent.</i>
11	Missouri	18	Newport News Co	99.9	99.95
12	Ohio	18	Union Iron Works	84.5	85.5
13	Virginia	19	Newport News Co	52.5	53.8
14	Nebraska	19	Moran Bros. Co	35	37.7
15	Georgia	19	Bath Iron Works	42.5	45.4
16	New Jersey	19	Fore River Ship and Engine Co.	49.43	50.3
17	Rhode Island	19	do	50.61	51.7
18	Connecticut	18	Navy-yard, New York, N. Y.	26.7	28.5
19	Louisiana	18	Newport News Co	34.5	37.55
20	Vermont	18	Fore River Ship and Engine Co.	2.76	3.6
21	Kansas	18	New York Shipbuilding Co.	2.6	3.9
22	Minnesota	18	Newport News Co	12	14.73
<i>Armored cruisers.</i>					
4	Pennsylvania	22	William Cramp & Sons ...	64.9	66.8
5	West Virginia	22	Newport News Co	70.5	73.32
6	California	22	Union Iron Works	51	54
7	Colorado	22	William Cramp & Sons ...	69	71.8
8	Maryland	22	Newport News Co	65.4	69.15
9	South Dakota	22	Union Iron Works	47	50
10	Tennessee	22	William Cramp & Sons ...	15.1	16.6
11	Washington	22	New York Shipbuilding Co.	12	13.9
<i>Protected cruisers.</i>					
14	Denver	17	Neafe & Levy	98	98
15	Des Moines	16	Fore River Ship and Engine Co.	97	99
16	Chattanooga	16	Lewis Nixon	72	72
17	Galveston	16	William E. Trigg Co	70.5	72
18	Tacoma	16	Union Iron Works	99	100
19	St. Louis	22	Neafe & Levy	36.2	37.9
21	Milwaukee	22	Union Iron Works	41	42.5
22	Charleston	22	Newport News Co	56.9	60
<i>Gunboats.</i>					
17	Dubuque	12	Gas Engine and Power Co.	20	25
18	Paducah	12	do	16	22.2
<i>Training ships.</i>					
	Cumberland	Sails.	Navy-yard, Boston	12	25.5
	Intrepid	Sails.	Navy-yard, Mare Island ..	5	7
<i>Training brig.</i>					
	Boxer	Sails.	Navy-yard, Portsmouth ..	6	10
<i>Torpedo boats.</i>					
19	Stringham	30	Harlan & Hollingsworth ..	93	93
20	Goldsborough	30	Wolf & Zwicker	99	99
27	Blakely	26	George Lawley & Son	99	99
29	Nicholson	26	Lewis Nixon	99	99
30	O'Brien	26	do	98	98
34	Tingey	26	Columbian Iron Works ...	100	-----
<i>Steel tugs.</i>					
8	Pentucket	12	Navy-yard, Boston	100	-----
9	Sotoyomo	12	Navy-yard, Mare Island ..	98	99

Relative order of war-ship strength.

At present.		As would be the case were vessels building now completed.	
Nation.	Tonnage.	Nation.	Tonnage.
Great Britain	1,516,040	Great Britain	1,867,250
France	576,108	France	755,757
Russia	416,158	United States	616,275
Germany	387,674	Russia	558,432
United States	294,405	Germany	505,619
Italy	258,838	Italy	329,257
Japan	243,586	Japan	253,681
Austria	93,913	Austria	149,893

SEA STRENGTH OF THE PRINCIPAL NAVAL POWERS.

Number and displacement of war ships, built and building, of 1,000 or more tons displacement.

Type.	Great Britain.				France.				Russia.				Germany.			
	Built.	Tons.	Build- ing.	Tons.	Built.	Tons.	Build- ing.	Tons.	Built.	Tons.	Build- ing.	Tons.	Built.	Tons.	Build- ing.	Tons.
Battle ships, first class ^a	50	669,000	9	142,600	20	223,021	6	87,800	17	201,129	8	112,864	14	152,581	6	77,982
Other battle ships and coast-defense ironclads.....	6	49,900			20	94,615			12	66,679			16	90,773		
Armored cruisers.....	27	262,800	14	166,000	15	113,767	8	91,849	8	71,261			8	28,144	3	28,048
Protected cruisers, first class (above 6,000 tons).....	21	201,950			4	31,513			6	39,546	3	10,965				
Protected cruisers, second class (3,000 to 6,000 tons).....	53	235,880	7	21,000	19	79,752			5	19,450	3	9,445	9	46,949		
Other cruisers and scouts (above 1,000 tons).....	44	96,510	8	21,610	18	32,840			11	18,093			31	69,427	4	11,715
Total.....	201	1,516,040	38	351,210	96	576,108	14	179,649	59	416,158	14	142,274	73	387,874	13	117,745
Combined total.....	239, of 1,867,250 tons.				110, of 755,757 tons.				73, of 558,432 tons.				86, of 505,619 tons.			

Type.	United States.				Italy.				Japan.				Austria.			
	Built.	Tons.	Build- ing.	Tons.	Built.	Tons.	Build- ing.	Tons.	Built.	Tons.	Build- ing.	Tons.	Built.	Tons.	Build- ing.	Tons.
Battle ships, first class ^a	11	125,129	11	166,700	14	173,276	5	63,125	6	84,300					3	31,800
Other battle ships and coast-defense ironclads.....	12	47,945			3	12,244			3	13,004			11	62,480	2	16,720
Armored cruisers.....	2	17,415	8	111,800	5	31,891	1	7,264	8	73,550			2	11,520	1	7,400
Protected cruisers, first class (above 6,000 tons).....	2	14,750	3	23,800												
Protected cruisers, second class (3,000 to 6,000 tons).....	15	56,393	4	12,400	5	17,490			10	41,226	3	10,095	2	8,128		
Other cruisers and scouts (above 1,000 tons).....	23	32,773	2	2,170	11	23,937			17	31,506			6	11,735		
Total.....	65	294,405	28	321,870	38	258,838	6	70,419	44	243,586	3	10,095	21	93,913	6	55,920
Combined total.....	93, of 616,275 tons.				44, of 329,257 tons.				47, of 253,681 tons.				27, of 149,833 tons.			

^a Battle ships, first class, are of (about) 10,000 tons or more displacement, and are not more than 20 years old. (The few exceptions as to age have been reconstructed and are given a modern armament.)
^b Contract not yet awarded for two additional authorized.

N. B.—Gunboats and other vessels of less than 1,000 tons are not given in the table, nor are transports, dispatch vessels, converted merchant vessels or yachts, or obsolete cruisers. Vessels not begun are not included in the table.

Recapitulation of expenditures by fiscal years.

Year.	Civil and miscellaneous.		War Depart- ment.	Navy Depart- ment.	Indians.	Pensions.	Interest on public debt.	Total expendi- tures, includ- ing premiums.	Bonds and other securi- ties applied to sinking fund.
	Premium on loans and purchase of bonds, etc.	Other civil and miscel- laneous items.							
1856	\$385,372.90	\$32,124,214.07	\$16,948,196.89	\$14,091,781.06	\$2,769,429.55	\$1,298,208.95	\$1,353,822.37	\$69,571,025.79	
1857	363,572.39	28,164,532.97	19,261,774.16	12,747,976.83	4,267,543.07	1,312,043.01	1,678,295.23	67,795,707.66	
1858	574,443.08	26,429,609.57	25,485,383.60	13,984,551.09	4,026,738.91	1,217,488.47	1,567,055.67	74,185,270.39	
1859		23,700,235.14	23,243,822.38	14,642,989.73	3,625,027.24	1,220,378.29	2,638,463.96	69,070,976.74	
1860		27,976,434.22	16,409,767.10	11,514,964.96	2,949,191.34	1,102,826.15	3,177,314.62	63,130,538.39	
1861		23,267,010.46	22,981,150.44	12,430,887.89	2,841,353.28	1,036,064.06	4,000,173.76	68,546,644.89	
1862		21,408,491.16	394,368,407.36	42,668,277.09	2,273,223.45	853,095.40	13,190,324.45	474,761,818.91	
1863		23,256,965.39	599,298,600.83	63,221,963.64	3,154,957.11	1,078,991.59	24,729,846.61	714,740,725.17	
1864		27,506,539.46	690,791,842.97	85,725,994.67	2,629,858.77	4,963,924.41	53,685,421.69	865,322,641.97	
1865		43,047,658.01	1,081,323,360.79	122,612,945.29	5,116,837.08	16,338,811.13	77,397,712.00	1,297,555,224.41	
1866	1,717,900.11	41,056,961.54	284,449,701.81	43,324,118.52	3,247,064.56	15,605,352.35	133,067,741.69	520,809,416.99	
1867	58,476.51	51,110,223.72	95,224,415.63	31,034,011.04	4,642,531.77	20,336,551.71	143,781,591.91	267,542,675.16	
1868	10,813,349.38	53,009,867.67	123,246,648.62	25,775,502.72	4,100,682.32	23,782,386.78	140,424,045.71	377,340,284.66	
1869	7,001,151.04	56,474,061.53	78,501,990.61	20,000,757.97	7,042,923.06	28,476,621.78	130,694,242.80	322,865,277.80	
1870	1,674,680.05	53,237,461.56	57,655,675.40	21,780,229.87	3,407,938.15	28,340,202.17	129,235,498.00	309,653,590.75	
1871	9,016,794.74	60,481,916.23	35,799,991.82	19,431,027.21	7,426,997.44	34,443,894.85	125,576,595.98	292,177,188.25	\$5,691,000.00
1872	15,996,555.00	60,984,757.42	35,372,157.20	21,249,809.99	7,061,728.82	28,533,402.76	117,357,839.72	277,517,962.67	28,151,900.00
1873	6,968,266.76	73,328,110.06	46,323,133.31	23,526,256.79	7,551,704.88	29,359,426.86	104,750,638.44	290,345,245.33	29,936,250.00
1874	5,105,919.99	69,641,533.02	42,313,327.22	30,932,587.42	6,682,462.09	29,038,414.69	107,119,815.21	287,133,873.17	28,678,000.00
1875	1,305,073.55	71,070,702.98	41,120,645.98	21,497,636.27	8,384,656.82	29,456,216.22	108,093,544.57	274,623,392.84	25,170,400.00
1876		66,953,373.78	38,070,888.64	18,963,309.82	5,966,553.17	28,257,895.69	100,243,271.23	258,459,797.33	32,182,488.09
1877		56,252,036.60	37,082,735.90	14,959,935.36	5,277,007.22	27,963,752.27	97,124,511.58	238,690,008.93	24,498,910.05
1878		53,177,703.57	32,154,147.85	17,935,301.37	4,029,280.28	27,137,019.03	102,500,874.65	236,964,396.80	17,012,694.57
1879		65,741,555.49	40,425,690.73	15,125,126.84	5,206,109.08	35,121,482.39	105,327,949.00	266,947,883.53	723,692.99
1880	2,735,320.42	54,713,529.76	38,116,916.22	13,536,984.74	5,945,457.09	56,777,174.44	95,737,515.11	267,642,957.78	73,904,617.41
1881	1,061,248.78	64,416,324.71	40,466,460.55	15,686,671.66	6,514,161.09	50,059,279.62	82,508,741.18	200,712,887.69	74,490,351.05
1882		57,219,750.98	43,570,494.19	15,032,046.26	9,736,747.40	61,945,193.95	71,077,806.79	257,981,439.57	60,137,855.55
1883		68,678,022.21	48,911,382.93	15,283,437.17	7,362,590.94	66,012,573.64	59,160,131.25	265,408,137.64	44,897,236.96
1884		70,920,433.70	39,429,603.36	17,232,601.44	6,475,999.29	55,429,228.06	54,578,378.48	244,120,244.33	46,790,229.50
1885		87,494,258.38	42,670,578.47	16,021,079.67	6,552,494.63	56,102,267.49	51,386,256.47	260,223,935.11	45,604,035.43
1886		74,166,929.85	34,324,152.74	13,907,887.74	6,089,153.17	63,404,864.03	50,580,145.97	242,483,138.50	44,551,043.33
1887		85,294,825.59	38,561,025.85	15,141,126.80	6,194,622.69	75,029,101.79	47,741,577.25	267,932,179.97	47,903,248.15
1888		72,952,290.80	38,522,426.11	16,926,437.65	6,249,807.87	80,288,508.77	44,715,007.47	267,924,801.13	43,732,550.00
1889	8,270,842.46	80,664,064.26	44,435,270.85	21,378,809.31	6,892,207.78	87,624,779.11	41,001,454.29	299,288,978.25	39,066,173.35
1890	17,292,362.65	81,403,256.49	44,532,838.08	22,006,206.24	6,708,046.67	106,936,855.07	56,099,284.05	318,040,710.66	39,847,839.50
1891	20,304,224.06	110,043,167.49	45,720,095.01	25,113,896.46	8,527,469.01	124,415,951.40	57,547,135.37	365,773,905.35	44,006,111.37
1892	10,401,220.61	99,841,988.61	46,895,456.80	23,174,133.98	11,150,577.67	134,583,052.79	23,378,116.23	345,023,390.53	37,574,179.98
1893		103,732,739.27	49,641,773.47	30,136,084.43	13,345,947.27	159,367,557.87	27,264,392.18	383,477,954.49	6,708,744.50
1894		101,943,884.07	54,567,929.85	31,701,293.79	10,263,481.52	141,177,284.96	27,841,405.64	367,525,279.33	221,537.20
1895		93,279,730.14	51,804,759.13	28,797,795.73	9,939,754.21	141,395,228.87	30,978,030.21	356,195,298.29	1,136,396.43
1896		87,216,294.62	50,830,920.89	27,147,732.88	12,165,528.28	139,434,000.98	35,385,028.93	352,179,446.08	5,333,349.85
1897		80,401,267.82	48,950,267.82	24,561,546.29	13,016,802.46	141,053,164.63	37,791,110.43	365,774,159.57	252,002.00
1898		96,520,505.17	91,992,000.29	58,823,984.80	10,994,637.70	147,452,368.61	37,585,066.23	443,368,582.80	40,100.00

Recapitulation of expenditures by fiscal years—Continued.

Year.	Civil and miscellaneous.		War Department.	Navy Department.	Indians.	Pensions.	Interest on public debt.	Total expenditures, including premiums.	Bonds and other securities applied to sinking fund.
	Premium on loans and purchase of bonds, etc.	Other civil and miscellaneous items.							
1889		\$119,191,255.90	\$229,841,254.47	\$83,942,104.25	\$12,805,711.14	\$189,394,929.07	\$39,896,925.02	\$905,072,179.85	\$31,273.48
1900		105,773,190.16	134,774,767.78	55,953,077.72	10,175,105.76	140,877,316.02	40,160,333.27	487,713,791.71	56,544,553.06
1901		122,282,003.10	144,615,697.20	60,506,978.47	10,896,073.35	139,323,621.99	32,342,379.04	509,967,353.15	56,484,080.73
1902		113,469,323.91	112,272,216.08	67,803,128.24	10,049,584.86	133,488,559.73	29,108,044.82	471,190,857.64	70,249,669.14
1903		124,944,289.74	118,619,520.15	82,618,034.18	12,365,168.08	138,425,646.07	28,556,348.82	506,029,007.04	29,511,323.82

NOTE.—The expenditures for 1888 include \$4,549,368.26 uninvested cash in Union Pacific sinking fund paid to Treasurer United States and covered into the Treasury as part payment on Union Pacific indebtedness. The additional sums of \$13,645,250, the proceeds of sale of bonds in sinking fund, and \$46,556,905.49, paid by agents of the Union and Kansas Pacific companies, making in all \$54,751,223.75, were also covered into the Treasury on account of Pacific Railroad indebtedness, and are included in the receipts for 1888.

The receipts for 1899 include \$11,793,314.14, paid into the Treasury as part of Central Pacific Railroad indebtedness. The receipts for 1900 include \$3,338,016.49 paid into the Treasury as part of Central Pacific Railroad indebtedness and \$821,897.70 paid into the Treasury for interest account of Kansas Pacific Railroad, making a total of \$4,159,914.19.

The receipts for 1901 include payments into the Treasury on account of Pacific Railroads, as follows: Part of Central Pacific Railroad indebtedness, \$4,576,247.10; for interest account of Kansas Pacific Railroad, \$133,942.89; amount realized from sale of claim of United States against the Sioux City and Pacific Railroad, \$2,122,841.24; making a total of \$6,833,031.23.

The receipts for 1903 include \$4,036,349.56 paid into the Treasury as part of Central Pacific Railroad indebtedness.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, DIVISION OF BOOKKEEPING AND WARRANTS.

Mr. CLAY. It will be seen from the table in regard to receipts and expenditures that our total expenditures in 1886 amounted to \$242,483,138.50; in 1887, \$267,932,179.97, and the next year, \$267,924,801.13. Now, in the year 1899, \$605,072,179.85; 1900, \$487,000,000; 1901, \$509,000,000; 1903, \$506,000,000.

It shows that in a period of ten years our annual expenditures have doubled. The best information I have been able to get is that we are raising more money by taxation for the support of our Government than any Government in the world except that of Russia.

Mr. President, it is time we should call a halt on our public expenditures. We have now reached a point where we have a navy ample to cope with any country in the world. I do not believe the American people will justify a continuous increase of expenditures for the Army and Navy when in all probability we will decline during the present session to give a single dollar to public buildings and to rivers and harbors.

We know that thus far not a single dollar has been appropriated during the present session of Congress for public buildings. We are told that not a single dollar is to be appropriated for rivers and harbors. I believe that the public buildings, the rivers and harbors of our country are of equal importance with the Army and the Navy. We were told on the floor the other day that we are not to have even a public building to relieve the State, War, and Navy Department building. We know we are paying \$320,000 a year for rentals in the city of Washington for public purposes, and notwithstanding that fact the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds can not get a single dollar through the Senate for that laudable purpose—not a dollar for a public building in any State in this Union; not a dollar for rivers and harbors, but two hundred and seven millions for purposes of war.

This nation has made a reputation second to none in the world, and not by virtue of war, or a desire for war. We have made our reputation by reason of the fact that we were a just, a peace-loving people; by reason of the fact that we have sought peace. The Father of our Country taught us to maintain friendly and peaceful relations with all the countries of the world; to seek to do business with all the countries of the world, leading a high and moral life; to teach the world to follow our example; and the whole world has regarded us as the greatest Christian nation on this earth. Let us maintain forever the reputation and the character for peace and justice and righteousness which we have maintained heretofore.

I desire to ask permission of the Senate to have inserted as a part of my remarks pages 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and part of page 7 of the Report of the Secretary of the Treasury, dated Washington, December 8, 1903, and also to have inserted as a part of my remarks Table G on page 78.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOPKINS in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Georgia? The Chair hears none.

The matter referred to is as follows:

Receipts and expenditures.

FISCAL YEAR 1903.

The revenues of the Government from all sources (by warrants) for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1903, were:

From customs	\$284,479,581.81
From internal revenue	230,810,124.17
From sales of public lands	8,926,311.22
From profits on coinage, bullion deposits, etc.	8,254,739.88
From revenues of the District of Columbia	5,168,088.56
From fees—consular, letters patent, and lands	4,048,833.22

From sales of Indian lands, proceeds of Indian labor, etc.	\$2,333,268.83
From navy pension, navy hospital, clothing, and deposit funds.	2,307,591.17
From tax on circulation of national banks	1,647,429.28
From immigrant fund	1,366,153.33
From trust funds, Department of State	1,203,032.07
From payment of interest by Pacific railways	997,197.79
From customs fees, fines, penalties, etc.	878,254.78
From miscellaneous	748,059.83
From Soldiers' Home permanent fund	743,139.39
From sales of Government property	434,233.21
From judicial fees, fines, penalties, etc.	398,757.46
From deposits for surveying public lands	305,701.88
From sale of lands, buildings, etc.	289,730.82
From tax on sealskins	286,133.40
From depositions on public lands	231,144.26
From sale of naval vessels and army transports	174,517.10
From sales of ordnance material	173,188.16
From license fees, Territory of Alaska	83,625.22
From Spanish indemnity	28,500.00
From part payment Central Pacific Railroad indebtedness	4,066,249.56

From postal revenues	560,333,674.40
	134,224,443.24
Total receipts	694,621,117.64

The expenditures for the same period were:

For the civil establishment, including foreign intercourse, public buildings, collecting the revenues, District of Columbia, and other miscellaneous expenses	122,175,370.54
For the military establishment, including rivers and harbors, forts, arsenals, sea-coast defenses, and expenses of the war with Spain and in the Philippines	118,619,520.15
For the naval establishment, including construction of new vessels, machinery, armament, equipment, improvement at navy-yards, and expenses of the war with Spain and in the Philippines	82,618,034.18
For Indian Service	12,365,168.08
For pensions	138,425,646.07
For interest on the public debt	28,553,348.82
For deficiency in postal revenues	2,768,919.20

For Postal Service	506,093,007.04
	134,224,443.24
Total expenditures	640,323,450.28

Showing a surplus of..... 54,297,667.36

In addition to the revenues collected during the year and the amounts received on the indebtedness of Pacific railroads, the cash in the Treasury was increased \$760 by the issue of 4 per-cent bonds in liquidation of interest accrued on refunding certificates converted during the year.

The securities redeemed an account of the sinking fund were as follows:

Fractional currency	\$2,083.00
Treasury notes of 1861	50.00
One-year notes of 1833	250.00
Two-year notes of 1863	50.00
Compound-interest notes	520.00
Refunding certificates	90.00
Funded loan of 1881, continued at 3½ per cent	500.00
Funded loan of 1891, called	6,400.00
Funded loan of 1891, continued at 2 per cent	63,500.00
Bonds purchased:	
Loan of 1904	\$25,300.00
Loan of 1925	16,504,300.00
	16,529,600.00

Premium on bonds purchased:	
Loan of 1904	1,022.51
Loan of 1925	6,201,025.41
	6,202,047.92

Premium on bonds exchanged:	
Funded loan of 1907	4,170,932.47
Loan of 1908-1918	534,139.43
	4,705,071.90

National-bank notes redeemed in excess of deposits..... 2,001,161.00

Total..... 29,511,323.82

Compared with the fiscal year 1902 the receipts for 1903 increased \$10,294,837.17, as follows:

Increase in receipts for 1903.

Source.	1902.	1903.	Increase.	Decrease.
Customs.....	\$254,444,708.19	\$284,479,581.81	\$30,034,873.62	
Internal revenue.....	271,880,122.10	230,810,124.17		\$41,069,997.93
Profits on coinage, bullion deposits, etc.....	10,979,506.57	8,254,739.88		2,724,766.69
Tax on sealskins, and rent of Fox Islands.....	231,821.20	286,233.40	54,412.20	
Sales of Indian lands.....	1,775,832.63	2,336,268.83	617,436.20	
Sales of Government property.....	829,314.15	434,296.21		395,017.94
Sales of public lands.....	4,144,122.78	8,926,311.22	4,782,188.44	
District of Columbia.....	4,217,841.43	5,168,063.56	950,197.13	
Navy pension, navy hospital, clothing, and deposit funds.....	2,019,850.25	2,300,501.17	280,650.92	
Fees—consular, letters patent, and land.....	4,085,229.87	4,048,833.22		36,396.65
Depredations on public lands.....	107,995.58	231,144.21	123,148.63	
Customs fees, fines, penalties, etc.....	828,971.35	878,254.73	49,283.38	
Judicial fees, fines, penalties, etc.....	334,233.95	308,757.41		25,476.54
Immigrant fund.....	747,217.15	1,356,158.32	608,941.17	
Deposits for surveying public lands.....	316,579.23	305,701.88		10,877.35
Tax on national banks.....	1,643,454.73	1,647,429.22	3,974.49	
Part payment Central Pacific Railroad indebtedness.....		4,066,349.56	4,066,349.56	
Payment of interest by Pacific railways.....	1,564,554.71	997,197.71		567,356.92
Sales of lands and buildings.....	272,422.72	289,730.82	17,308.10	
Sales of ordnance material.....	330,438.53	173,188.16		157,250.37
Sales of old vessels.....	313,948.98	174,517.10		139,431.88
Soldiers' Home permanent fund.....	536,045.62	743,139.32	207,093.70	
Prize money.....	20,000.00	38,551.04	18,551.04	
Trust funds, Department of State.....	222,061.94	1,203,092.07	981,030.13	
Spanish indemnity.....		28,500.00	28,500.00	
Miscellaneous.....	631,959.55	793,034.01	161,074.46	
Total ordinary receipts, exclusive of postal revenues.....	562,478,233.21	560,396,674.40	43,019,596.92	45,101,065.73
Postal revenues.....	121,848,047.26	134,224,443.24	12,376,365.98	
Aggregate receipts.....	684,326,280.47	694,621,117.64	55,365,932.00	45,101,065.73
Net increase.....			10,294,837.17	

There was an increase of \$47,284,545.38 in expenditures, as follows:

Increase in expenditures for 1903.

Object.	1902.	1903.	Increase.	Decrease.
CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT.				
Legislative:				
Salaries and expenses.....	\$11,330,201.87	\$12,190,749.17	\$860,547.30	
Executive proper:				
Salaries and expenses.....	213,585.22	357,637.23	144,052.01	
Department of State:				
Salaries and expenses.....	186,467.44	178,098.28		\$8,369.16
Foreign intercourse.....	2,765,734.01	3,204,522.01	438,788.00	
Treasury Department:				
Salaries and expenses.....	3,533,329.24	3,846,800.94	313,471.70	
Independent Treasury.....	683,544.89	704,203.54	20,658.65	
Mints and assay offices.....	1,535,666.06	1,456,230.57		79,435.49
Territorial governments.....	165,734.85	261,591.08	95,856.23	
Salaries, etc., internal revenue.....	4,248,497.33	4,346,139.89	97,642.56	
Miscellaneous, internal revenue.....	1,859,659.97	2,370,682.57	1,011,022.60	
Rebate of tax on tobacco.....	2,928,191.28	3,886,991.14	958,799.86	
Collecting customs revenue.....	7,967,473.86	8,468,710.19	501,236.33	
Refunding excess of deposits, customs.....	5,414,259.82	4,248,535.81		1,165,724.01
Debentures or drawbacks, customs.....	5,236,157.44	5,948,308.96	112,151.52	
Miscellaneous items, customs.....	242,752.01	260,509.15	17,757.14	
Revenue-Cutter Service.....	1,203,637.12	1,441,614.26	237,977.14	
Regulating immigration.....	399,692.38	655,428.42	255,736.04	
Chinese-exclusion acts.....	202,744.09	262,274.07	59,530.04	
New revenue vessels.....	112,514.96	205,057.17	92,542.21	
Alien contract-labor laws.....	150,032.16	106,718.89		43,313.27
Public Health and Marine-Hospital Service.....	1,234,264.51	1,356,455.87	122,191.36	
Life-Saving Service.....	1,667,688.48	1,746,841.19	79,152.71	
Light-House Establishment.....	4,181,403.39	4,537,315.67	355,912.28	
Coast and Geodetic Survey.....	838,832.07	865,215.78	26,383.71	

Increase in expenditures for 1903—Continued.

Object.	1902.	1903.	Increase.	Decrease.
CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT—continued.				
Treasury Department—Continued.				
Steamboat-Inspection Service.....	\$344,490.06	\$436,871.50	\$92,381.44	
Engraving and printing.....	2,653,522.43	2,782,348.50	128,826.07	
Public buildings.....	5,118,157.35	7,679,721.24	2,561,563.89	
Fuel, etc., public buildings.....	831,279.99	907,384.32	26,704.33	
Custodians and janitors.....	1,080,029.26	1,085,044.49	5,015.23	
Furniture for public buildings.....	257,389.74	270,856.35	13,466.61	
Fish hatcheries.....	51,435.72	55,953.28	4,517.56	
Salaries and expenses, Fish Commission.....	489,255.45	524,798.31	35,542.86	
National Museum.....	271,828.94	255,037.93		\$16,791.01
Zoological Park.....	83,333.19	101,850.00	18,516.81	
Smithsonian Institution.....	140,009.18	147,717.85	7,708.67	
Interstate Commerce Commission.....	270,059.55	302,972.35	32,912.80	
French spoliation claims.....	193,257.73	557,342.13	364,084.40	
Claims under Bowman and Tucker acts.....	407,855.31	172,285.00		235,570.31
Epidemic diseases.....	141,814.53	176,553.53	34,739.00	
Refunding customs revenue collected from Porto Rico.....	399,988.10	375,402.45		24,585.65
Payment of debt of Hawaii.....	751,202.44	187,300.04		563,902.40
Buffalo exposition, New York.....	83,756.90	500,347.96	416,591.06	
Louisiana Purchase Exposition, St. Louis.....	45,275.59	424,967.06	379,691.47	
South Carolina exposition.....		173,975.14	173,975.14	
Suppressing bubonic plague, Hawaii.....		1,000,000.00	1,000,000.00	
Miscellaneous items.....	859,839.95	905,532.61	45,732.66	
War Department:				
Salaries and expenses.....	2,385,030.04	3,062,025.73	676,995.69	
Navy Department:				
Salaries and expenses.....	498,897.02	498,762.44		134.58
Interior Department:				
Salaries and expenses.....	4,742,480.28	4,333,329.83		191,449.55
Public Lands Service.....	3,212,636.28	3,619,628.49	406,992.21	
Reclamation fund.....		238,517.23	238,517.23	
Colleges for agriculture.....	1,200,000.00	1,200,000.00		
Twelfth Census.....	2,915,194.81	1,345,329.45		1,569,865.36
Reconstructing rooms of old Library of Congress.....	205,365.43	38,004.26		167,361.17
Miscellaneous items.....	1,052,652.36	1,663,644.76	610,992.40	
Post-Office Department:				
Salaries and expenses.....	1,053,649.79	1,439,498.87	385,849.08	
Deficiency in postal revenues.....	2,402,152.52	2,768,919.20	366,766.68	
Mail transportation, Pacific railways.....	592,682.31	701,648.28	108,965.97	
Department of Agriculture:				
Salaries and expenses.....	3,423,215.92	4,073,235.06	650,019.14	
Weather Bureau.....	1,156,773.69	1,259,121.70	102,348.01	
Department of Labor:				
Salaries and expenses.....	176,202.49	182,084.49	5,882.00	
Department of Commerce and Labor:				
Salaries and expenses.....		34,473.84	34,473.84	
Department of Justice:				
Salaries and expenses.....	473,903.04	589,144.39	115,241.35	
Salaries of justices, assistant attorneys, etc.....	1,038,000.85	1,320,695.50	282,694.65	
Salaries, fees, and expenses of marshals.....	1,151,351.20	1,364,915.99	213,564.79	
Fees of witnesses.....	829,086.97	820,936.59		8,150.38
Salaries and fees of district attorneys.....	416,257.34	493,749.69	77,492.35	
Fees of jurors.....	614,858.37	889,904.10	275,045.73	
Fees of clerks.....	247,928.05	263,194.46	15,266.41	
Fees of commissioners.....	130,531.70	131,055.80	523.90	
Support of prisoners.....	734,008.16	811,610.64	77,602.48	
Pay of bailiffs.....	146,828.52	153,728.50	6,899.98	
Judgments, United States courts.....	26,496.64	19,154.16		7,342.48
Miscellaneous items.....	953,492.33	1,081,795.28	128,302.95	
District of Columbia:				
Salaries and expenses.....	9,363,742.00	8,584,037.32		779,704.68
Total civil establishment.....	113,469,323.91	124,944,289.74	16,145,225.78	4,670,259.95
MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT.				
National defense.....		192,801.69	192,801.69	
Emergency fund.....	42,362.20	76,187.43	33,825.23	
Pay Department.....	36,915,284.17	28,615,763.10		8,299,521.07
Extra pay, war with Spain.....	82,538.85	157,191.65	74,652.80	
Subsistence Department.....	6,420,827.28	5,419,793.20		1,001,034.08
Quartermaster's Department.....	31,725,860.32	30,822,802.69		903,057.63
Medical Department.....	850,602.41	1,320,023.99	469,421.58	

Increase in expenditures for 1903—Continued.

Object.	1902.	1903.	Increase.	Decrease.
MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT—continued.				
Ordinance Department	\$11,155,777.83	\$10,637,105.75		\$518,672.08
Engineer Department	755,001.75	1,082,265.56	\$327,173.81	
Signal Service	245,379.06	343,930.85	98,551.79	
Military telegraph and cable lines	106,491.47	384,007.20	277,515.73	
Military Academy	257,104.92	490,980.17	233,875.25	
Improving harbors	6,331,737.29	7,342,183.23	1,010,445.94	
Improving rivers	8,616,213.45	12,247,835.98	3,631,622.53	
Bringing home remains of officers, soldiers, and others	109,972.27	90,993.13		18,979.14
Military posts	1,053,242.45	1,824,432.09	771,189.64	
National Homes for Disabled Soldiers	3,236,434.40	3,038,294.04	701,859.64	
State Homes for disabled soldiers	1,004,724.80	1,031,355.43	26,630.63	
Support of Soldiers' Home	536,045.62	743,139.39	207,093.77	
Soldiers' Home permanent fund	236,000.00	254,000.00	18,000.00	
Soldiers' Home interest account	87,661.27	98,633.37	10,972.10	
Reimbursing States and Territories, expenses of raising troops, Spanish war	599,431.34	217,852.35		381,578.99
Refunding to States expenses incurred in raising volunteers	1,053,652.42	6,364,609.31	5,310,956.89	
Payment to State of Florida		692,946.00	692,946.00	
Relief of distress in the Philippines		3,000,000.00	3,000,000.00	
Miscellaneous items	849,750.51	1,230,324.45	380,573.94	
Total military establishment	112,272,216.08	118,619,520.15	17,470,147.06	11,122,842.99
NAVAL ESTABLISHMENT.				
National defense	24,969.72	1,872,734.22	1,847,764.50	
Emergency fund	114,019.42	175,132.01	61,112.59	
Increase of the Navy	19,736,144.29	26,067,104.25	6,378,959.96	
Bureau of Yards and Docks	5,701,780.29	6,404,410.50	702,630.21	
Bureau of Equipment	5,144,548.32	5,439,182.18	294,633.86	
Bureau of Navigation	580,547.94	862,062.11	281,514.17	
Bureau of Construction and Repair	6,968,828.98	7,783,546.78	784,717.80	
Bureau of Ordnance	2,549,000.51	3,474,681.03	925,681.12	
Bureau of Steam Engineering	3,253,231.78	3,613,724.40	360,492.62	
Bureau of Supplies and Accounts	3,957,819.29	5,701,472.94	1,743,653.65	
Bureau of Medicine and Surgery	415,870.92	541,577.20	125,706.28	
Marine Corps	2,718,621.95	3,246,688.47	528,066.52	
Naval Academy	872,693.13	1,320,562.87	447,869.74	
Pay of the Navy	13,017,036.61	14,969,881.86	1,952,845.25	
General account of advances	1,905,880.92	17,634.10		1,888,255.82
Judgments, bounty for destruction of enemies' vessels	314,853.97	53,669.37		261,184.60
Miscellaneous items	440,236.20	473,969.29	33,733.09	
Total naval establishment	67,803,123.24	82,618,034.18	16,964,346.36	2,149,440.42
Indian Service	10,049,584.86	12,935,168.08	2,885,583.22	
Pensions	138,488,559.73	138,425,046.07		63,513.66
Interest on the public debt	29,108,044.82	28,556,348.82		551,696.00
Total ordinary expenditures, exclusive of postal service	471,190,857.64	506,039,007.04	34,848,149.40	18,557,153.02
Postal service	121,848,047.26	134,224,443.24	12,376,395.98	
Aggregate expenditures	593,038,904.90	640,263,450.28	47,224,545.38	18,557,153.02

FISCAL YEAR 1904.

The revenues of the Government for the current fiscal year are thus estimated upon the basis of existing laws

From customs	\$250,000,000.00
From internal revenue	235,000,000.00
From miscellaneous sources	45,000,000.00
From postal revenues	144,767,664.00
Total estimated revenues	674,767,664.00

The expenditures for the same period are estimated as follows:

For the civil establishment	\$131,000,000.00
For the military establishment	115,000,000.00
For the naval establishment	96,000,000.00
For the Indian Service	11,000,000.00
For pensions	139,000,000.00
For interest on the public debt	24,000,000.00
For postal service	144,767,664.00
Total estimated expenditures	660,767,664.00

Or a surplus of..... 14,000,000.00

FISCAL YEAR 1905.

It is estimated that upon the basis of existing laws the revenues of the Government for the fiscal year 1905 will be:

From customs	\$260,000,000.00
From internal revenue	240,000,000.00
From miscellaneous sources	45,000,000.00
From postal revenues	159,472,000.72
Total estimated revenues	704,472,000.72

The estimates of appropriations required for the same period, as submitted by the several Executive Departments and offices, are as follows:

Legislative establishment	\$5,351,109.50
Executive establishment:	
Executive proper	\$320,000.00
State Department	217,600.00
Treasury Department	10,027,174.50
War Department	2,165,576.00
Navy Department	883,981.48
Interior Department	5,279,229.00
Post-Office Department	1,511,050.00
Department of Agriculture	6,729,889.00
Department of Commerce and Labor	2,799,660.00
Department of Justice	254,860.00
Judicial establishment	30,189,050.66
Foreign intercourse	901,420.00
Military establishment	2,236,300.69
Naval establishment	77,794,813.05
Indian affairs	90,964,750.34
Pensions	7,502,252.54
Public works:	138,152,600.00
Legislative	5,500.00
Treasury Department	10,545,883.79
War Department	40,497,542.41
Navy Department	11,901,699.00
Interior Department	319,600.00
Department of Commerce and Labor	3,802,082.48
Department of Justice	255,000.00
Miscellaneous:	67,327,307.68
Legislative	6,390,645.82
Treasury Department	11,562,305.20
War Department	6,094,002.00
Interior Department	3,606,705.00
Department of Justice	6,516,660.00
Department of Commerce and Labor	6,869,212.99
District of Columbia	13,017,581.00
Postal Service, including \$8,613,709.28 deficiency in postal revenues	53,997,012.01
Permanent annual appropriations:	168,085,770.00
Interest on the public debt	\$24,250,000.00
Refunding—customs, internal revenue, etc.	12,263,000.00
Collecting revenue from customs	5,500,000.00
Miscellaneous	42,958,820.00
Total estimated appropriations, exclusive of sinking fund.	727,474,206.79

Or an estimated deficit of..... 23,002,146.07

TABLE G.—Population, net revenue, and net expenditures of the Government from 1837 to 1903, and per capita of the revenues and per capita of expenditures.

Year.	Population.	Net revenue.	Per capita on revenue.	Net expenses.	Per capita on expenditures.
1837	15,655,000	\$24,954,153.00	\$1.59	\$37,243,496.00	\$2.38
1838	16,112,000	26,302,562.00	1.63	39,865,050.00	2.10
1839	16,584,000	31,432,750.00	1.90	29,891,128.00	1.62
1840	17,060,453	19,480,115.00	1.14	24,317,579.00	1.42
1841	17,591,000	16,890,160.00	.96	26,565,873.00	1.51
1842	18,132,000	19,976,197.00	1.10	25,293,761.00	1.39
1843 (6 months)	18,694,000	8,302,702.00	.89	11,858,075.00	1.27
1844	19,276,000	29,321,374.00	1.62	22,337,571.00	1.16
1845	19,878,000	29,970,106.00	1.51	22,937,408.00	1.15
1846	20,500,000	29,699,988.00	1.45	27,766,925.00	1.35
1847	21,143,000	26,465,769.00	1.25	57,281,412.00	2.71
1848	21,805,000	35,735,779.00	1.64	45,377,225.00	2.08
1849	22,489,000	31,208,143.00	1.39	45,051,657.00	2.00
1850	23,191,786	43,603,439.00	1.88	39,543,492.00	1.71
1851	23,905,000	52,559,904.00	2.19	47,709,017.00	1.99
1852	24,802,000	49,846,816.00	2.01	44,194,919.00	1.78
1853	25,615,000	61,587,054.00	2.40	48,184,111.00	1.88
1854	26,423,000	73,800,341.00	2.79	58,044,802.00	2.20
1855	27,256,000	65,350,573.00	2.40	59,742,668.00	2.19
1856	28,083,000	74,056,699.00	2.64	69,571,026.00	2.48
1857	28,916,000	68,965,313.00	2.38	67,795,708.00	2.34
1858	29,753,000	46,685,366.00	1.57	74,185,270.00	2.49
1859	30,596,000	53,486,466.00	1.75	69,070,977.00	2.26
1860	31,443,321	56,064,608.00	1.78	63,130,598.00	2.01
1861	32,064,000	41,509,930.00	1.29	66,546,645.00	2.08
1862	32,704,000	51,987,455.00	1.59	474,761,819.00	14.52
1863	33,365,000	112,697,291.00	3.38	714,740,725.00	21.42
1864	34,046,000	264,626,772.00	7.77	865,322,614.00	25.42
1865	34,748,000	333,714,005.00	9.60	1,297,555,224.00	37.34
1866	35,469,000	558,032,620.00	15.73	520,809,417.00	14.68
1867	36,211,000	490,634,010.00	13.55	357,542,675.00	9.87
1868	36,973,000	405,038,083.00	10.97	377,340,285.00	10.21
1869	37,756,000	370,943,747.00	9.82	322,805,278.00	8.55
1870	38,558,371	411,255,473.00	10.67	308,653,561.00	8.03
1871	39,355,000	383,323,945.00	9.69	292,177,188.00	7.39
1872	40,156,000	374,106,868.00	9.22	277,517,969.00	6.84
1873	41,077,000	333,738,205.00	8.01	290,345,245.00	6.97
1874	42,096,000	304,978,755.00	7.13	302,639,873.00	7.07
1875	43,051,000	288,000,051.00	6.55	274,623,393.00	6.25
1876	44,137,000	294,065,865.00	6.52	265,101,085.00	5.87
1877	45,353,000	281,406,419.00	6.07	241,334,475.00	5.21
1878	47,568,000	257,738,879.00	5.42	236,964,327.00	4.98
1879	48,866,000	273,827,184.00	5.60	166,947,884.00	5.46

TABLE G.—Population, net revenue, and net expenditures of the Government from 1837 to 1903, etc.—Continued.

Year.	Popula- tion.	Net revenue.	Per cap- ita on revenue.	Net expenses.	Per cap- ita on expendi- tures.
1880.....	50,155,783	\$333,526,611.00	\$6.65	\$287,642,958.00	\$5.34
1881.....	51,316,000	360,782,293.00	7.00	290,712,888.00	5.68
1882.....	52,495,000	403,525,250.00	7.68	257,981,440.00	4.91
1883.....	53,693,000	398,287,582.00	7.41	285,408,138.00	4.94
1884.....	54,911,000	348,519,870.00	6.33	244,126,244.00	4.44
1885.....	55,148,000	323,690,706.00	5.76	290,226,935.00	4.65
1886.....	57,404,000	336,439,727.00	5.86	242,483,138.00	4.22
1887.....	58,680,000	371,403,277.00	6.33	267,932,179.00	4.56
1888.....	59,974,000	379,266,075.00	6.32	a 267,924,801.00	4.46
1889.....	61,269,000	387,050,059.00	6.31	b 299,288,978.00	4.88
1890.....	62,622,250	403,080,982.00	6.43	c 318,040,710.00	5.07
1891.....	63,947,000	392,612,447.31	6.14	d 365,773,905.35	5.72
1892.....	65,191,000	354,937,784.24	5.44	345,023,330.58	5.29
1893.....	66,456,000	385,819,628.78	5.81	383,477,954.49	5.77
1894.....	67,740,000	297,722,019.25	4.40	367,525,279.83	5.43
1895.....	69,043,000	313,390,075.11	4.54	356,195,298.29	5.16
1896.....	70,365,000	326,976,200.38	4.65	352,179,446.08	5.01
1897.....	71,704,000	347,721,705.16	4.85	365,774,159.57	5.10
1898.....	73,060,000	403,321,335.20	5.53	443,388,532.80	6.07
1899.....	74,433,000	515,960,620.18	6.93	605,072,179.85	8.14
1900.....	76,295,230	537,240,851.89	7.03	487,713,791.71	6.39
1901.....	77,754,000	587,685,337.53	7.55	509,967,353.15	6.56
1902.....	79,117,000	562,478,293.21	7.11	471,190,857.64	5.96
1903.....	80,847,000	560,306,674.40	6.93	506,099,007.04	6.26

a This includes \$3,270,342.46 of "premiums on purchase of bonds."
 b This includes \$17,292,332.65 of "premiums on purchase of bonds."
 c This includes \$20,304,224.06 of "premiums on purchase of bonds."
 d This includes \$10,491,230.61 of "premiums on purchase of bonds."

NOTE.—The net revenue and expenses and per capita on revenues for 1891 were erroneously stated by the Register of the Treasury in his reports for 1891, 1892, and 1893. (See Finance Reports for those years, pp. 845, 767, and 903.)

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, as a member of the committee from which this bill was reported, I desire to say a very few words.

The bill was reported unanimously. There was no dissent or division in the committee. The responsibility is now transferred from the committee to the floor of the Senate, and it is a very wholesome practice to have all these great appropriation bills carefully scrutinized on the floor of the Senate. If there is a single item in the bill which is unnecessary or extravagant, it should be stricken out. If there is a dollar proposed to be appropriated by this bill in maintenance of a policy that is unwise, injudicious, or hurtful, the bill should be amended. The discussion so far has not disclosed any fault in either respect. No Senator has asked that any item in the bill be stricken out. No Senator has stated that anything in the bill either initiates or continues a policy which is unwise or hurtful to the public welfare.

With the exception of the discussion, which was a lengthy one, in relation to the location of a training school, the only point raised has been, I may say, academic and speculative; that is, what may be a wise policy in the future.

It is true that this bill does increase the Navy; it increases the ships and it increases the number of men; but no Senator who has addressed the Senate has dissented from the wisdom and propriety of that course. It is true that the bill carries \$97,000,000. That fact has been commented upon, yet no Senator has asked that it be diminished. The only suggestion is whether or not the time may come in the near future when we may call a halt in naval construction.

Mr. President, the policy of renewing our naval establishment was commenced under the administration of the Navy Department by Mr. W. C. Whitney years before those events which have so materially changed the relation of our Government to international affairs. And since the initiation of that policy at that time we have continued to increase our Navy. I do not believe there is a man within the broad limits of the United States who will say that there has been a dollar unwisely or injudiciously appropriated for that purpose. I believe we must have a strong navy. I believe the relation of the United States to international affairs now makes it indispensable to the public safety. I believe the American people take that view of this matter and are willing to be taxed to pay for a navy that will give a sense of safety which will come in no other way.

We have acquired the Hawaiian Islands. We have assumed responsibilities in relation to Cuba. We have acquired Porto Rico. We have acquired the Philippine Islands. We have undertaken the construction of an isthmian canal. We have reasserted in its broadest and its boldest form the Monroe doctrine. Each one of these transactions has had a material effect in changing the relations of the United States toward international affairs. Each one of them has increased the importance of having and maintaining in this country a powerful navy. The maintenance of a powerful navy in no wise conflicts with our desire to be at peace with all the people of the world. It does not militate

against those high purposes referred to by the Senator from Georgia—the purpose of dealing justly and righteously with all governments.

In this day and time we hear a good deal about the peaceful methods which should prevail between the different countries. We hear a great deal about settling controversies between nations by arbitration. But do we see anything of that sort going on? When England desired possessions in South Africa, was her course governed by those high purposes about which we hear so much? Was there any suggestion of arbitration to determine what should be the true relation between those governments in respect to the matters in controversy? On the contrary, she took her army and her navy and took possession of what she wanted. Many other instances of like character might be cited. Unfortunate as it may be to have to say it, our own country has on more than one occasion engaged in similar business.

I deduce from this, Mr. President, the conclusion that a government can not rely altogether on these high ideas, on a high moral tone, a righteous course toward other nations, as a protection. The experience of mankind demonstrates that the only protection is in power to maintain what is right. There may be such a thing as international morality. It exists in theory, but in practice I observe very little of it. There may be near at hand a period when we may call a halt in naval construction. It is true that we have to-day a great navy, second in power only to that of Great Britain. It is possible that in the near future we will be able to discontinue heavy appropriations for increasing our naval strength. The future will determine that. I sincerely hope that time is near at hand. I earnestly hope we will not again in the near future be called upon to make such a heavy appropriation as this bill carries for naval construction.

The distinguished chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs called attention to the subject and threw out that suggestion that Senators might bear it in mind and give it careful consideration. I sincerely hope the time will soon be at hand when we may discontinue this heavy expenditure for naval construction. But, Mr. President, that time is not to-day. War is raging between two of the most powerful Governments of the world. One of them, Russia, is in close alliance with France, and it is not impossible that before the end is reached France may be drawn into the conflict. England is in close alliance with Japan and may be drawn into it. In the midst of the talk about peaceful methods, in the midst of the talk about arbitration, we find the governments of the world to-day more fully and more completely armed and prepared for war than at any other time in fifty years, and we find this war in the East, where we have interests and where we may become involved by remote possibility, although I do not believe it will come.

I say in the aggressive spirit manifested by the governments of the world and the unrest which now prevails, in the high state of armament that exists, it would not become the United States at this critical hour to call a halt on the increase of her naval establishment. When the time will come when we may safely call a halt is academic, is speculative. I sincerely hope that it will come in the near future, but I most positively believe that the time is not to-day. I am gratified to see that not a Senator on this floor has been willing to ask that a single item be stricken out, that a single vessel provided for shall not be constructed. The American people have a right to have that sense of security which comes only from a powerful navy. They will not begrudge the money necessary to maintain a powerful navy.

Mr. DEPEW. Mr. President, I have listened with great pleasure, as I always do, to the speech of my friend the Senator from Georgia [Mr. CLAY]. He seeks to separate the distinguished Secretary of War from my own State, who recently retired from office, from the Republican party on the question of the retention of the Philippine Islands. My own impression is that if Mr. Root shall, as he doubtless will, during the coming campaign, give a full exposition of his views from the platform, and not in the way in which an interview often misstates a man's opinions, it will be found that he does not differ from the line in which the Republican party has acted and, I think, will continue to act. To use a common phrase, the American people are not "quitters." They never yet have given up anything which they deemed it advisable to obtain.

I am not at this time going into a discussion of the reasons why we will find stronger arguments every year for establishing closer relations with the Philippines, but I will say that I believe no one now living will see those relations weakened. I believe that the extraordinary progress which has been made by those people, as testified to by Governor Taft, in education, in civilization, and in the industries, will continue with accelerated speed as the schools become more numerous, the education more general, and the communication between the United States and the Philippine Islands more constant and rapid. I do not think we yet fully understand two things. First, how much the Philippine Islands

are to be advantageous to us in their own development; what they are to grow to when they have absorbed the spirit and are putting in practice the principles of American liberty, American law, and American enterprise. And the other, that we can not yet comprehend until the war clouds in the Far East are over and years have passed by the increasing importance to the United States, on its commercial and industrial side, of the possession of those territories, with their harbors and their depots so near to that market for which all the world is contending.

The Senator from Georgia was very vigorous and forceful in demanding that there should be universal investigations of the operations of the Government. He was alarmed for fear that in all the Departments there is either extravagance or corruption, which he said should be disclosed and corrected by an investigating committee on the part of Congress. He took the ground that now there is no supervision, no care, or attention of the operation of the great Departments of the Government. But, sir, every penny which is expended by these Departments has come here and gone to the other House before appropriated. The Appropriation, Finance, Ways and Means, the Naval, Post-Office, and Military are all of them investigating committees in perpetual session. Upon every one of them is a minority membership, selected by the minority, of members on their side, who are most competent to serve their party as well as their country upon these great committees.

They have the opportunity for months, as the programme comes in from the Post-Office, Navy, War, and other Departments, to look at each one of the proposals for the future and to examine what has been done in the past, and if the committee dared—which it would not—refuse an inquiry as to any item or as to any officer asked for by a minority member, a Senator or Member can go before the House or Senate explaining that he has been denied the privilege as a member of a great committee of receiving information or making an investigation which he wants, and neither House would for a moment stand before the country as obstructing any such inquiry.

But, sir, there has been an inquiry—an inquiry not made by an investigating committee or on the initiative of the Democratic members of any committee, but an inquiry made by the President of the United States, when the disclosures might bring disasters to his party, upon the principle which he has always maintained, of finding rascality if there is any, and punishing the rascal when he is caught.

There have been several speeches made in both Houses assailing the good faith and the earnest intentions of the President in this regard, but he has moved forward on his motto that no guilty man should escape, regardless of criticisms or complaint.

He set the whole machinery of justice at work, and the result is seen in the indictment of men in high position in the Government and out of it, and a few days ago in the illuminating exposition in this District of the conviction of men who had for years, under all administrations, had the confidence of the Department and, as far as they were known, of the country.

But, sir, I intend to make a few remarks upon the broader subject which was so ably discussed this afternoon by my friend the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. CLAY]. The present naval bill provoked much more debate in the House of Representatives than it has done here. The general charge against it has been very much on the line so vigorously portrayed by the Senator from Georgia, against the size of this appropriation and the dangers of its increase in the future.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. President, I spoke entirely in regard to what should be the size of our appropriations in the future. I said I did not believe we should continue at the rapid rate we have been going during the last six or seven years, and I did not speak against the passage of this bill.

Mr. DEPEW. I accept the correction. I misunderstood the Senator. But certainly in the other House the objection was of that character.

Now, I find no fault with rigid economists in public life. I believe in the "watchdog of the Treasury." It is a most disagreeable and unpopular position, but it is one which ought to be held by somebody in every deliberative body. No matter how rich we may be, and our wealth is constantly exploited, it is no reason for extravagance or foolish or unwise expenditures.

But, sir, we have been liberal in every direction, and especially in those directions about which complaint is made, that in order to take care of the Navy we are neglecting internal improvements and the construction of public buildings. We have been engaged for years in the most liberal expenditures for rivers, harbors, and bays. We have made those expenditures, though they are entirely local, out of the Treasury of the whole people, and out of taxation of the whole people, because we believed that it is the duty of the Government to promote navigation and safe carriage of our goods everywhere in the country.

We have gone a step further and made large appropriations for

irrigation in territories which are sparsely inhabited, which will never have large populations, which 99 per cent of our people will never see, because we believed that what was for the benefit of one part of the country was the benefit of all, and that if we could bring vast regions of desert into productive agriculture we would be accomplishing a good result in the increase of the wealth, the opportunities for homes and employment, and the good living of our citizens.

We have made like appropriations with great liberality for the construction of public buildings all over the country, until the criticism has been made that many of them are beyond what the needs of the localities are or ever can be.

Every great power has found it necessary to provide protection for its commerce, its foreign trade, its ports, and its people doing business or traveling in other countries. We have become a great power. It is not an idle expression; it is a fact. We to-day line up alongside of the five great powers of the world. We have assumed responsibilities by this expansion from which we can not escape, and ought not to if we could.

Therefore it is incumbent upon us to act on the lines of the nations which are our rivals and competitors and whom we hope to keep our friends. We are free from invasion. Nobody supposes for a moment that it would be possible for any nation to send here an army that could secure a foothold upon our land. Our forts in our harbors and our submarines are protection for our coasts, and the Volunteer Army, which is always ready on call, would annihilate any army which any fleet, if by possibility it reached our coast, could land upon our shores.

But, sir, we are and have become within a few years, in being a world power, subject to perils and conditions which never existed before. We have obligations to the island of Cuba, where we have said to the world we will protect her against assault or invasion, against any attack upon her independence or the integrity of her territory or her institutions. We have Porto Rico, which can be defended only from the sea, as Cuba can be defended only from the sea. We have Tutuila, Guam, Hawaii, and the Philippines, far from the United States, all of which must be protected from the sea.

But we have assumed another obligation which is much greater, and that is the isthmian canal. We have the longest line of sea-coast of any power in the world except one—7,000 miles, and in addition to that Alaska. Alaska is growing in wealth and in population to an extent which is enlisting attention everywhere, and has to be defended from the sea.

But, sir, the isthmian canal has opened a new era for America and the world. Already the treaty has been signed, the negotiations have ended, the Commission has been appointed. We are to establish soon a government upon the tract ceded to us and assume the responsibility for order and law. The spade is on its way. The steam drill and the dredge will be heard within a few months. One of the most inspiring lines of literature is Emerson's, "Here once the embattled farmers stood and fired the shot heard round the world," and the sound of the dredge and the drill on the Isthmus will be heard around the world, because it is to alter the paths of commerce and to change the relations of nations.

The future of the Monroe doctrine is in the custody of our Navy. Its peaceful recognition will be the tribute which other nations pay not to the doctrine, but to our sea power.

We do not appreciate until we study the subject that the acute commercial jealousies and alarms which now exist in Europe against us will be accentuated by the construction and completion of this canal. Not alone our States on the Pacific, but the whole line of ports on the Atlantic coast will come into this competition, for the ports on the Atlantic coast will be as near in miles to Japan, China, and the Orient by the isthmian canal as are the reservoirs that gather for distribution abroad the products of continental Europe or London through the Suez Canal.

We all remember that during the Spanish-American war the prime minister of Austria did his best to bring about a holy alliance against us among European powers because of what he termed an industrial invasion which threatened the living of the people of the Old World. He failed in forming that combination because of international jealousies, but with the opening of the isthmian canal those jealousies are to increase, for the highly organized industrial nations of Europe are now making so much more than they can consume that they must have either a congestion of population and production, with its result of desperation, poverty, and anarchy, or they must find markets. There is only one market which is free, and that is among the dependent peoples of Asia and Africa.

Now, when through the isthmian canal all products of the industrial energies of this country can reach that market just as quickly and cheaply as can the manufactures of the Old World, then, sir, will come a competition which will be most acute because of the skill of our artisans and business talent of our people. There will be no difference between it and competition between

individuals. We all know what competition means between men, firms, or corporations, and in the progress of civilization all great nations have become business concerns, each looking in a materialistic and business way for the production of manufacturing and agricultural products which shall give employment to and support its people and a market for the surplus of those products.

Now, sir, we can not protect that commerce by an army or treaties alone. We can not protect our commerce and expand our trade by arbitration at The Hague alone. We can only maintain our commerce by having a sea power adequate for its protection, for the security of our islands, and to prevent a hostile fleet from destroying in a week the isthmian canal after it has cost us two to four hundred million dollars and ten years to build—a sea power, sir, which will not be aggressive, but will stand for and keep peace. Our peculiar position gives us a stronger place on the ocean than any other country, because we are less vulnerable upon the land. If we have a sea power so that our floating fortresses will be second or third in rank, no power, no matter what its industrial or diplomatic jealousies or its aggressive tendencies, no matter what its feelings beneath its professions, will ever incur the peril of a contest when there is so much to lose and so little to gain.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New York will suspend one moment while the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The SECRETARY. A bill (S. 2259) to regulate shipping in trade between ports of the United States and ports or places in the Philippine Archipelago, between ports or places in the Philippine Archipelago, and for other purposes.

Mr. SPOONER. I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Wisconsin asks that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside, that the Senate may proceed with the consideration of the naval appropriation bill. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and that order is made.

Mr. DEPEW. Mr. President, every year, by the natural increase in population and the tremendous immigration which is pouring in upon us, we are stimulating our industries and our productiveness beyond that of any other nation in the world, and that stimulation increases a surplus for export which will grow larger as the years go by. Unless we can carry out the broad policy of expansion of markets, which has been so successfully pursued up to the present hour, there is danger to our business, employment, wages, and peace.

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. President—

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

Mr. DEPEW. Certainly.

Mr. PATTERSON. I should like the Senator to be a little more exact in his suggestion as to danger unless we carry out our present plans or proceed along the broad line of expansion which we have inaugurated. Does the Senator from New York mean that we are to continue the securing of additional outlying territory, seeking conquests or purchases in different countries?

Mr. DEPEW. Mr. President, I do not mean that we shall secure more outlying territory. I do not think the occasion will ever arise, so far as at present the situation is visible, where we will need or accept other lands. But I do mean that we shall, if possible, have a mercantile marine some day or other. I do mean that we shall have a navy adequate to protect our commerce all over the world, our people everywhere, and the outlying territories we possess. I do mean that we shall follow continuously, from our Executive and State Department, the line upon which the notes of Secretary Hay to the foreign powers for the open door and the integrity of China against partition proceeded, and that this will continue to be a policy for the benefit of the growing commerce, industries, and productiveness of the United States.

We all remember, who were in Europe after the formation of the German Empire and who had the opportunity of knowing, what were the views of that greatest statesman of the German race, Bismarck, that at that time he saw infinite peril to the German people because the increase of population and productiveness was so far beyond their home markets that he said he saw a congestion which might lead to a social revolution unless outlets could be found. So he sent his agents all over the world looking for territories which could be acquired or settled in South America or carved out of Africa or Asia for German colonization and for places where the productive German cradle could find homes and happiness.

He was followed by Emperor William, one of the most enlightened and far-sighted executives who ever inherited a throne. He saw these conditions and he improved upon them, both in the German mercantile marine and in the German navy. Under the inspiration of his energetic genius, under the inspiration, if you please, of his impulsiveness and strenuousness, the German mercantile marine has received encouragement from the Government by

which, within ten years, it has grown from a very small place until now it ranks next to Great Britain. Its mighty steamships have their full share of the carriage of American products, and in every sea and in every port and in every trade in the world is found the subsidized ship of the German mercantile marine.

Coincident with that this enlightened and far-sighted Emperor has taken up the question of the navy of Germany. Germany is a most economical country, and yet the German navy, under the pressure of the enlightened opinion now shared universally by the intelligent and progressive people of that country, has risen from a low rank within ten years to be third in equipment and power.

I was in England some years since when a wave of pessimism was rolling over Great Britain and pervading Parliament. The general opinion was that the expenses of the naval armament were in excess of the needs of the country and a burden which could not be borne by the British taxpayer. That sentiment affected the budget. The admiralty could not get from Parliament what it asked and required.

There appeared at the time a book, and I am free to say that no book ever published from a private citizen and an ex-officer produced such an immediate impression upon the naval powers of the world as the *Sea Power* of Captain Mahan. It had the widest circulation and was generally read in Great Britain. Newspapers took it up. It became the talk of the clubs, the drawing rooms, and the workshops. The debate was enlivened in Parliament. I heard men of the highest distinction, from royalty down, talk with enthusiasm of the revelations and teachings of this book and the wisdom of acting upon its suggestions. Very soon a new programme was adopted by Great Britain, a programme which provided that, no matter what other countries might expend or do, Great Britain would always have a fleet equal to the combined fleets of the two largest naval powers.

We have given our thought and energies mainly during the hundred and seventeen years of our organized existence to the development of our territory and its settlement, to invention and manufactures, to the building of railroads and canals, and to developing and encouraging our internal commerce; and we have paid very little attention to the sea.

Our position upon the sea has been spasmodic and not logical until within the last fourteen years. Whenever we have been forced upon the ocean the record of our Navy has been brilliant and glorious. The story of our ships with John Paul Jones in the Revolution, Hull, Decatur, Perry, Lawrence, McDonough, Rogers, and their associates in the war of 1812, Farragut, Porter, Foote, and others in the civil war, and Dewey and the Santiago heroes in the Spanish war has proved that upon the sea we only need the ships, for we have the officers and the men.

But, sir, after the war of 1812 there was little done for our Navy. The old frigates, whose names and victories were the inspiration of all of us in our school days and are still war cries on battle ships and cruisers, went into dry dock and were either broken up or became practice vessels or museums. Then, when the civil war came suddenly upon us, we bought everything which could float, much of which was only fit for the scrap heap. It is admitted that what that Navy did during the civil war was one of the principal means in bringing it to a close, and if we had possessed at that time a navy adequate to our needs it would have ended much sooner, notwithstanding that it was an internecine conflict and mainly upon land and carried on under conditions which could never exist in a war with a foreign power.

After the war we sold most of our fleet and devoted ourselves to recuperation, to repairing the losses and disasters of the strife, and paid little attention to our Navy.

Then came the Spanish-American war. We had progressed somewhat in the naval programme then, or I do not know where Dewey would have been, or how we could have conducted the Cuban campaign. We had not the proper armament in our forts. We had nothing adequate in our harbors in the way of torpedoes, submarines, and the like. If that war, coming up in a night, had been with Germany, Great Britain, or France our situation would have been deplorable. Happily for us it was with a nation which could not compare with us as a sea power, and therefore its fleet was quickly destroyed.

Now, sir, the situation is changed. We have a programme which was adopted some fourteen years ago. It has been pursued with reasonable consistency up to the present time. It has given us ships which have raised us from the twentieth in rank to the fifth, and with the ships in course of construction and the programme carried out which is in this bill we will be second in sea power.

One of the most valuable presentations made on this question has been the very able speech of the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE], the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs. But I will go for an instant outside of the limits of the official statement into the general character of this question.

The necessity for a navy which will place us third or second

in rank I have already in a measure outlined. It takes five years to build a battle ship. It takes a proportionate number of years to build armored cruisers, torpedo boats, submarine boats, and torpedo-boat destroyers. A navy can not be extemporized or constructed in a day or a year.

I have no doubt, in addition to the tariff walls which have been put up all over Europe against us, and which prevent further expansion of our trade on the Continent of Europe, that Mr. Chamberlain will succeed in England. I think he will be defeated in the next general election, but the sentiment will grow, and there will be a short life for the party which comes into power on the old free-trade programme. Mr. Chamberlain will find himself in five or six years, with an increased majority behind him, coming into power on an entire reversal of the traditional policy of Great Britain.

The example of the United States, the tremendous development of our resources and industries by reason of the protective tariff, our enormous growth in wealth, because we have made America for Americans, have already made Germany, France, Russia, Italy, and Austria adopt the protective system.

Their tariff walls are raised against us because the enterprise of our manufacturers and the skill of our artisans and cheap transportation are making our competition dangerous. When England reverses her policy, when she ceases to be a dumping ground for our surplus, when her ports are no longer open to our cereals, our fabrics in cotton and wool, our manufactures in wood and steel, when she enacts a tariff which will keep her factories going and her own workmen employed at living wages against foreign producers, then we will find that the American business man, the American factory, the American farm, and the American workman will demand that we enter those markets of the East, which will not be opened and kept open for us except by an adequate Navy.

I do not know what will result from this war between Russia and Japan. We are taking no part with one side or the other, but we do know that whatever happens is of infinite moment to us.

Ten years ago, from a commercial standpoint, we would not have cared what happened to China. To-day what becomes of that ancient Empire is vital to American commerce, industry, and trade. If Russia should succeed, for instance, and take Manchuria, which is a large portion of Chinese territory, with its millions of people, with what Great Britain, Germany, and France have sliced off from that country, if in the general adjustment there should be further division and occupation, it would all mean that other doors were to be closed and other barriers to be raised against American production and its entrance into those markets.

So our policy is, and must be, to maintain as far as possible the integrity of China and her autonomy. We are going to be consulted when that time comes and this Russian-Japanese war is over, no matter which side is the victor. We are to be consulted because the adjustment is not to be made nor to be permitted by the rest of Europe to be made by those two powers, but by a European congress, the same as it always has been.

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. President—

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

Mr. DEPEW. I do.

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. President, this is a very interesting portion of the distinguished Senator's speech, touching upon China and its future. He speaks of the possibility or the probability of European powers dividing up China, and says that we must be consulted. Suppose the European powers divide up China without consulting us, has the policy of the United States been so changed, under a Republican or other Administration, that we shall enter into a foreign war to prevent the disposition of China by European powers?

Mr. DEPEW. No, sir; not that exactly, but—

Mr. PATTERSON. Well, not exactly, but pretty close to it?

Mr. DEPEW. Just only so close as this: If we have a navy which is second among world powers at that time, and we will come pretty near it—

Mr. PATTERSON. But suppose, Mr. President, England, with its navy as large as the navies of any other two powers, or Germany, whose navy at least will then be third in size, or France—this is the task we are undertaking—with the combined navies of those countries outclassing ours as three to one, what, in the opinion of the distinguished Senator from New York, will the United States do to prevent it? If mere negotiation fails, then is it the Senator's understanding that the policy is war?

Mr. DEPEW. My observations on this question are based upon broader lines than the possibilities of our going to war. They are based upon the position which the United States will hold among nations so jealous of one another that our friendship, even in a moral way, will be eagerly sought.

The partition of China is not to be done without immense friction. It is not to be done without tremendous antagonisms among

European nations. Why are they now accepting a very unpopular note from Secretary Hay and assenting to it when we have no adequate Navy? It is because none of the great powers of the world want any irritation of any kind with the United States, even with her present equipment, for they recognize our boundless resources.

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. President, the Senator from New York, I think is aware that the note from Secretary Hay to which he refers was not on the initiative of Secretary Hay, but was suggested to him by the German Government, and when Secretary Hay sent out his note to the different powers he simply acted as the mouthpiece of Germany, according to the reports which have been uncontradicted now ever since that note went out.

Then one additional matter—passing from that, and the Senator can take it up—suppose the moral force and power of the United States is disregarded? The Senator has not yet answered that question.

Mr. DEPEW. I beg pardon. Will the Senator please repeat his statement?

Mr. PATTERSON. Suppose the moral influence, the moral power, upon which the Senator from New York enlarges so eloquently and clearly, is disregarded by those European powers, the European powers going upon the theory that "the United States, under the Monroe doctrine, excludes us from the Western Continent, therefore we will exclude the United States from our continent;" what, then, is the United States to do? The Senator from New York has not seen fit to answer, although the question relating to that particular phase of the subject has been pretty pointed.

Mr. DEPEW. Mr. President, I thought I had answered.

Mr. NELSON. Will the Senator allow me?

Mr. DEPEW. Certainly.

Mr. NELSON. I want to say to the Senator from Colorado [Mr. PATTERSON] that the case he put is not a supposable case. The interests of the United States, England, and Japan are, in the nature of the case, one. They are all in favor of and believe in maintaining "the open door" as against Russia and whatever power may be associated with her. The conditions which the Senator from Colorado presupposes are never likely to exist. It is purely a farfetched hypothetical case.

With our Navy in those Eastern waters, with our power in those Eastern waters, we will be in exactly the condition we were when the Boxer rebellion broke out in China. With a few of our troops from the Philippine Islands and with part of our Navy we participated in suppressing that Boxer rebellion, and the voice of the United States was as potential as that of any of the great nations of the world in settling those Boxer troubles and bringing peace to China.

Mr. DEPEW. Mr. President—

Mr. PATTERSON. Will the Senator allow me?

Mr. DEPEW. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. President, in reference to the reply of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON] I understand now that he goes upon the theory that there is some sort of an alliance between the United States and Great Britain and Japan.

Mr. NELSON. If the Senator from New York, who has the floor, will allow me—

Mr. DEPEW. Certainly.

Mr. NELSON. I am trespassing on his time.

Mr. PATTERSON. So am I.

Mr. NELSON. With the permission of the Senator from New York, I will say there is nothing of the kind; there is no alliance other than that alliance which arises from a mutuality of interest. We have interests in common; we are interested in the Philippine Islands and we are interested in the building up of our commerce in the Orient. England is interested in maintaining her commerce in those countries; she has possessions there, and her commerce is immense. So with Japan. Their interests are identical with ours, and their interests are, in the very nature of the case, hostile to the dismemberment of the Chinese Empire or the absorption of Manchuria by Russia.

Mr. PATTERSON. Then, with the permission of the Senator from New York [Mr. DEPEW], I understand, according to the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON], there is no actual alliance, so far as he has knowledge, between the United States and Great Britain and Japan. It is simply a temporary alliance arising out of mutuality of interest. I am quite free to confess, if that is the case, that so long as that mutuality exists and it is not overcome by interests of still greater weight of one or the other of the three nations referred to by the Senator it is very likely that those three nations will stand united and opposed to the other nations which insist upon a different policy.

But, Mr. President, how long will an alliance based upon mutuality of interest exist where there is no obligation resting upon one nation having such an alliance with the other, except present mutual interest in a certain line of policy in the Far East? How

long, Mr. President, would it require Great Britain, if it came to the conclusion that it was either war or a division of the Chinese Empire, to side with Germany and France and Italy and Spain and conclude, "Since China is to be divided, we will unite with the other European nations and get the lion's share if we can?"

It is useless, it is childish, it seems to me, Mr. President, to rest for any considerable length of time upon a present friendly feeling between three far-distant nations—one in the Far West, another in the Far East, and the other between them—that depends solely upon present interests happening to be mutual for the time, because there is danger to the one or the other if they should disunite or seek benefits along another line. It becomes a mere matter in the future of greater interest or greater results for either one or the other to abandon the alliance that is based simply upon mutuality.

So, Mr. President, both Senators should look the proposition squarely in the face, since we are talking about our great Navy, and having become a world power, and that we must be consulted when the question of the division of the Chinese Empire may arise. The question the people of this country are interested in—since both of the Senators represent, in my opinion, the average sentiment of the Republican Administration—is what is to be the course of the United States in the event of these interests changing and Great Britain uniting with other powers for the dismemberment of China?

Mr. HALE. Mr. President—

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

Mr. DEPEW. Certainly.

Mr. HALE. I do not desire, Mr. President, that the scope of the debate upon this appropriation bill, purely a matter of the Navy, should extend to extraneous matters; but I do not want the statement the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON] has made in the Senate to go unchallenged. I do not want it to be quoted, as it will be, and stated as a proposition covering the attitude of the United States, now that this war in the East is going on, to the countries involved in that war or to the interests that other countries or we may have.

I do not agree that there is any such common interest as the Senator from Minnesota states between the United States and Great Britain and Japan upon the one side against Russia and Germany or France or any other country on the other side. The attitude of the United States, as taken by the State Department, the attitude of the Administration, is one of complete neutrality between those parties; and when it is said that we have to-day a common interest with Japan and with England with reference to Manchuria, that is a statement that the Government of the United States and its interests and its tendencies are against Russia and in favor of Japan.

I do not want that statement to go unchallenged. I do not attempt to forecast—I can not pierce the future—but if I were called upon to prophesy, I should say that in the future, particularly if Japan emerges triumphant from this war, the country the United States will find her greatest rival in trade, her greatest antagonist in competition, the nation most likely to aggress, to monopolize, and control China is not Russia, but is Japan.

Now, I do not want to say, following that, that our interests and our attitude are in favor of Russia as against Japan; but I do not want it said, on the other side, that our attitude and our sympathies and our trade are all with Japan and with England and against the other powers.

Take the Philippines. If we hold that people in our power as colonies and continue to keep them under the yoke, the first power that will give us any trouble in the Philippines will not be Germany, nor Russia, nor France, nor England, but the growing, aggressive, ambitious power of the Orient—the Japanese Empire. It is not a feeble people; it is not a small people.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, as the Senator has called me to task for what I said, I should like to know by what right he calls the little country of Japan a vicious power.

Mr. HALE. "A vicious power!" I have not called it "a vicious power."

Mr. NELSON. The Senator just used that expression.

Mr. HALE. "Ambitious," I said. The two words, if the Senator will look at the dictionary, are not the same. "Ambitious" has one property, one definition; "vicious" has another.

Mr. NELSON. I beg pardon; I misunderstood the Senator.

Mr. HALE. I would use "ambitious" as applied to the Senator from Minnesota, but I would not use "vicious."

No, Mr. President, what I am protesting against is any statement here that countervails or modifies the wise position the Government is taking, that in this contest not only will it not interfere, but that it will not avow, show, or have any sympathy, but will maintain a determined and wise neutrality.

Whatever we may think, whatever may be our feeling, I am not going to discuss which nation I sympathize with. That is not

the question. But, again I say, without my protest, no declaration shall be made here which, while the Senator says does not involve an alliance, is so strong a statement that it would in any emergency that might come up produce an alliance. I do not believe that, Mr. President.

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. President—

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

Mr. DEPEW. Certainly.

Mr. PATTERSON. Just one word, because I recognize that we already have trenched too long upon the time of the Senator from New York. I simply want to emphasize, if possible, the attitude of the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] in insisting that this country shall be regarded as absolutely impartial in its feelings, if that were possible, and in its course as between the two fighting nations. Whether that is wise or not, or whether the public mind of the United States will permit it or not, is a question that need not be discussed now.

But, as I understand the attitude of the Senator from Maine, it is that, being impartial, the United States is in a position to take advantage for the benefit of the United States, whichever side may win. If it is Russia, the United States will be in with Russia; if it is Japan, the United States will be in with Japan; and there will be no antagonism between the United States and either the one nation or the other; and, following the commercial instinct, the United States will be in a position to secure the greatest possible benefit whichever way the war may end.

Mr. HALE. I do not go to that extent.

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

Mr. DEPEW. Yes.

Mr. HALE. I do not go to that extent. I suppose if we maintain this neutrality, whatever the outcome may be, we shall not have made an enemy; but I do not feel that we are maintaining that attitude for the sake of any great benefit to the United States.

I do not join in the feeling that a very critical thing for, a very great thing to the United States, and a thing of great magnitude in our commerce is this oriental trade. It is a very small matter compared either with our other foreign trade or our immense home trade and home market. We have, through the events that have taken place in the last four or five years, not gained trade, but we have lost trade relatively.

When the troubles broke out in China, when the Boxer rebellion came to the surface, we were beating all the nations of the world in the trade with China. We did not want "the open door;" we had the preference of the Chinese. We had let China alone. England had bullied her; France had insulted her; Germany had derided her; Russia had despoiled her, and the United States had kept hands off. If we had not, through our position there, through our naval force and the proximity of the Philippine Islands, joined the armies of the predatory nations—of which we were not—the Chinese Boxers would have taken the legation of the United States, borne it in friendly arms to the seaboard, and kept it there while fighting with the other powers.

People have not reflected exactly upon that situation. We were beating the world, and if we had not been involved in any of these Eastern troubles we should have had no question of "the open door." They were with us. We alienated them for the time, and I do not want to see them further alienated. Again, I say that the question of trade out there is nothing to be compared with our other foreign trade and our immense home trade; it is very small. Therefore, when I am in favor of maintaining neutrality, I have not got any view that we are going to, when this war is over, drive a bargain that will be of any great importance to us with either power that comes out ahead. But we ought to keep our hands off of these oriental combinations and intricacies and policies. It will be an ill day for the United States when she takes upon herself the proposition that it is her business to maintain the integrity of China, as Europe has taken the proposition that it is their business to maintain the integrity of Turkey; because, as in Turkey's case, that means ultimately when it comes, war, if it is necessary to enforce that proposition.

I am not in favor of any policy that involves us at last in the immense expenditures, the stupendous losses, and the unspeakable wickedness of the American people and the United States being involved in a war upon any issue that arises in those seas, 7,000 miles away from us. So I want neutrality, and I want nothing said anywhere that will be quoted by either of those powers to inflame the other power, and so I deprecate the statement of the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. DEPEW. Mr. President, my speech has had a very interesting interruption, as it always has when the keen intelligence of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. PATTERSON] is watchful of the interests of his party; but when he states that the note of Secretary Hay, which has aroused such world-wide interest and such

universal approval, was inspired by the German Government it would indicate that his enterprising paper, the Denver News, has Marconi relations with the palace at Potsdam, where the Emperor resides, not enjoyed by other newspapers of the United States.

Certainly, the revelation is brand new, and the Senator from Colorado would not make it unless, under the broad seal of Germany and the royal arms of its Emperor, he was in receipt of the information.

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. President, just one moment. The Associated Press, which communicates to all the papers of the country, made that statement; and if the Senator from New York was conversant with the Associated Press news as published in the great dailies of the empire city of his own State, he would be just as familiar with it as though he were a subscriber for and a constant reader of the Denver News.

Mr. DEPEW. I am a careful reader of the New York metropolitan newspapers, the country journals which are sent me by my friends the country editors, and the papers of Washington. I think they will be delighted with this revelation which has come to them this afternoon from the Senator from Colorado.

Now, this interruption has developed the fact that the Republican party is the most liberal party in any free country of the world where parties exist, because in essentials there is unity, and in nonessentials liberty. Certainly the debate between the distinguished Senator from Maine and the distinguished Senator from Minnesota indicates that we can differ broadly and yet support this bill. While the Senator from Minnesota expressed his preferences for Japan, with a vigorous statement and straightforwardness characteristic of him, the Senator from Maine, in calling him rigidly to account for expressing in his position as a Senator any preference for one side or the other in this contest, said he was going to conceal his views.

Nobody in this Chamber, however, who heard what the Senator from Maine said has the slightest doubt where his sympathies are. So while the outspoken expression of the Senator from Minnesota is for Japan and the concealed views of the Senator from Maine are plainly for Russia, the Senator from Colorado adopts the position which comes from Democratic teachings and Democratic seekings for issues, without much regard to principles—he is for the side that is going to win, after it has won. [Laughter.]

To return, Mr. President, from the politics of the world to the construction of our Navy, we all know that a navy can not be built in time of war. We all know what supreme folly it is to wait for that. We can raise an emergency army in a month, but it takes five years to build a navy.

I remember being in the Executive Mansion at one time and in Mr. Lincoln's office when a telegram was handed to him which gave the information that a brigadier-general, through foolishness of an extreme sort, had been captured down in Virginia. In his command was a long train of pack wagons and mules. Mr. Lincoln read the dispatch and then took up his pen and said: "With that pen I can make a brigadier-general in a minute, but I can not replace those mules." [Laughter.]

Now, some one, in the exaggeration of American description, has said, while that may be true in the creation of brigadier-generals, it takes forty years to make an Admiral. We must have, if we are to occupy the position which seems to be admitted on all sides to be ours, the ships on which the future Admiral can be trained. Our Navy happily differs from every other navy in the world, because it has developed a democratic tendency. There is no navy except that of the United States where the sailor has the incentive to work because he can reach a commission. But with us the sailor is trained so completely in every branch of the service that if he has the genius, industry, temperance, and ambition he rises through the several grades until he gets his commission.

We all know that during the Spanish-American war—and none better than my friend here, the distinguished Secretary of War at that time and now the Senator from Michigan [Mr. ALGER]—when we endeavored to secure additions to our Navy there were no ships for sale. One of the most interesting competitions in trade which ever occurred was between the United States and Spain in trying to buy war ships. We knocked with a golden fist on the doors of every navy department of every nation, great or small, and the answer of all was: "No matter how much we want your money, it takes us too long to replace a ship, and you can not have it." Finally we discovered there were two building in the shipyards of England for a South American republic. I happened to be in London at the time, and the amount of diplomatic business and trading ability which was brought to bear, each bidding over the other, surpassed anything I had ever seen before in any trade. Of course the Yankee talent for barter came out ahead and we got the ships, but the Spaniard ran us a much closer race in trade than he did on the sea.

We know that in the present war both Japan and Russia, or

Russia and Japan, so as not to place either first [laughter], tried to buy war ships, and in the whole world there was only one available; and I suppose the Senator from Minnesota is pleased that Japan got it.

I agree with what the Senator from Maine has said in regard to our position, but the fact can not be concealed that every man, woman, and child in the United States is lined up on one side or the other in this fight, as Americans always are. When there is a fight on, no matter what it is, whether a battle between nations, or a strife between parties, or a contest between individuals, or baseball or football, or a horse race, Americans instantly take sides; and they are lined up on one side or the other of this contest. But so far as we as a nation are concerned, our position has been expressed by the President of the United States in his proclamation, and we unanimously approve his action. Behind that we individually can say what we like.

Now, in this connection for I had hoped that my friend the Senator from Maryland [Mr. GORMAN] would enlighten us, as the leader of his party, in regard to the views of the opposition upon the naval programme this afternoon, I beg to call attention to a speech which he made on February 4, which created a great deal of comment in this country and interest abroad, as the utterances of the distinguished Senator always do. He said:

Mr. President, an overgrown navy, an unnecessary navy, an unnecessary army, mean what? It is inevitable that the officers, the admirals without number, and captains too many to be counted in the great fleets which are unnecessary for our protection, will find a way to make trouble. It appears to me that the action of the Commander in Chief, the President of the United States, in the occurrences now upon the Orient in moving that unnecessary fleet from the presence and from the very ground where a conflict, if it comes, is likely to occur, was a wise precaution. There was more statesmanship shown in that act than in any other order issued to the Navy. It was done so that we might be kept out of what, as everybody thinks, was the desire of the patriotic and brave commander of that fleet to participate.

We have naval vessels everywhere. Have you not enough now? Everybody will answer "Yes," unless it is true, as was floating around in high naval circles, that we are marching around the globe with a chip on our shoulders, looking for the one great nation that troubles us more than any other in our trade relations, to get up some trouble. Who wants it?

Mr. President, there is nothing in the history of our new Navy, begun by my valued friend, that eminent New Yorker who recently died, and whose death is a loss to the country, William C. Whitney—there is nothing in the history of our Navy under its expansion by Republican Presidents, nothing in that Navy as it appears to-day in all the waters of the globe, which justifies a suggestion that the war ships of the United States are cruising about the world with chips on the shoulders of their admirals, their commodores, and their commanders, seeking trouble. I know of no trouble which we have ever got into by the indiscretion of officers of our Navy. They receive a training which is so perfect, an education which is so complete, they pass so many years in the Naval Academy and then so many years as subordinate officers before reaching supreme command that they have the age for command and the conservatism of age and experience.

No matter how large our Navy, wherever it is it will stand not for war, but for peace. No matter how great our Navy, it will stand not for aggressiveness, but for defense. I do not believe that the admiral of the fleet in the Eastern waters was seeking for trouble or would have involved us in a war with any nation out there or into taking sides with either of the combatants even if he had not been ordered away. We have twenty-four great ships now in those Eastern waters in the neighborhood of the hostilities; and we can absolutely trust their commanders, while preserving the honor, the rights, the trade, and the territories of the United States, not to invite trouble with anybody.

There is no better insurance policy than a navy. I am a believer in insurance. In a free country, where institutions rest upon the people and opportunities are alike for all, every school-house, every church, every asylum, every college, every hospital, every influence of every name, nature, and description which educates the young or looks after those who are invalided and helpless is an insurance policy of a high kind for the safety, the peace, the good citizenship, and the future of the Republic. A large navy, adequate to the needs of the country, which is strong enough both to protect and defend it, is a minister of peace.

In these days, I would say to my friend the Senator from Colorado, with the tremendous results that follow war, no nation is going to seek war unless it is to gain more than it is to lose. We are to be aggressors nowhere. We are to be assailants nowhere. We simply, when we have the power, are to say what our rights are, and we will state them so conservatively that they will not be denied if we have the Navy. But if we have not the Navy, no matter what we assert, it will be denied.

Wars arise in a minute, and, as I said before, it requires years to build a navy. Our Spanish-American war came on overnight almost. Nobody anticipated it. The Japanese-Russian war, each side complain, came on unexpectedly, when they were negotiating. I will tell a little incident, and I do not vouch for its abso-

lute accuracy, though I received it from a distinguished man who was in every way credible, which illustrates how a hair's breadth stands between peace and war.

I was told by this gentleman that when President Cleveland's Venezuelan message arrived in London, one of the strongest and most eminent members of the British cabinet said:

This evinces a disposition and a desire for war. If a war is to occur between Great Britain and the United States and if the feeling of that country is as evidenced in this message, then the time to fight is now. America has no navy that can not be swept by us off the sea in a few months. Her ports have no forts. They have no guns. Her harbors are unprotected by torpedoes or any other appliances. The war would be a calamity beyond any which has ever occurred in history, and would leave both nations harmed to a degree that the imagination can hardly picture; it would set back civilization, but it is the time, if war is inevitable, when Great Britain can fight successfully for a peace with honor, because the Americans will appreciate soon what a sea power is, and when they do the United States will be the most formidable power in the world because of their inaccessibility upon land.

Now, that statement, so I was told, was overruled by the unanimous judgment of his associates and by the unanimous feeling of the British people that they would have good relations with the United States under any circumstances. But the incident shows, if the incident was as narrated by my friend, that there stood just a hair's breadth between peace with honor, as it came in the arbitration which we brought about, and the most disastrous war of modern times, with the United States absolutely unprepared.

My friends the enemy have frequently assailed the President on account of the danger to the country with a great navy in his hands. Through several speeches which have been made there has run that current, that it would be dangerous to place in the hands of the President a naval power such as we will have when the ships now under construction are completed and this programme is carried out.

Mr. President, I want to say that, with all the wonderful accumulation of epithet with which this phrase of unsafety has been sent over the country and repeated in the two Houses of Congress over and over again, there is nothing in the utterances or in the acts of President Roosevelt which justifies the charge. He had the opportunity, with the whole country behind him, to make trouble at the time of the Canadian arbitration, if he had chosen. Suddenly there had been discovered within the disputed territory untold wealth in the mines, and thousands upon thousands of American citizens had rushed up there and accumulated great interests and made large investments.

The whole country stood by the President in maintaining the line we claimed, which brought these rich mines and this valuable territory under our flag. It would have taken but little to have stood firmly for our rights and to have said "We yield not at all," and a less wise and more impulsive and impetuous President would have seen there the opportunity of arousing the enthusiasm of the country for his course. But the President laid that aside. He suggested and secured arbitration.

When the Alaska Boundary Commission—upon which were the very able Secretary of War, the very able Senator from Massachusetts, and the very able ex-Senator from Washington on the one side and the equally able and distinguished commissioners on the other, with that great lawyer and judge, the chief justice of England—met in London, the whole country looked on at this mighty contest of testimony and of law.

We have sent abroad at different times in our history several commissions who discharged their duties with distinction, but none displayed higher judicial temperament and judgment or won more important results for our country than this one on the Alaska boundary.

When the trial was over and the judgment rendered, nothing in modern history so excited in all countries among right-thinking people greater gratification than that event and its example. The country will and the country does owe to President Roosevelt a debt of gratitude for the wisdom and the patriotism with which he initiated and carried to a successful conclusion that arbitration.

Mr. President, nations change rapidly. There is no telling what may occur in the realignment after the closing of the Russian-Japanese war. There is no telling what may be the position of Japan. Thirty-eight years ago I was appointed minister to Japan. You would not think it to look at me. [Laughter.] I did not go, happily for me, but I was confirmed by the Senate and studied the question for months. It took then, thirty-eight years ago, six months to get there. It now takes six weeks. Japan at that time was in the feudal condition of Europe in the twelfth century. She had no navy except junks. Her army was equipped with spears, and bows and arrows, and clad in armor. Thirty-eight years have passed by since the opening of Japan at that time, and she has been studying the methods of Western civilization so completely that she has advanced as far in thirty-eight years as Europe did in six hundred years.

Now she has a representative government, a constitution, a parliament, universal suffrage, colleges and schools, and a free press and railroads, telegraphs, telephones and electric lights, and an army built upon the plan of and quite as efficient as that of Germany, and a navy built upon the plan of and quite as efficient, as far as it goes, as that of Great Britain. She advanced because her people saw if they were to keep up with the rest of the world, now that they had become part of its activities, they must follow the example of the successful nations and get abreast of the best. She saw that while in her isolation she might live in her old way, if she became a power of the world she must have its tools and weapons, intellectual and physical. She saw the necessity of a naval power, and she began ten years ago to develop both her mercantile marine and her navy.

In doing that she secured for herself commerce and markets for her products and a naval power which has enabled her to arouse the wonder of the world for the last few weeks. In the alignment of nations, a government with a possibility of 300,000 troops against a government with 3,000,000 seems to be nowhere, and would be nowhere if the contest was on land. But the command of the sea illustrates what Captain Mahan has said, that it is the sea which will govern the world for the future; and if the command of the sea proves complete, then this war is to result in conditions which will be the surprise of everybody.

Now, as to our ability. We are a nation of 80,000,000 people. According to Mulhall we have one hundred and twenty-seven thousand million dollars of wealth. Great Britain has 42,000,000 people and \$65,000,000,000 of wealth. France has 39,000,000 people and \$54,000,000,000 of wealth. Germany has 56,000,000 people and \$45,000,000,000 of wealth.

The commerce exports and imports of the United States last year were \$2,606,000,000; of Great Britain, \$4,000,000,000; of France, \$1,669,000,000, and of Germany, \$2,453,000,000. Germany is under us by \$150,000,000, and France is under us by nearly one-half.

And yet the cost of the navies now on the sea and in course of construction are \$629,000,000 for Great Britain, with one-half of our population and less than one-half of our accumulated wealth; \$327,000,000 for France, with less than one-half of our population and less than one-half of our accumulated wealth, and \$182,000,000 for Germany, with less than three-quarters of our population and less than one-half of our accumulated wealth.

The actual cost of the vessels in commission and those that will be when the present construction is carried out for the United States, against the figures for these other countries, will be \$182,000,000. The United States now occupies the fifth place, with 294,405 tons, as against 387,874 for Germany, 416,158 for Russia, 576,108 for France, and 1,516,040 for Great Britain. When the vessels of all nations now building are completed, then Great Britain will have 1,867,250 tonnage, France 755,757, and the United States 616,275, and while the United States will be in the third rank, Russia and Germany will be very close to us. There are 723 battle ships, armored cruisers, and other cruisers and scouts above 1,000 tons built and building belonging to all the nations of the world. Of this number the United States has 93.

It has been one of the claims of all writers on the monarchical side that republics, where the people govern, will not have that high appreciation of international relations which maintains the national honor. I have read repeatedly in nearly all English newspapers, when there has been the election of a workingman or an extreme radical, a prediction that if his party got in power Great Britain would lose her place among the nations by cheese-paring policies and legislation on finance and industry which would result in the loss of her prestige and power and the decline of that commerce upon which she depends. But, sir, the United States stands as a living refutation of all those charges. Our appropriations are upon a scale of liberality unequalled in history, but justified by our resources.

We have spent \$450,000,000 for the improvement of our rivers and harbors, \$150,000,000 of it in the last seven years. We have appropriated more in the last ten years for the improvement of our rivers and harbors than the entire cost of our Navy, both that already afloat and that which will come out in the next five years from our shipyards.

Republics are not ungrateful. We are paying \$140,000,000 a year in pensions to the soldiers and their widows of a war which ended forty years ago. We are paying it cheerfully and gratefully. The time is not distant when there will be added \$30,000,000 or \$40,000,000 for a service pension, and then we will be paying to these heroes who saved the country and to their widows a sum greater than the cost of the active army of any great nation in the world, and a sum equal to the present cost of the American Navy, with that added which is now in the shipyards. The cost of the active French army is about \$143,000,000 and of Germany \$129,000,000.

At the same time we have with great liberality built public buildings everywhere. We have established and are establishing forest reservations for the preservation of our magnificent domain of the woods and for the protection of farms from the floods which come from denuded hills. We have wisely appropriated some twenty-odd millions of dollars for expositions which were purely local in their immediate administration, upon the ground, and the wise ground, that by bringing anywhere the products of other countries for the study of our skilled artisans and the exhibition of our skill for other countries we were promoting the best interest of the trade, commerce, employment, and happiness of our people.

Mr. President, I have talked longer than I intended, but I have been helped by so many to extend the time that I think I may be excused. But I trust that I may be permitted to offer a fervent aspiration that after this programme of naval equipment is completed, this programme of naval equipment which, in my judgment, receives the almost unanimous approval of the American people, then we shall enter into some enlightened system, I care not much what it may be, by which we can have a mercantile marine that will save us from paying \$200,000,000 a year to foreign ships to carry the products and the merchandise of America, while we are paying \$100,000,000 a year for a navy which could be happily employed in conjunction with our mercantile marine.

The American flag is seldom seen in any port or on any sea or navigable water of the world except upon a fighting ship. We are in every sense a peaceful and a producing people. We are not a fighting nation except under necessity and provocation and for defense. Our clipper ships over fifty years ago were the fastest vessels afloat, models for other nations, and carried 60 per cent of our commerce. Now only 8 per cent goes under the American flag and 92 per cent in foreign vessels. I look forward hopefully to a near future when, by the adoption of a wise and patriotic policy, an American mercantile marine will reverse these humiliating conditions and bring 92 per cent of our tonnage under our flag, when \$100,000,000 spent upon our Navy annually will have an offset in the transfer of two hundred millions per annum, now paid to alien shipowners for the carriage of our trade, to an American fleet to find its stimulating way into every channel of our internal commerce and every department of our industries.

I want the world to know that we are a commercial nation by becoming familiar with the flag of the United States upon steamers and sailing vessels carrying our products and the exchange of exports and imports. I want our flag, as an emblem of peace, of expanding commercial relations, and of prosperity, to be on every sea and in every port in the world. [Applause in the galleries.]

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Applause is not permitted under the rules of the Senate. It must not be repeated.

Mr. GORMAN. Mr. President, I shall not detain the Senate very long, because I am not in a condition to do so, and have no desire to weary the Senate. I wish, however, to congratulate the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] in charge of this great bill upon the distinguished services he has rendered in connection with the construction of the new Navy. It has been my good fortune to have been associated with that Senator for eighteen years in the consideration of bills making appropriations for the support of the Navy, and during that whole period, with the exception of one Congress, the party to which he belongs has been in the majority in this body. But, sir, the construction of the new Navy has not been a political matter, as Senators on both sides of this Chamber have always favored liberal appropriations for a navy of sufficient size for our country's needs.

After the close of the civil war the Navy was permitted to deteriorate, and the party to which I belong made its condition a subject of political discussion. Finally, in 1881, the pressing need of appropriate vessels was so apparent that Hon. William H. Hunt, the then Secretary of the Navy, assembled a board of officers, known as the "advisory board," to consider and recommend a scheme for a modern navy, as all patriotic Americans desired a navy of which we might be proud and sufficient to protect our interests at home and abroad.

Following Secretary Hunt came another distinguished Secretary of the Navy, Secretary Chandler, under whose immediate administration the first three ironclads for the new Navy were constructed. At that time there was but a single man of the genius, enterprise, and foresight to provide a shipyard at which they could be built, and even then political feeling had run so high, the Navy having been for so long a period the football of party, that Mr. Roach was almost driven to bankruptcy.

The Administration of President Cleveland followed, and Hon. William C. Whitney, so feelingly referred to by the Senator who has just spoken, accepted the portfolio of Secretary of the Navy. We are all familiar with the patriotic and distinguished services he performed during the time he presided over the Navy Department. A man of tremendous intellectual force, of vast compre-

hension, with executive ability of the highest order, he devoted all his energies to the great work under his charge, and we can not pay him a tribute worthy of his genius. When Mr. Whitney found the party on the other side of this Chamber in the majority, it did not require a second appeal to the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE], in charge of the naval appropriation bill, or the Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON], or other distinguished Republicans to unite with those of us on this side and provide for the construction of a navy under a plan carefully considered and well devised. During the Administration of President Harrison, which followed, and up to this hour, so far as I know, party lines have never divided us upon the question of proper appropriations for the naval service.

But, Mr. President, there have been on both sides careful inquiry, thoughtful consideration, and frank criticisms. At one time we stayed the hands of the Administration when we believed it had gone too far in the construction, too rapidly for a healthy increase, and I did not hesitate to criticize the Democratic Secretary who failed to recommend sufficient ships, in my judgment. At another time I aided and we succeeded in preventing him from securing the authority of Congress to construct too many ships.

Such is my position to-day. And I think, Mr. President, that the distinguished Secretary of the Navy who now controls that Department, for whom I have a high personal regard and whom I knew during his service in Congress, has grown too sensitive, has been imprudent and unwise, because I happened to criticize the rapidity with which this great work goes on, in rushing to a distant city and there charging my action to partisanship and trying to create the impression that the Democratic party is opposed to the Navy. I will state, Mr. President, I spoke only for myself, and not for the Democratic party.

But that does not, Mr. President, prevent those of us who believe in a proper Navy, one ample and of sufficient size to protect all our interests, from saying to the Department, "You have gone too far," or from saying to the whole Administration, "You have advanced too rapidly; there is no necessity for it, in our judgment."

The executive branch of the Government must be brought to realize that it was intended by the framers of this Government that the representatives of the people and the Representatives from the States in this body should determine how much money is to be expended for war purposes as well as to declare war. It is for the Executive Departments to recommend; but the judgment is here, and it is placed here by the organic law. If I may say so, and I think it entirely proper, the executive officers of the Government would serve their country better if they attended to the details of their offices and abstained from criticisms of Senators and Members of the House.

Now, Mr. President, what was the scheme upon which we entered? It was for the construction of seventy ships for the whole American Navy, the number recommended, after mature consideration, by the most skillful officers of the Government. Twice seventy ships have been constructed, and the expenditure of \$25,000,000 per annum has grown to \$100,000,000, and is soon to be \$150,000,000.

The Senator from New York says it is for peace and commerce that we want this great organization. The fathers and all who preceded us thought otherwise. But then we are coolly informed by the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] that the fathers knew very little of the conditions which confront us and their judgments amount to nothing.

Mr. President, every thoughtful man who has discussed this question in Congress has feared this great armament both on sea and land, and I call attention to the patriotic words of President Garfield, delivered in the House of Representatives in 1878 and repeated and indorsed by Secretary—afterwards Senator—Chandler in his annual report in 1883.

Mr. Garfield said:

The men who created this Constitution also set it in operation and developed their own idea of its character. That idea was unlike any other that then prevailed upon the earth. They made the general welfare of the people the great source and foundation of the common defense. In all nations of the Old World the public defense was provided for by great standing armies, navies, and fortified posts, so that the nation might every moment be fully armed against danger from without or turbulence within. Our fathers said: "Though we will use the taxing power to maintain a small army and navy, sufficient to keep alive the knowledge of war, yet the main reliance for our defense shall be the intelligence, culture, and skill of our people; a development of our own intellectual and material resources which will enable us to do everything that may be necessary to equip, clothe, and feed ourselves in time of war, and make ourselves intelligent, happy, and prosperous in peace."

President Garfield believed, as the country has always believed, that we should not be classed as one of the great military powers of the world. But now it is coolly stated by the distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts that we have become a rich and progressive nation, with aggressive policies, and therefore our Navy, in point of numbers and effectiveness, must be greater than that of France, greater than that of Russia, superior to that

of Germany, and he bows only to England. I wonder that he and the distinguished Senator from New York hesitated at desiring a navy equal to that of Great Britain.

Mr. CARMACK. It will not be long before they do want it.

Mr. GORMAN. No; it will not take long at the rate at which we are now moving on, unless the people of the country shall return to that old sound Republican and Democratic theory that our power and our prestige do not depend upon the number of guns afloat in the Navy or the number of men who wear uniforms on land.

The expense, Mr. President—"well, what of the expense?" I am quite certain the Senator from New York would say: "We are a rich people. There is no trouble about our paying for a hundred more ships and meeting our annual expenditures on this account, even if they run up to one hundred and fifty million or two hundred million dollars, as the case may be." But who pays these expenditures? The people. Will they submit to it? For the time being it is possible they may, as no man can deny they desire and insist that we shall have a splendid, well-equipped navy, equal to any which exists in the world in respect to appointments. They do not ask for a Republican or a Democratic navy, but an American navy; and when one or more of its officers in command of its men are unfortunately brought into an engagement, they want not only the conduct of the officers praised, but they desire that the men who really fight the battles and who win the victories shall receive their just mead of praise, and not be relegated to the rear because of petty jealousy.

It is the people's Navy. They want it well administered, but they want it administered with due reference to economy. I do not mean parsimony, but economy.

The American people are familiar with our past greatness. They know that every interest has been protected; that the Monroe doctrine has been as safe with a navy which cost \$14,000,000 a year to maintain as it is with one which costs \$100,000,000. They also know when our expenditures reach \$100,000,000 for this one branch of the service in 1904 that there is something radically wrong in its administration.

Mr. President, the increases in our naval expenditures have gone on so rapidly and we have been so prosperous that the amounts of money flowing into the Treasury and out of it have not been considered. They will not be until you reach the time when it becomes necessary to collect more money by taxes either from internal revenue or from the tariff.

Mr. President, I doubt, unless Senators have carefully inquired into this matter, if they know how much we have expended on this account in the last few years. My attention was called to it sharply, as I have no doubt was that of other Senators, by the statement of a distinguished gentleman in another branch of Congress who has a right to speak as to appropriations. He called the attention of Members of another body and the attention of all of us here in the Senate to the fact that in the present condition of the revenues we must proceed with great care in the appropriations made or otherwise there would be a deficit.

The gentleman referred to, Hon. JAMES A. HEMENWAY, chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, in a speech delivered on January 26 last said:

Mr. Chairman, before referring to the provisions of the bill which I bring before the House, I want to call attention to the condition of the Treasury of the United States. It is well in the affairs of government as well as private affairs to take occasionally an account of stock and see "where we are at."

In view of different statements made by Members of this Congress in which legislation is suggested upon the ground that we have a large surplus in the Treasury, I think it my duty to call the attention of the House and of the country to a real problem that we are called upon to solve. It is this: How can we reduce the estimated expenses of the Government for the ensuing fiscal year \$42,000,000?

The total estimates submitted at the beginning of this session for ordinary expenses, exclusive of \$56,500,000 required to meet the sinking fund, amount to \$77,474,206.79.

In addition, more than ten millions in the nature of supplemental estimates have come to the Committee on Appropriations by reference of the House. Those that have gone to other committees and still more that will follow, that will come to Congress before the session closes, will surely increase that sum at least \$15,000,000. The arbitrary cut made in the engineer's estimates for contract work on rivers and harbors, which will probably not be sustained if the contract obligations are met, amounts to \$4,843,716. Adding these sums to the original estimates makes a grand total of \$747,317,922.79.

The total revenues are estimated by the Secretary of the Treasury for the fiscal year beginning July 1 next at \$704,472,000.72. Estimates in excess of the probable total revenues, \$42,845,922.07.

His action in cautioning us was wise and proper, and upon that statement this discussion began.

I submit to Senators on the other side who have tried to give this debate a party turn that they will not succeed. We on this side will join with the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations and aid him to reduce the expenditures of this Government. They have never been greater in the history of the country than they are now in the matter of preparation for war. The expenditures provided for in this bill for the pay of officers and the amount included for ships are greater than the entire amount expended in any one year of Mr. Lincoln's Administration, when

we had to create a navy which was sufficient to blockade every port from the Potomac to the Gulf.

The sum of \$122,000,000 in 1864 included all the naval expenditures, as well as the money used to purchase ships, and we were then purchasing vessels of any kind we could secure.

Let me read to Senators a statement compiled from the appropriation bills, so that we may see how rapidly our appropriations for the Navy have increased since the first Administration of Mr. Cleveland:

Appropriations for the Navy.

First Cleveland Administration, fiscal years 1886-1889:	
1886	\$15,070,837.95
1887	16,489,907.20
1888	25,767,348.19
1889	19,942,835.35
Total	77,270,928.69
Estimated average population for the 4 years	59,336,750
Appropriations per capita for the 4-year period	\$1.30+
Harrison Administration, fiscal years 1890-1893:	
1890	\$21,692,510.27
1891	24,136,035.53
1892	32,541,654.78
1893	23,543,385.00
Total	101,913,585.58
Estimated average population for the 4 years	64,475,312
Appropriations per capita for the 4-year period	\$1.58+
Second Cleveland Administration, fiscal years 1894-1897:	
1894	\$22,104,061.88
1895	25,327,126.72
1896	29,416,245.31
1897	30,562,680.95
Total	107,410,094.86
Estimated average population for the 4 years	60,603,000
Appropriations per capita for the 4-year period	\$1.54+
First McKinley Administration, fiscal years 1898-1901:	
1898	\$33,003,234.19
1899	56,028,783.68
1900	48,089,969.58
1901	65,140,916.67
Total	202,242,904.12
Estimated average population for the 4 years	75,303,847
Appropriations per capita for the 4-year period	\$2.68+
Second McKinley-Roosevelt Administration, fiscal years 1902-1905:	
1902	\$78,101,791.00
1903	78,856,363.13
1904	81,876,791.43
1905 (as reported to the House)	96,338,038.94
Total	335,172,984.50
Estimated average population for the 4 years	81,037,500
Appropriations per capita for the 4-year period	\$4.13+

Mr. President, no appropriations, except those for the Army, compare in their increase with this naval appropriation, and it is evidently intended to make our Navy the second in the world. Is it not time to consider this matter? Probably nothing can be accomplished now, but I desire to call attention to it, so that this subject may be dealt with hereafter.

Think of it, Mr. President! The total expenditures for the Navy from 1860 to 1860, inclusive—the ten years which included the period of the great civil war—were \$458,000,000. The following period of ten years, from 1870 to 1879, inclusive, they ran down to \$204,000,000, making a total for twenty years, from 1860 to 1879, of \$662,000,000. From the Administration of President Harrison to 1905 (pending bill included), a period of sixteen years, we will have expended \$746,000,000, or \$84,000,000 more than were expended for the twenty years which included the civil war.

But this taken by itself does not begin to give a correct idea of all we have expended for army and for naval purposes and for fortifications. We have inaugurated a system of fortifying the coasts at every great harbor in the United States. The necessity for this was brought sharply to the attention of the country, and more sharply than by any other by Mr. Tilden, who was probably the greatest statesman of the Democratic party in my time. He called attention to the necessity of fortifying the coasts of the United States at a time when we had not facilities here to make a gun of respectable caliber, and we then began our system of fortifications.

The following tables show the total appropriations on account of the Army, Navy, and fortifications from the first Administration of Mr. Cleveland to the period covered by the pending bill:

Appropriations for the Army, Navy, and fortifications.

First Cleveland Administration, fiscal years 1886-1889:	
Army	\$95,963,128.40
Navy	77,270,928.69
Fortifications	4,697,000.00
Total	177,931,057.09
Estimated average population for the 4 years	59,336,750
Appropriations per capita for the 4-year period	\$2.99

Harrison's Administration, fiscal years 1890-1893:	
Army	\$97,445,116.54
Navy	101,913,585.58
Fortifications	11,975,808.00
Total	211,334,510.11
Estimated average population for the 4 years	64,475,312
Appropriations per capita for the 4-year period	\$3.27
Second Cleveland Administration, fiscal years 1894-1897:	
Army	\$94,349,535.28
Navy	107,410,094.36
Fortifications	13,919,504.50
Total	215,679,134.14
Estimated average population for the 4 years	69,603,000
Appropriations per capita for the 4-year period	\$3.09
First McKinley Administration, fiscal years 1898-1901:	
Army	\$240,973,035.91
Navy	202,342,904.12
Fortifications	31,183,165.00
Total	474,499,105.03
Estimated average population for the 4 years	75,938,847
Appropriations per capita for the 4-year period	\$6.30
Second McKinley-Roosevelt Administration, fiscal years 1902-1905:	
Army (as passed House for 1905)	\$300,442,896.22
Navy (as reported to House for 1905)	335,172,984.50
Fortifications (as passed House for 1905)	28,982,574.22
Total	724,598,454.94
Estimated average population for the 4 years	81,067,500
Appropriations per capita for the 4-year period	\$8.93+
Total army, navy, and fortification appropriations.	
1898-1901 (4 years), first McKinley Administration	\$474,499,105.03
1896-1899 (4 years), first Cleveland Administration	177,931,057.09
Excess	296,568,047.94
1898-1905 (8 years), McKinley-Roosevelt Administrations	1,199,097,559.97
1896-1899, 1894-1897 (8 years), first and second Cleveland Administrations	308,610,191.23
Excess	890,487,368.74

Mr. President, in the aggregate these appropriations reach the tremendous sum of \$1,804,000,000 since the beginning of Mr. Cleveland's first Administration. In addition we appropriated in what are known as "special acts," that had no opposition on either side of the Chamber—the national-defense acts—at the time of the war with Spain, three hundred and fifty-odd million dollars more, placing \$50,000,000 of that amount—yes, nearly \$80,000,000—in the hands of the executive branch of the Government without specification as to how it should be spent to protect the honor, the interest, and the safety of the country. Part of it was spent for the Navy, and that is not included in the figures to which I have referred, part of it was spent for the Army, and part of it for the purchase of the two ships alluded to by the Senator from New York, which were bought in an hour when there was anything but well-balanced consideration in the Navy Department and which never reached this country until after the close of the Spanish war. Thus about \$2,154,000,000 has been appropriated for these three purposes within the last twenty years. Has this money been wisely expended, Mr. President?

The report of the Secretary of the Navy informs us that he wants all the ships in commission and thoroughly manned. There are more sailors now in the Navy during a time of peace than there have been at any time during the history of this country.

We have now a naval force, including the marines, equal to the whole Army of the United States immediately after the close of the Mexican war. The Secretary of the Navy desires these ships to be all in commission, for he says, "Why give me battle ships unless you give me men to man them, and the way to train sailors is to put them into active service in the Navy." These ships must be sent from one end of our country to the other and all over the world. What is going to be the cost, Mr. Secretary? Half a million dollars a year to run each battle ship, it is said by the report. Add to it the depreciation of wear and tear, and it will make nearly a million dollars a year for every battle ship that is in commission. In other words, we will have to spend nearly the first cost of the ship on the machinery to keep it in repair for twenty years.

I do not see any necessity for it. If there were any necessity for it, if war were imminent, if it were to protect our commerce threatened by any other navy on the face of the earth, who would consider dollars? We would give the Secretary of the Navy and the Administration all they could spend. We have not even inquired whether the money voted for the Navy has been spent lavishly or imprudently, but the country knows and appreciates the situation, as we must.

These millions, these billions that have been poured out by Congress with so lavish a hand, have tended to demoralization. Extravagance is in the very atmosphere. A war with Spain, that lasted in fact but a few days of actual conflict, has cost us, Mr. President, a billion of money.

Well, it is said we have entered upon a new policy. That is true. We now have colonies, as was frankly admitted by the Senator from New York, and to stop would be to recede in a way disagreeable to those who inaugurated the system. Mr. President, I opposed this policy when the question of acquiring those distant lands was before this body. I do not speak of naval stations or coaling stations, as they are necessary in every sea, but I considered the acquisition of islands, thousands of miles distant from our shores, and the governing of their eight or ten millions of inhabitants, as the most expensive and serious undertaking upon which we had ever entered, and productive of dire consequences.

The money it has cost we can afford to lose; but I fear from the intimation we get from the Senator from New York, who speaks so eloquently and by such authority, that when this great naval power of ours shall have been made greater than that of any other nation, except Great Britain, we will not stop in the acquisition of more colonies.

I have myself no sympathy whatever with any movement which would involve us with the great powers that are engaged in war in the Far East or those whose interests are in China. I still adhere to the old-fashioned doctrine of the fathers. No alliance whatever do I want with any of those nations. England, Russia, and Japan may divide China and carve it up among themselves; but no matter who happens to control those governments they can never prevent the American people from acquiring their share of the commerce of the world if we stand aloof, as we have done for one hundred and twenty-five years, and let it be known that our Navy or Army will not be used in the affairs of other nations.

Mr. President, we should provide a sufficient navy to protect this continent and to look after our trade and commerce in every sea of the world. Why, sir, a single battle ship or armored cruiser of to-day has greater power than all the fleet that was commanded by Perry when he opened Japan to the world.

It did not take many guns to open the ports of Japan. Commodore Perry, on his mission, was accompanied by a distinguished citizen of my State as the commissioner, and the dawn of the greatness and success of Japan began from that hour. It was not the fear of our guns, but it was because the Japanese knew that they were dealing with a nation that had no design upon their Government. The opening of Japan, their relations with the outer world, their education, and all the great improvements they have made are due to the impetus received from America.

With China, Mr. President, we have dealt differently. In our anxiety for the commerce of that great Empire we have made treaties and then have abrogated them at will and treated her as we have treated no other nation on the earth. But on one occasion, in the Boxer uprising, the Administration, in its wisdom and broad statesmanship, took part and tried to check the hands of the other powers in demanding excessive indemnity from that nation. That wise and just action has not only been universally commended, but it has greatly advanced our commercial interests.

Mr. President, fair dealing and noninterference with the governments of the East is the policy of our country; and it will do more to strengthen our trade and increase our commerce than all the ships that can be built in the next twenty years.

Mr. President, it resolves itself finally to the question, Can we afford, from a financial standpoint, to go on with these vast expenditures? This year or next year, if a deficit arises, as is intimated by the chairman of a great committee, who belongs to the Republican party, it can be met, but the turning point will have been reached in the great policy that is now being discussed.

I thank the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE], who has done so much to build up the Navy, for permitting debate to go on here and giving us the frank statements he has made, thus bringing this question to the attention of the country. In the face of the approaching election the policy of the party in power can not be changed.

Mr. President, this bill will pass, with all the increase of ships and men therein provided. When the party exigency has passed, I hope and believe that we shall determine the question of the size of the Navy without regard to party lines, as partisanship ought not to enter into the consideration of this subject. We all take pride in a navy composed of ships equal to any that float and manned by officers and crews superior to any—a navy sufficient to protect every American interest at home and abroad, but not one so large as to create the impression that we are striving to dominate political affairs in other portions of the earth.

Mr. CARMACK. Mr. President, I am only going to claim the attention of the Senate for a very few minutes. I listened with a great deal of admiration to the speech of the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. DEPEW]. Of course, I shall not undertake any elaborate reply to that speech, but will address just a few remarks to one or two features of it.

The Senator dwelt upon the vast commercial importance of the

Philippine Islands to the United States, and he denied with great earnestness that the possession of that country would be a source of military weakness or a military burden to the United States. That is one view of the question, Mr. President, and I do not know anyone who can state it better than the distinguished Senator from New York.

There is another view of the question, once expressed by a distinguished citizen of New York, one Chauncey Depew. I will leave the Senate to decide which of these two views ought to prevail. I undertook a day or two ago to get up a debate between the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. SPOONER] and the Senator from New York. I failed in that. I hope now I can get up a debate where the two opponents will be exactly equal in wit, logic, and power of argument.

The statement made by the Senator's distinguished relative is as follows:

If we should keep the Philippine Islands, we should reverse the traditions of this Government from its foundation. We should open up a new line of policy. It would mean the establishment of the military government over possibly 10,000,000 people 6,000 miles away from us. It would mean the increase of our Navy to the proportions of the navies of Europe. It would mean the increase of our Army to 150,000, more likely to 200,000 men. It would mean the increase of our annual expenditures to double what they are now.

The Senator then went on to say that the increase of taxes would be felt in the homes of the country, and he said that the Federal tax collector would become a familiar official to the American people. One result of this policy, he declared, would be a "centralization of power far beyond what the old Federalists ever dreamed of."

He added:

You can not have empire without all its attributes, and that means a practical revolution of our form of government and an abandonment of the belief which the fathers held when they established this Government in 1776.

Mr. DEPEW. Will the Senator allow me?

Mr. CARMACK. With pleasure.

Mr. DEPEW. I am glad you read those utterances of mine made many years ago.

Mr. CARMACK. Your relative is dead now, I understand.

Mr. DEPEW. That Chauncey Depew is dead. I knew nothing about the Philippines at that time, and I was not then a Senator. I was simply a New Yorker making speeches every night without much thought, and that was one of them.

I was born a Democrat, and continued so until after I had received a collegiate education. [Laughter.]

Mr. CARMACK. Does the Senator say he was born a Democrat?

Mr. DEPEW. I was born a Democrat. My father was a Democrat—a very rigid one—and, as I say, after I received a collegiate education and had some contact with the world and saw the necessities of the country I became a Republican. [Laughter.] But it so happens that my first impressions are always Democratic. [Laughter.] When I made that speech it was a first Democratic impression. When I studied the question I changed my views.

When Daniel Webster—and I am not comparing myself to Daniel Webster, except to follow him as an example, and a long way off—entered Congress he came here a free trader. After he had been here long enough he became educated into a protectionist. When he was taken to task for a great protection speech by having quoted to him his free-trade views, he remarked that only wise men change their opinions. [Laughter.]

Mr. CARMACK. The Senator from New York says he used to be a Democrat. I heard of a distinguished man once who made a like statement, and his competitor replied to it by saying: "So Satan, when he trod the burning marl of hell, boasted that he, too, was once an angel of light." [Laughter.]

The Senator says that when he made that speech he was just talking; that he had not thought. I think, Mr. President, the difference between the Senator's situation then and now, if I may be permitted to say so, is that at that time he was not a member of this body; that he was speaking simply as a patriot, and that he had not then taken a case as a criminal lawyer to defend the policy of the Republican party. I think the Senator's prophecy made in that speech is in line with what he has said here to-day when he warned us, in effect, that we must get ready to take part not only in European, but in oriental politics, and that we must be ready and have a sufficient navy to enable us to engage in the great war which some people think is pending over the division of China. I say that is in line with the warning which the gentleman gave, or his distinguished relative gave, in 1898.

Mr. President, I do not agree with the Senator upon that. If there is to be any great war over oriental questions between the nations of Europe, it would be to our advantage to keep out of that war. While they are destroying each other, wiping each other's commerce from the sea, we would seize and hold the commerce and the carrying trade of the world.

I do not agree with the Senator either in his belief that henceforth we must look—

Mr. DEPEW. May I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. CARMACK. Certainly.

Mr. DEPEW. Where would we get the ships, as we have none now, to do the carrying trade of the world, as long as the Senator's party will not let us have the ships?

Mr. CARMACK. Oh, Mr. President, "the Senator's party" is trying to give you the ships. If you had the good old Democratic policy of free ships you would have had them long ago, and you will have the ships whenever it pays to build ships. The time is coming, and is now at hand, when American capital is ready to go into the building of ships for our merchant marine. The distinguished Senator from Maine [Mr. FRYE] who presides over this body, in a speech upon the ship-subsidy bill, gave as one reason why American capital had not been invested in building American ships the fact that it had been so much employed in building railroads and developing the internal industries of the country that it had not cared to seek investment along that line.

Now that the country has developed in that respect, that railroads have been built all over the country, American capital is ready to go into the building up of a great merchant marine, and if you will just let American shipbuilders know, once for all, that they are not going to get any subsidy, they will at once proceed so to invest their money.

As I was saying, I think the Senator from New York is very much mistaken if he thinks the hope of extending our foreign commerce lies in the Orient. I think the hope of a foreign commerce would be a very poor hope indeed if we had to depend upon that. We have heard a great deal about the vast possibilities of our commerce in China and Japan and India. Mr. President, the 400,000,000 people in China buy from all the world just about what the 5,000,000 people in Canada do. That is the kind of trade you are to get in these oriental countries. If we could sell to the people of China one-half of all the goods they buy from all the world, it would be just about what we are now selling to the 5,000,000 people in Canada. The imports of India amount only to about \$250,000,000 per annum; the imports of Japan to about \$125,000,000 or \$130,000,000. People who have a low standard of living, people who work, like the people of India do, for 4 or 5 or 6 cents a day, are never going to become great purchasers of American goods. That is India after it has been one hundred and fifty years under British rule.

Mr. President, I will say furthermore that I agree with what was said by the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] with respect to Russia and Japan. Like that Senator, I do not care to take any part. I intend to make a proclamation of neutrality and to live up to it. But I am tired of hearing people say it is to the interest of the United States that Japan shall prevail in that conflict. Japan is an aggressive, ambitious nation, a progressive nation in one sense, but it is not a nation built upon the model of our western peoples or our western country, and if China falls under the dominion of Japan, and that great country is organized with the genius and the progressive talent of the Japanese, its vast internal resources developed, and its 400,000,000 people organized on such a military system as Japan could organize, it is a very serious question whether or not this country or the countries of Europe, for that matter, would derive any advantage from it.

Mr. President, there is just one other little matter to which I wish to call the attention of the Senate in reference to the pending bill. There are many items of naval expenditure so covered up in the appropriation bill that they are not visible to the naked eye. A naval appropriation bill is intended to be, or at least is supposed to be, an appropriation of public money for public purposes, for the purpose of strengthening and maintaining the American Navy.

Now, it ought to be plain, Mr. President, and it ought to require no argument to show, that the expenditure of money for the maintenance of a pleasure yacht for any individual, from the highest to the lowest, is not a naval purpose, and it is not a governmental purpose.

I wish to read in this connection a statement, as follows:

Refurnishing the U. S. S. <i>Mayflower</i> for use as the President's yacht.	\$100,000
Cost of refitting and repairing the <i>Mayflower</i> in 1902 and 1903 for the President's use	65,000
Estimated cost of repairs this year	30,000
Cost of keeping the <i>Mayflower</i> and the <i>Sylph</i> at the disposition of Mr. Roosevelt in 1902 and 1903	60,000
Estimated cost of keeping the two ships in readiness for a Presidential call this summer	90,000

The total is about \$345,000. It is not important as an item of expense: it is a very modest item compared with the total appropriation carried in this bill, but it is important from the standpoint that it is a misappropriation of public money. Where does the President get any authority to convert a naval vessel of the United States into a private pleasure yacht for his own use and benefit? He is Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, but because he is Commander in Chief of the Army that does not give him the right to take all the cavalry horses of the United States and put them in his own stables and use them to draw his own carriages; and likewise because he is Commander in Chief

of the Navy it does not give him the right to convert a naval vessel of the United States, purchased or constructed for naval purposes, into a private yacht for the private use of himself and his family.

Mr. President, it is simply a question of *meum et tuum*. The naval vessels of the United States belong to the Government and the people of the United States. They are not the goods and chattels of any man who may happen to be President at the time. The President may find or invent laws never heard of before to justify the seizure of the territory of another country, but there is no "law of international eminent domain" and there is no "mandate of civilization" which justify him in seizing and using the property of this Government and of the people of the United States for his own use.

I say it is not a matter of much consequence, so far as the amount of money expended is concerned, but the principle involved is an important one. Naval vessels of the United States ought to be used for naval purposes. Every Senator on this floor has as much right to have a naval vessel converted into a pleasure yacht for his exclusive use and benefit as the President of the United States has. I do not think the President intended anything wrong; I do not think he had the remotest idea of any impropriety in this act; but it is simply because he lacks the sense of responsibility and the sense of law. He is using the property of the United States and has converted it to his own use and benefit.

Mr. BACON. I wish to ask the Senator from Maine one or two questions. It will not occupy very much time. I notice at the bottom of page 34 of the bill this item:

Naval station, Guantanamo, Cuba: Dry dock, \$200,000.

The question I wish to ask the Senator from Maine is what evidence has been given to the Senate—I presume, of course, if the committee has it the Senate has it also—of the fact that the port of Guantanamo has been ceded to this Government? Did the Senator from Maine hear the question I propounded?

Mr. HALE. Yes; I was looking for the papers. Has the Senator concluded?

Mr. BACON. I asked the Senator what evidence has been furnished to the Senate or to Congress that the port of Guantanamo in Cuba has been ceded to the United States.

Mr. HALE. I do not know about the technical completion of any act of cession, but that the station has been turned over to the United States, that the United States is in possession, and that it is in a small way going on with its plan of making a naval station, the purpose for which it was acquired, are shown by the hearings before the committee and by the estimates of the Department, which I will say in this matter estimated something more than a million dollars. That amount has been cut down to \$385,000.

Mr. BACON. I am not criticising the amount.

Mr. HALE. No. I was giving the Senator the fact as to what is the condition.

Now, the Senator can tell better than I whether the final interchange has taken place between the two Governments. I do not know. But to all intents and purposes the United States owns Guantanamo, possesses it, is using it, and is in a gradual way building up a naval station.

Mr. BACON. How does the Senator arrive at that conclusion?

Mr. HALE. First, the estimates, and then the hearings.

Mr. BACON. Certainly the Senator does not undertake to say that when territory known to belong to a foreign government is represented as having been ceded to the United States appropriations are to be made upon hearsay or even upon hearings before the committee or upon estimates sent from a Department? The Senator would not contend for either of those as furnishing sufficient evidence to authorize action by Congress in the absence of any official communication to Congress of the fact that there has been a transfer of sovereignty to the United States.

Suppose we should have an estimate sent in by a Department with respect to a part of some Canadian province or for a port in Canada on the Atlantic side, and there should be hearings before a committee, in which it should be said that there had been a cession to the Government of the United States; would the Senator say that that was sufficient evidence upon which to proceed to make an appropriation for the fortification of that port?

Mr. HALE. Now—

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, I am not in doubt as to the attitude of the Senator or the attitude of Congress. I suppose I know about the same as the Senator knows and the same as other Senators know, and the object I have in calling attention to this is to show the attitude which we to-day occupy in relation to this matter.

We know by common newspaper report that there has been some negotiation. Of course we know the fact that in the Platt amendment one condition upon which the Government of the

United States relinquished control of Cuba was that we should have the right to select certain ports in Cuba to be established as naval stations, and we have heard through the newspapers, and doubtless I will say that before the committee, statements have been made that there have been such selections made. But is that the proper information upon which Congress is to act?

Mr. President, if Cuba is an independent country—and we claim that she is—and in recognition of the fact we enter into treaties with her, there is but one way in which there can properly be a cession of any territory of Cuba to the United States, and that is by a treaty entered into in the manner in which the Constitution of the United States says a treaty shall be entered into—through negotiation by the President and by the approval of this body. But we stand here to-day proceeding to legislate with reference to this matter as an accomplished fact, when we have not only failed to have any treaty in this way, but when we have failed to have any official communication whatever to us of the fact that there has been ceded to the United States the port of Guantanamo.

Mr. HALE. Let me say to the Senator that the thing is all brought out fully. The Senator asked what reason I had for assuming that we should appropriate for this naval station. The Secretary of the Navy has gone into it very fully in the hearings before the Naval Committee of the House, all of which is brought out in the public document which has been printed, and he states there just what the situation is. An arrangement has been made by which a perpetual lease is to be given by the Republic of Cuba, if it has not already been given, to the United States, and that possession has been taken in accordance with it. Quite likely Senators on the Foreign Relations Committee know more about what the exact status is as to the interchange of treaties or the actual completion and acceptance of the lease.

Mr. BACON. I will ask the Senator from Maine if he recognizes that as a proper way in which Congress should be informed of such a fact?

Mr. HALE. I think Congress is informed. First, there is the provision of the treaty.

Mr. BACON. What treaty?

Mr. HALE. The Platt amendment.

Mr. BACON. That is not a treaty.

Mr. SPOONER. It is a legislative compact.

Mr. BACON. That is a different matter.

Mr. HALE. If the Senator will allow me—

Mr. BACON. I was replying to the Senator from Wisconsin when I said it was a different matter. I beg pardon.

Mr. HALE. I base it on what appears here by Secretary Moody and the provision—

That to enable the United States to maintain the independence of Cuba and to protect the people thereof, as well as for its own defense, the Government of Cuba will sell or lease to the United States lands necessary for coaling or naval stations at certain points to be agreed upon with the President of the United States.

I suppose the Senator from Massachusetts and the Senator from Wisconsin, as members of the Committee on Foreign Relations and as having more direct communication with the Secretary of State, can tell just how far it has proceeded. But that it has proceeded far enough that we have taken possession to go on and occupy and build a naval station there I have no question whatever.

Mr. BACON. Of course we all know the facts the Senator is stating. I suppose I have the same information that the Senator from Massachusetts and the Senator from Wisconsin have, so far as information has been communicated to the Committee on Foreign Relations. I am not in any manner disputing the fact that these things are stated, and that they have been brought to our attention in that way, but the point to which I am calling attention is that whatever we may know about it in our private capacity or in our official capacity, gathered from newspaper reports or other statements sent to us by departmental officers or as members of a committee, those are not matters of communication to Congress.

There are two suggestions which I make. The first is that, in my opinion, if there had been any cession, if there had been any sale or any lease, that is the subject-matter of a treaty. What the Senator has read is an agreement to make it a treaty.

Mr. HALE. A lease.

Mr. BACON. I am speaking of the Platt amendment. The Platt amendment, under which this is made, is a specific agreement that a treaty will be made to carry it into effect.

Mr. SPOONER. No; not at all.

Mr. HALE. No; it is not. It does not depend upon that. This provides that there shall be either a sale or a lease, and it is left to the President.

Mr. BACON. I am not speaking of that. The Platt amendment stipulated that it should be embodied in a permanent treaty.

Mr. SPOONER. That is another thing.

Mr. BACON. No, if the Senator will pardon me, it is not.
 Mr. LODGE. The Platt amendment is the law of the land. There is no doubt about that. It is embodied in a law passed by Congress. That law provided that in regard to the Isle of Pines we should proceed by treaty; that in regard to a further assurance we should make a treaty, but that in regard to lands for coaling or naval stations Cuba should sell or lease them to us, and it became the duty of the President—

Mr. BACON. The Senator will allow me—
 Mr. LODGE. The Senator from Georgia will allow me to finish my sentence?

Mr. BACON. Yes; of course.
 Mr. LODGE. It became the duty of the President to make an agreement, and that agreement has been made.

Mr. BACON. How does the Senator know it?
 Mr. LODGE. It is so stated by the Secretary of the Navy—
 Mr. BACON. Oh!

Mr. LODGE. A person of authority.
 Mr. BACON. The Secretary of the Navy—
 Mr. LODGE. Wait a moment—

Mr. BACON. Is not the officer to communicate that fact to us.
 Mr. HALE. If the Senator will allow me, I sent for the papers, and I have a copy of the lease and the statement of the different stages it has gone through. It was signed at Habana June 2, 1903; approved by the President October 2, 1903; ratified by the President of Cuba August 17, 1903; ratifications exchanged at Washington October 6. It is just as complete a document as a deed of warranty when it passes from the grantor to the grantee and has been recorded in the office of the register of deeds.

Mr. LODGE. And it has been transmitted to Congress by the President.

Mr. BACON. The point I am making is that it has never been officially communicated to the Senate or to Congress.

Mr. LODGE. It has been. It is a Senate document officially transmitted.

Mr. BACON. Transmitted by whom?
 Mr. HALE. Transmitted from the Executive.

Mr. BACON. By the President?
 Mr. LODGE. Transmitted by the President of the United States.

Mr. BACON. I did not see that. That is exactly the information I have been trying to get from the Senator from Maine all the time. I asked him in the beginning where he got the information, and he has been insisting that he got it from the Secretary.

Mr. HALE (reading):
 I, Theodore Roosevelt, President of the United States of America, having seen and considered the foregoing lease, do hereby approve the same, by virtue of the authority conferred by the seventh of the provisions defining the relations which are to exist between the United States and Cuba, contained in the act of Congress approved March 2, 1901, entitled "An act making appropriation for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1902."

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

WASHINGTON, October 2, 1903.
 Transmitted to Congress.

Mr. BACON. Transmitted by whom?
 Mr. SPOONER. By whom could it be transmitted?

Mr. BACON. It could be transmitted by a departmental officer. I want to know if the President ever sent a communication to Congress on the subject.

Mr. HALE. He has.
 Mr. BACON. Please show me the document in which he sent it.

Mr. HALE. Here it is.
 Mr. BACON. If the Senator had stated in the beginning that the President had transmitted it, he would have answered my inquiry. But I do not still understand—

Mr. HALE. He did not bring it down here himself. He never does that. He sends one thing to us through the Navy Department and he sends another through the Treasury Department, but that—

Mr. BACON. I will follow the example of my distinguished friend [Mr. HALE] in his lecture this afternoon to the Senator from Minnesota in calling his attention to the difference in the dictionary between the definition of the word "transmit" and the word "bring." I used the word "transmit," and if the Senator will refer to the dictionary he will see that that does not mean the same as "bring." I said "transmit," not "bring."

Mr. HALE. He has transmitted it.

Mr. BACON. This is the report of the Secretary of the Navy, and if there has been any message sent to the Senate or Congress—

Mr. LODGE. It is in the annual message.

Mr. FORAKER. How do we get the report of the Secretary of the Navy? Was it not transmitted by the President of the United States? If the Senator will look at the message he will see that the President transmits the reports of all the Secretaries. That is how we get them there.

Mr. HALE. I am sorry the Senator from Georgia, who is an old Senator, does not know more about the vehicle by which we get things from the Departments. They are all—

Mr. BACON. That is not the question at all.
 Mr. HALE. That is this question.

Mr. BACON. No, I beg the Senator's pardon, it is not.
 Mr. HALE. If the Senator will allow me, I think he is making a very fine point here on the matter of transmittal. The President sends in his annual message. With that he sends in the reports of the Secretaries. They are not made to us. They are made to him.

Mr. ALLISON. Except the report of the Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. HALE. Except the report of the Secretary of the Treasury. The reports of all the other Departments are made to the President and he transmits them; and among the papers that he has transmitted is this report of the Secretary of the Navy, which recites the existing facts that the lease is based upon the law, that it has been entered upon and signed by all parties, that it has been ratified in Cuba by the Government there, that the President has ratified it here, and it is now in force. If the Senator can find any more exhaustive method of transmitting a thing and of showing that it has been transmitted than I have shown here, then he has more ingenuity and more knowledge than I have. I do not know of any better way than what has been disclosed here of transmitting this lease, upon which the appropriation that Congress has made is based.

Mr. SPOONER. There is no other way.
 Mr. HALE. As the Senator from Wisconsin says, I do not know of any other way by which the President could do it. In his special message at the beginning of the session he made this announcement.

Mr. BACON. Now, Mr. President, I come to the main point I had in mind and to which I now call the attention of the Senate. I stated before two propositions. In the first place, that any agreement which had been made between the United States and Cuba was an agreement constituting a treaty which must be ratified by this body before it could be effective. Senators will remember that I mentioned that.

In the second place, I had no information of the manner in which the fact had been communicated to us of any agreement, and I asked the Senator to state in what way he had received that information.

Passing from the point as to whether or not it has been properly communicated to us, the point to which I call the attention of the Senate is that this is a treaty between Cuba and the United States; that it should properly have been sent to this body for ratification, and that in the failure to do so there is simply a continuance and an increase of the habit, not simply of the present Administration, but of the executive department generally under all Administrations, to usurp, if I may not use that term offensively—I will change it to the word encroach—to encroach upon the authority of Congress and upon the Senate, and to absorb that authority to itself.

I have here now in my hand what I have not seen before, and I did not know that it was here until the Senator gave it to me a moment ago. It is what he says is a lease, and I propose to read parts of it, at least, to the Senate, to show that it is a treaty—not only in substance, but in form—executed by those who were delegated with the power to make a treaty, and using the very phraseology which is always used in the case of treaties. And yet it was not sent to this body for its consent, and it is not proposed to send it to this body.

Mr. President, what does the Constitution mean when it says that a treaty may be made by the President of the United States by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, two-thirds consenting thereto? It means that any agreement between two countries which shall have the effect of law shall be one requiring the assent of two-thirds of this body before it shall become law, and it is intended to distinctly take away from the Executive that which belongs or did belong to all the executives of Europe at the time our Constitution was made, the treaty-making power, and to confer it upon the Executive only in conjunction with the Senate.

I will read the beginning of this agreement to show to the Senate that my objection is not a captious one; that it is one of substance. It is upon a par with the President giving a commission to a man as a minister and sending him to a foreign country while the Senate is in session without ever having submitted his name to the Senate for confirmation, if such a thing ever occurred, or sending him even after his name had been submitted by nomination and before he had been confirmed. One is as much without authority of law as the other.

Now, how does this agreement between the United States and Cuba differ from a treaty. Let us see whether or not it is a treaty. First, as to form. It is true it speaks of it as a lease, but you

can not change the substance and character of an instrument by a change of names. If it is an agreement between two countries which is intended to have the effect of law, it is a treaty, and this went through all the forms of a treaty.

The United States of America and the Republic of Cuba being desirous to conclude the conditions of the lease of areas of land and water for the establishment of naval coaling stations in Guantanamo and Bahia Honda, the Republic of Cuba made to the United States by the agreement of February 16-23, 1903, in fulfillment of the provisions of article 7 of the constitutional appendix of the Republic of Cuba, have appointed their plenipotentiaries to that end—

The President of the United States of America, Herbert G. Squiers, envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary in Habana;

And the President of the Republic of Cuba, José M. Garcia Montes, secretary of finance, and acting secretary of state and justice, who, after communicating to each other their respective full powers, found to be in due form, have agreed upon the following articles—

Do Senators, who so often have to pass upon treaties, recognize the phraseology, the ordinary form of parties coming together in behalf of two governments for the purpose of making a treaty? Then it goes on with the enumeration of the different articles, and it winds up as follows:

In witness whereof we, the respective plenipotentiaries, have signed this lease, and hereunto affixed our seals.

Mr. SPOONER. Read that again, please.

Mr. BACON (reading):

In witness whereof—

I am speaking of the signatures of the plenipotentiaries—

In witness whereof we, the respective plenipotentiaries, have signed this lease and hereunto affixed our seals.

Done at Habana, in duplicate in English and Spanish, this 2d day of July, 1903.

H. G. SQUIERS. [SEAL.]
 JOSÉ M. GARCIA MONTES. [SEAL.]

Mr. SPOONER rose.

Mr. BACON. I am not through, but still if the Senator wants to speak on this point I will yield. I wish to call attention to other features of the agreement.

Mr. SPOONER. That is what I was going to ask the Senator to do.

Mr. BACON. I am going to do that because—

Mr. SPOONER. I had never seen it.

Mr. BACON. I never saw it before.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. BACON. Yes, sir; with pleasure, in a moment. I had heard of it, but had never seen it. I think it has never been transmitted. Even if it were a proper document, even if it did not require the approval of Congress, it has not been transmitted to the Senate in the way in which I think it was due to the Senate that it should have been transmitted—by a formal Presidential message. It is true, as the Senator from Maine says, it is here in a departmental report, and that departmental report was transmitted by the President, but that is not a direct communication by the President of the character which is usually employed when important matters are communicated to Congress, upon which they are to take action.

Mr. SPOONER rose.

Mr. BACON. If the Senator will pardon me a moment, I am coming to the features of the agreement.

Mr. SPOONER. Just a moment. The Senator says it was transmitted to Congress, not to the Senate?

Mr. BACON. Yes; I understand that is the case, and so far as that goes it is a mere matter of form. I would be perfectly content to pass by as an inadvertence the manner of transmission; but the point I am troubled about, and which every Senator here ought to be troubled about, and which ought not to be one upon which we divide on party lines, is that this is a treaty and is of no effect until it has been properly transmitted to the Senate and has received the approval of two-thirds of this body.

Now, as to the form, I have already shown that it is in the usual form of treaties made by parties empowered as plenipotentiaries are for the purpose of making treaties, exhibiting to each other their credentials and each agreeing that the other has his authority in due form. Now it goes on. In Article I there is an agreement—but I will read it rather than state the substance:

ARTICLE I.

The United States of America agrees and covenants to pay to the Republic of Cuba the annual sum of \$2,000, in gold coin of the United States, as long as the former shall occupy and use said areas of land by virtue of said agreement.

While that is in pursuance of an agreement to make a lease, it is nevertheless a covenant between two countries, which could only be made by a treaty to be the law of the land.

All private lands and other real property within said areas shall be acquired forthwith by the Republic of Cuba.

The United States of America agrees to furnish to the Republic of Cuba the sums necessary for the purchase of said private lands and properties, and such sums shall be accepted by the Republic of Cuba as advance payment on account of rental due by virtue of said agreement.

ARTICLE II.

The said areas shall be surveyed and their boundaries distinctly marked by permanent fences or inclosures.

The expenses of construction and maintenance of such fences or inclosures shall be borne by the United States.

ARTICLE III.

The United States of America agrees that no person, partnership, or corporation shall be permitted to establish or maintain a commercial, industrial, or other enterprise within said areas.

That certainly is subject-matter of treaty agreement.

Mr. DRYDEN. Was it transmitted to the Senate?

Mr. BACON. No, sir; it was never transmitted to the Senate. I repeat the sentence which I desire certain Senators to hear. That stipulation is a matter of treaty agreement. It is true it grows out of a lease, but it is a stipulation which is to have the effect of law in this country, a binding obligation, and one which can only be made by the treaty-making power. But if there were any doubt about it the next article is one which, it seems to me, puts it beyond the possibility of difference between us about it:

ARTICLE IV.

Fugitives from justice charged with crimes or misdemeanors amenable to Cuban law, taking refuge within said areas, shall be delivered up by the United States authorities on demand by duly authorized Cuban authorities.

Is it possible that any Senators can divide on party lines on a question of that kind, as to whether that is a treaty stipulation, which can only be made by a properly executed and approved treaty? It is an absolute extradition stipulation.

On the other hand—

Mark the other side now—the reciprocal agreement on the part of Cuba—

On the other hand, the Republic of Cuba agrees that fugitives from justice charged with crimes or misdemeanors amenable to United States law, committed within said areas, taking refuge in Cuban territory, shall on demand be delivered up to duly authorized United States authorities.

I do not know whether I should stop to discuss Article IV or not. I am in doubt whether by discussing I should assume that any Senator will for a moment doubt or dispute the proposition that it is a treaty provision. There is a plain reciprocal extradition treaty on the one part, and on the other something that never was conceived of before as possible, except through a treaty properly made and properly consented to by the Senate.

ARTICLE V.

Materials of all kinds, merchandise, stores, and munitions of war imported into said areas for exclusive use and consumption therein shall not be subject to payment of customs duties nor any other fees or charges, and the vessels which may carry same shall not be subject to payment of port, tonnage, anchorage, or other fees, except in case said vessels shall be discharged without the limits of said area; and said vessels shall not be discharged without the limits of said areas otherwise than through a regular port of entry of the Republic of Cuba, when both cargo and vessel shall be subject to all Cuban customs laws and regulations and payment of corresponding duties and fees.

It is further agreed that such materials, merchandise, stores, and munitions of war shall not be transported from said areas into Cuban territory.

ARTICLE VI.

Except as provided in the preceding article, vessels entering into or departing from the bays of Guantanamo and Bahia Honda within the limits of Cuban territory shall be subject exclusively to Cuban laws and authorities, and orders emanating from the latter in all that respects port police, customs, or health, and authorities of the United States shall place no obstacle in the way of entrance and departure of said vessels except in case of a state of war.

ARTICLE VII.

This lease shall be ratified and the ratifications shall be exchanged in the city of Washington within seven months from this date.

In witness whereof, etc.

Then follows the approval of the President:

I, Theodore Roosevelt, President of the United States of America, having seen and considered the foregoing lease, do hereby approve the same, by virtue of the authority conferred by the seventh of the provisions defining the relations which are to exist between the United States and Cuba, contained in the act of Congress approved March 2, 1901, entitled "An act making appropriation for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1902."

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

WASHINGTON, October 2, 1903.

That approval was doubtless made in good faith by the President, but it was none the less an approval which could have no effect to make it law and binding on the United States. The agreement, being essentially and necessarily a treaty, could only become law, binding in its terms and effect, when consented to and advised by two-thirds of the Senate.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. There is another lease—

Mr. McCOMAS. Will the Senator allow me to read just from that reference?

Mr. BACON. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut. I will yield to the Senator from Maryland in a moment.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. There is another lease of a different date, establishing the boundaries, which has nothing in it except the establishment of boundaries.

Mr. BACON. Very well.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. I did not know whether the Senator had that lease.

Mr. BACON. I will be very frank and say to the Senator from Connecticut, and to other Senators, that my object in calling the

attention of the Senate to this matter was not for the purpose of defeating this item of appropriation, because I have the moral certainty of the fact, which has been stated by the Senator from Maine and known to other Senators, as to what has occurred. But, in the first place, I had not the information, and I still do not have it, that we have been properly informed of it; and, in the second place, and more particularly (I might say that without this I should have said nothing), I had heard casually, never having seen this document, that it did contain these provisions, which were provisions which could not possibly be of force, according to my view, unless they had been put into a treaty properly negotiated, submitted to the Senate, and consented to in the way prescribed by the Constitution.

Mr. SPOONER. Will the Senator allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. BACON. Certainly. I yield the floor to the Senator.

Mr. SPOONER. I do not wish to take the floor. I only want to ask the Senator whether he is not of the opinion that this agreement, whatever may be its form, is valid so far as it leases or attempts to lease to the United States a coaling station? If invalid, it must be under those provisions concerning which no authority was conferred, or perhaps would be conferred, upon the President by the Platt amendment. That is the question, and the only question, which has to do with the question of appropriations.

Mr. BACON. My judgment is that while, of course, the agreement would be binding on Cuba from the fact that it was a condition upon which we had surrendered the military control of the island and turned it over to its own people, that fact alone is not one which would authorize that which the Senator spoke of just now as a legislative compact between two nations, so as to take it out of the class known as "treaties." In other words, I do not recognize the fact that Great Britain and the United States can enter into a legislative compact unless that compact is put into the form of a treaty and consented to by the Senate.

I do recognize the fact that Cuba could enter into an agreement with us which would not rise to the dignity of a treaty and not require the formality of a treaty at the time she consented to the Platt amendment, as we call it for purposes of brevity and perfect identity, because she was not then in a condition in which she could make a treaty. Cuba could not make a treaty at the time the Platt amendment was consented to by her, but she could consent to a condition by which she would be put into a position where she could thereafter make a treaty. That fact, I am sure, is recognized by Senators who were not only familiar with the Platt amendment, but were instrumental in devising it and constructing it.

The Platt amendment itself contains a provision which recognizes the very legal status which I have spoken of, that while it would exact this as a condition before the United States would take certain action, Cuba should make the treaty thereafter, when after that change of condition she should have the power to make a treaty.

Now, this lease is executed at the time when Cuba was empowered to make a treaty, and I think that any cession of territory, whether it be a permanent cession accompanied by absolute sovereignty or a temporary cession accompanied by partial sovereignty given by one nation to another, must necessarily be a treaty. The Senator from Connecticut has just pointed out to me that there is another one. Is this the one?

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. I do not think it is there. I have sent for it.

Mr. BACON. I understand from the Senator from Connecticut that there is another paper which has one of these provisions in it.

Mr. CULLOM. There are two papers. I have sent to the committee for those papers to see exactly what they are.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, I hope that what I have presented has relieved me from the imputation, which was plainly made by the Senators on the other side of the Chamber, that I was making a captious objection. I think it is a matter of the gravest moment that this Senate should not in any manner surrender its right to approve or disapprove any agreement between this country and any other country, because any agreement which is to have the effect of law must necessarily be a treaty, and the function of this Senate to advise and consent to such a treaty, or to reject it, is not to be defeated by calling a treaty by some other name.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. SPOONER] asked me a question which I probably have not answered as directly as I should. He asked whether, in so far as this paper is designed to convey a lease to this Government, I consider that effective without the ratification of the Senate, and I do not know that I have answered it concisely.

Therefore I will repeat what I said, much more generally. I think that any agreement by which territory is ceded, either temporarily or permanently, by any government to this Government must necessarily be in its essence and nature and substance a treaty, and should be negotiated in the same way and approved in the same way; and as a member of the Senate it would be my

opinion that that ought to be put in the form of a treaty, and ought to be sent to this Senate and receive its sanction in the manner provided by law.

So far as this particular appropriation is concerned, while it is proper that the matter I have spoken of should be called to the attention of the Senate, it is not my design to move to strike it out. But I do think that we ought never to pass—and I would object if there were a Democrat in the White House as quickly as I would when there is a Republican there—we ought never to pass without protest and resistance anything which looks like an encroachment upon the proper function of the Senate in so solemn a matter as the execution and ratification of a treaty.

Mr. CULLOM. I desire to state that the papers, which are agreements made in reference to these lands, were sent to me in response to a letter from myself to the Secretary of State.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Mr. President, I think perhaps the facts in this case ought clearly to appear.

Mr. BACON. Yes.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. There was a lease made of this Guantanamo property prior to what is called the "lease," to which the Senator from Georgia [Mr. BACON] has alluded. On the 16th of February, 1903, there was an agreement made between the United States of America and the Republic of Cuba. It does not seem to have proceeded along the same lines as the subsequent agreement. There was nothing said in it about plenipotentiaries having been appointed. It referred exclusively to the boundaries of the proposed territory to be leased for a coaling station, and I think, perhaps, to make this entire subject clear, I ought to read that entire agreement or lease. It is as follows:

CEBA COALING AND NAVAL STATIONS.

Agreement between the United States of America and the Republic of Cuba for the lease (subject to terms to be agreed upon by the two Governments) to the United States of lands in Cuba for coaling and naval stations. Signed by the President of Cuba February 16, 1903. Signed by the President of the United States February 23, 1903.

Agreement between the United States of America and the Republic of Cuba for the lease (subject to terms to be agreed upon by the two Governments) in Cuba for coaling and naval stations.

The United States of America and the Republic of Cuba, being desirous to execute fully the provisions of Article VII of the act of Congress approved March 2, 1901, and of Article VII of the appendix to the constitution of the Republic of Cuba promulgated on the 20th of May, 1902, which provide:

"ARTICLE VII. To enable the United States to maintain the independence of Cuba, and to protect the people thereof, as well as for its own defense, the Cuban Government will sell or lease to the United States the lands necessary for coaling or naval stations, at certain specified points, to be agreed upon with the President of the United States"—

have reached an agreement to that end, as follows:

ARTICLE I.

The Republic of Cuba hereby leases to the United States, for the time required for the purposes of coaling and naval stations, the following-described areas of land and water situated in the island of Cuba:

First. In Guantanamo (see Hydrographic Office chart 1857):

From a point on the south coast 4.37 nautical miles to the eastward of Windward Point Light-House, a line running north (true) a distance of 4.25 nautical miles;

From the northern extremity of this line a line running west (true) a distance of 5.87 nautical miles;

From the western extremity of this last line a line running southwest (true) 3.31 nautical miles;

From the southwestern extremity of this last line a line running south (true) to the seacoast.

This lease shall be subject to all the conditions named in Article II of this agreement.

Second. In northwestern Cuba. (See Hydrographic Office Chart 2038.)

In Bahia Honda (see Hydrographic Office Chart 520b) all that land included in the peninsula containing Cerro del Morrillo and Punta del Carenero situated to the westward of a line running south (true) from the north coast at a distance of thirteen hundred yards east (true) from the crest of Cerro del Morrillo and all the adjacent waters touching upon the coast line of the above-described peninsula and including the estuary south of Punta del Carenero with the control of the headwaters as necessary for sanitary and for other purposes;

And in addition all that piece of land and its adjacent waters on the western side of the entrance to Bahia Honda included between shore line and a line running north and south (true) to low-water marks through a point which is west (true), distant 1 nautical mile from Punta del Cayman.

ARTICLE II.

The grant of the foregoing article shall include the right to use and occupy the waters adjacent to said areas of land and water and to improve and deepen the entrances thereto and the anchorages therein and generally to do any and all things necessary to fit the premises for use as coaling or naval stations only, and for no other purpose.

Vessels engaged in the Cuban trade shall have free passage through the waters included within this grant.

ARTICLE III.

While on the one hand the United States recognizes the continuance of the ultimate sovereignty of the Republic of Cuba over the above-described areas of land and water, on the other hand the Republic of Cuba consents that during the period of the occupation by the United States of said areas under the terms of this agreement the United States shall exercise complete jurisdiction and control over and within said areas, with the right to acquire (under conditions to be hereafter agreed upon by the two Governments) for the public purposes of the United States any land or other property therein by purchase or by exercise of eminent domain, with full compensation to the owners thereof.

Done in duplicate at Habana, and signed by the President of the Republic of Cuba the 16th day of February, 1903.

[SEAL.]

T. ESTRADA PALMA.

Signed by the President of the United States the 23d of February, 1903.

[SEAL.]

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

The document which the Senator has read was a "lease to the United States by the Government of Cuba of certain areas of land and water for naval or coaling stations in Guantanamo and Bahia Honda," which was signed at Habana July 2, 1903; approved by the President October 2, 1903; ratified by the President of Cuba August 17, 1903, and ratifications exchanged at Washington October 6, 1903.

Mr. BACON. If the Senator will pardon me, I think the proper status of those papers is this: That the first paper is an entirely proper paper as a protocol; in other words, a preliminary to a treaty. It fixes the status, especially in a case like this, where there is an obligation which Cuba itself could not evade. I think the situation will be made all right if that is recognized as a protocol and is accepted as the document under which this appropriation is proceeding, and if hereafter there should be negotiated and sent to the Senate a subsequent paper as a treaty.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Mr. President, I desire to say that I think there is very great force in the claim of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. BACON] that some of the provisions of the second paper are such as are proper only for a treaty. I think the provisions about the extradition of criminals, customs dues, and tonnage dues are scarcely subjects which can be fairly included within the provisions of a lease; but I do think that under the act of Congress adopted here, and also put in the Cuban constitution, which provided that Cuba would sell or lease to the United States such land for naval or coaling stations as might be agreed upon with the President of the United States, and conferred such powers upon him—such a lease might be executed without sending it to the Senate to be ratified as a treaty. I do not think, however, that provisions which are usually included in treaties should be incorporated into such a lease without its ratification by the Senate.

Mr. CULLOM. I will take the liberty of putting the first paper, which has been read by the Senator from Georgia, in the RECORD.

Mr. BACON. As I have read that paper, it will necessarily go in the RECORD.

Mr. CULLOM. Very well.

Mr. NELSON and Mr. MCCOMAS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON] is recognized.

Mr. MCCOMAS. I thought the Senator from Georgia still had the floor; and I wish him to yield to me for a moment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair understood the Senator from Georgia to yield the floor.

Mr. BACON. I did yield it.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I beg the indulgence of the Senate, although it is rather late, to submit a few observations in reply to some of the statements which were made by the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE].

The Senator said or intimated that I had violated some of the principles of neutrality by calling the attention of the Senate, in a brief way to the fact that our commercial interests were to a large extent in the Orient and were identical with those of Japan, China, and England. The Senator seemed to think that that was a gross breach of the principles of neutrality, but in the same breath, and while taking me to task for that, he called the attention of the Senate to the great danger to us in case Japan should be victorious. He intimated to us—I can not quote his exact language—that Japan was such an ambitious power that, in his opinion, we have more to fear from that country than from any other. I submit to the Senate that if there was any violation of the principles of neutrality on my part, I think the Senator from Maine violated them as strongly on his side.

I want to say further, Mr. President, that in the remarks I made I did not intend to imply that our Government should take any other attitude than it has taken. We ought to have a navy to preserve strict neutrality in that controversy.

But aside from that question, when we are discussing a matter of this kind we have a right to look in the direction where our commercial interests lie. We have now become a great manufacturing and producing nation—the greatest on the face of the earth. Our productive capacity is far in excess of our home demand, of our local market.

We have got to look abroad. In Europe we have almost exhausted ourselves; we have almost got to "the end of our rope." Owing to the hostile tariff legislation which some of the European countries have enacted, and more that is threatened, and, as the Senator from New York [Mr. DEWEY] intimated to-day, such as the changed policy that is likely to take place in England, and owing to the commercial jealousies which exist in the countries of the old world we are subject to great competition and have great difficulties. The great field for American commerce and for the extension of our trade lies in the Orient. That is not a new gospel, as the Senator from Maine seems to indicate, but it is an old Democratic gospel. Away back in 1854, under a Demo-

cratic Administration, when Japan was a sealed book and a closed door to us, Commodore Perry was sent there by our Government to open Japan to the commerce of the United States and to the commerce of the world. In opening the doors of Japan we opened the eyes of those people to the benefits of western civilization and western progress.

We can see the difference, Mr. President. While Japan was in that condition, in a feudal state, with a closed door, we had no commerce and traffic with her at all. Since then our commerce with that country has grown and grown; and, as Japan has become civilized, progressive, and enlightened, we have secured an extensive commerce with her.

The Senator from Maine intimates that our commerce in the Orient is not of much consequence. It may not be as yet as large as our commerce with Europe, but the figures I have here indicate what we may expect in the future.

In 1892 our total commerce with oriental countries was \$102,583,634, and in 1903, eleven years later, it was \$213,701,048, more than double in eleven years; and, mind you, that increase occurred while the Boxer rebellion was on in China, which prevented the full measure of trade that we should otherwise have had with those countries.

Look at the territory in the Orient, China proper consisting of eighteen or nineteen provinces, with 1,353,300 square miles and a population of 383,000,000; there is Manchuria, with an area of 362,000 square miles and a population of between seven and eight million; there is Korea, with an area of 82,000 square miles, as big as the State of Minnesota, which I have the honor in part to represent here, and with a population of over 10,000,000. Then there is little Japan, progressive, the Yankee of the Orient—little Japan, with an area of 162,000 square miles and 50,000,000 people.

Right here in the midst of this beehive of humanity, right at its very doors, are our own possessions—the Philippine Islands. With those islands in our possession we are placed in a position to dominate the trade of the Orient. Manila and the Philippine Islands being in our possession, they will become the jobbing and distributing center of the oriental countries; and we need a navy, not for the purpose of keeping peace in the Philippine Islands—for peace reigns there to-day—but we need a navy, as all countries do, to look after our commerce and our commercial interests in foreign waters.

Mr. President, there is no part of the globe where we can hope to make such commercial conquests and acquisitions for the next twenty-five years as in the Orient, and with the Panama Canal constructed, as we are now about constructing it, it will place the cities of the Atlantic seaboard—Boston, New York, Baltimore, New Orleans and the other cities on the Gulf—as close to the large commercial centers of the Orient, Yokohama and Shanghai, as London and Bremen and the other great cities of Europe are by way of the Suez Canal. Can we afford to fritter away this commerce? Then Senators say disorder prevails in the Philippines; that war is there; that we ought to let go of that country. Let me read a brief statement here. I shall not weary the Senate. I read from a document lately presented to the Senate by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] and printed. It was prepared by Henry Gannett, chief geographer, United States Geological Survey, and assistant director of the Philippine census. I will first read what form of government they have in the Philippine Islands, and then show you the conditions which prevail there.

The islands are organized into forty civil provinces, the city of Manila, and the semimilitary, semicivil province of Mindanao—forty-two in all. The civil provinces are divided into nearly 1,000 pueblos, which resemble in certain ways our New England towns. These are in turn subdivided into nearly 14,000 barrios or villages.

The chief executive officer is the civil governor, who is aided by four Americans, who serve as executive heads of departments, with the title of secretary. These five, with three Filipinos, form the civil commission, which is the legislative body. Within these four departments are numerous bureaus, which, with two exceptions, have Americans at their heads. The judiciary is mainly composed of Americans, but contains several able Filipino judges.

The officers of the provinces are governors, most of whom are Filipinos, and treasurers and supervisors, all of whom are Americans, and secretaries, all of whom are Filipinos. The governor, treasurer, and supervisor of each province form the governing board, which decides all matters of importance concerning the province. The chief officers of the pueblos are the presidents, all of whom are Filipinos. The presidents of the pueblos and the governors of provinces are elected by the qualified voters. The civil governor has the right to suspend or remove any officer, whether elected or appointed, and to fill the vacancy thus created.

Throughout, in the general government, provincial government, and pueblo government, the minor offices and the clerical positions are in the main filled by Filipinos, who make excellent clerks.

So much for the government. Now, on the question as to whether war or peace prevails in that country I shall read a brief statement:

The question has been frequently asked, "Is the war in the Philippines over?" This would seem to indicate a great misapprehension concerning the situation in our Pacific islands. Many people seem to suppose that outside of a few garrisoned posts it is dangerous for white people to travel about. Nothing could be further from the truth. The fact is that in the portion of the islands inhabited by the civilized peoples—i. e., three-fourths of their area at least—a white man is as safe in traveling or living as in Arizona or

Colorado or Montana. He may go about with perfect freedom. Not only that, but the people are ready and anxious to show him hospitality. The Filipino from whom he asks a night's lodging feels highly honored and gives him of his best. The men salute him as he passes, and the children cry "Buenas dias"—

I am not a Spanish scholar, but I suppose that means "Good day"—

and are very proud if their salutation is returned. Among the wild people the situation is much the same, although here it is better to send notice of one's coming in advance and to bear some sort of credentials. With these precautions there is no more danger than in traveling on the reserve of a tribe of friendly Indians.

To illustrate the situation, the work of the provincial treasurers is instanced. Each of these (they are all Americans) is required by his business to visit every pueblo of his province, and such a trip may involve hundreds of miles of travel overland on horseback or by carromata. So far as known no treasurer has ever been molested, although he often carries much money about him. The provincial supervisors, also Americans, are obliged to travel everywhere, as are many other civil officers of the government. At the present time Americans are all over the islands on one errand or another, public or private. No one thinks of danger or provides against it beyond perhaps putting a revolver in his pocket.

This shows, Mr. President, that we have established a good government in the Philippine Islands and that law and order prevail there.

Mr. President, aside from the mere commercial interests involved in this question, there is the great moral question that was involved in the acquisition of the Philippine Islands. We are settling that as becomes a great nation. When we acquired those islands from Spain, we were confronted by a great moral problem, which was this: Could we as a civilized nation dare to turn those Filipinos back to the Spaniards? That would have been cruelty of the grossest and most oppressive kind. Could we afford to turn them over to themselves in their condition? They knew nothing about government. They were practically, as you might say, a mob. To turn them over to themselves would have been a matter of political suicide and destruction. To abandon them would have been to make them the spoil of the contention and plunder of the great nations of Europe. Manifestly we could not do that. There was only one honorable, upright, and manly thing for the great American people to do, and that was just what we did—take the country, occupy it, civilize the people, give them a good government, and establish law and order there. That is exactly what we have done.

With that country in our possession and under our rule, Mr. President, we have got such a footing in the Orient that we can dominate and control that trade. Having that possession, we need a fleet, not to take care of the Philippine Islands, to keep them in our possession and to preserve peace and order there, but we need a fleet in eastern waters to look after our commercial interests, to subserve them, and take care of them.

So, Mr. President, with all due respect to the Senator from Maine, I want to say to him that nothing in the past history of Japan, since Commodore Perry opened the doors of that country, will afford any ground for him to imagine that the American people need apprehend any danger from that point.

With Japan we have the open door, and have had it for years. With China, under the recent treaty, we have the open door, thank God, on liberal conditions, and we are not entirely out of Manchuria, as the Senator from Maine intimates. Under the recent treaty ratified by the Senate we get two treaty ports—Antung, near the mouth of the Yalu River, and Mukden, the capital of the Province of Sheng King. It is really the principal town in Manchuria. There is no country that has greater interests in the Orient than we have, and it is necessary that the American nation should exercise a moral influence, and a moral influence comes from the fact not only that we are a great and strong nation, but from the fact that we have a good, aggressive navy. I think every American citizen who believes in the progress and prosperity and growth of the country, who wants to build up our country, East and West, North and South, and to promote its interests in all quarters of the globe, ought to do his utmost to build up our Navy. We can never have it any too large.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KEAN in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. QUARLES] to the amendment.

Mr. QUARLES. I desire to suggest a verbal change in the amendment which I offered to this bill. It is in line 5 of the printed amendment, to strike out the word "school" and insert in lieu thereof the word "station."

Mr. HALE. Yes; that is right. If the Senator had not made that motion, I should have made it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, that verbal change will be made. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. HOPKINS. I move to lay on the table the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Illinois to lay on the table the

amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin to the amendment.

The motion was not agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question recurs on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin to the amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. HALE. I am very desirous of getting this bill out of the way of other matters in which Senators are greatly interested. I hoped to pass it to-night. The Senator from Colorado [Mr. PATTERSON] tells me that at this hour there are two or three amendments which he wishes to propose to the bill, but that he is not ready with his facts and desires that it shall go over until Monday morning. I am disappointed that we can not pass the bill to-night. But the only subject that has been really in controversy has been disposed of. Therefore I shall ask the Senate to take up the bill the first thing on Monday morning.

I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, March 7, 1904, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SATURDAY, March 5, 1904.

The House met at 12 o'clock m.

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

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

POST-OFFICE APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. OVERSTREET, from the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads, reported a bill (H. R. 13521) making appropriations for the service of the Post-Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1905, and for other purposes; which was read a first and second time, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. OVERSTREET. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MOON] may have the privilege of filing the views of the minority of the committee on this bill.

Mr. MANN. Are points of order reserved on the bill?

The SPEAKER. One moment—

Mr. SMITH of Kentucky. I want to reserve all points of order.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will say that the gentleman from Tennessee has the right to file the views of the minority, if they are ready.

Mr. MOON of Tennessee. Very well; I file them now, and I desire to reserve points of order on the bill.

The SPEAKER. All points of order are reserved upon the bill by the gentleman from Tennessee.

INDIAN APPROPRIATION BILL.

On motion of Mr. SHERMAN, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union (Mr. BOUTELL in the chair) and resumed the consideration of House bill No. 12684, the Indian appropriation bill.

Mr. SHERMAN. I notice on page 2928 of the RECORD that the amendment in reference to the Uinta Reservation contains the words "October 1, 1904." It should read "October 1, 1905." I think it is a misprint. It should be corrected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk informs the Chair that in the bill the language is "1905."

Mr. SHERMAN. That is correct.

Then, Mr. Chairman, on the same page is an amendment providing for the payment of \$5,000 out of the judgment in favor of the New York Indians, for the purpose of ascertaining the beneficiaries of that judgment. The amendment should have provided that the appropriation be immediately available. I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as adopted in that form.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to insert in the amendment to which he has referred the words "to be immediately available." Is there objection? The Chair hears none?

Mr. MANN. I notice, Mr. Chairman, that in the left-hand column of page 2927 of the RECORD, in an amendment which I offered, the language as printed is "San Francisco, Chicago, and St. Louis." It should be "San Francisco, Chicago, and New York." It was so read.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is informed by the Clerk that it so appears in the bill.

Mr. SHERMAN. In the printed bill, on page 41, which has been passed over, the word "building," in line 12, should have been "buildings." That is a printer's mistake. I ask unani-