

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That Hon. William Connell was duly elected a Representative in the Fifty-eighth Congress from the Tenth district of the State of Pennsylvania, and is entitled to a seat therein.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, in order to save time, I will ask for the yeas and nays on that vote.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

So the question was taken; and there were—yeas 159, nays 148, answered "present" 4, not voting 72, as follows:

YEAS—159.

Acheson,	Douglas,	Kennedy,	Pearro,
Adams, Pa.	Dovenor,	Ketcham,	Perkins,
Adams, Wis.	Draper,	Kinkaid,	Porter,
Allen,	Dresser,	Knapp,	Powers, Me.
Ames,	Driscoll,	Knopf,	Powers, Mass.
Babcock,	Dunwell,	Lacey,	Reeder,
Bartholdt,	Dwight,	Lafean,	Roberts,
Bates,	Esch,	Landis, Chas. B.	Rodenberg,
Birdsall,	Flack,	Lawrence,	Scott,
Bishop,	Fordney,	Lilley,	Sherman,
Bradley,	Foss,	Littlefield,	Sibley,
Brandagee,	Fowler,	Longworth,	Slemp,
Brick,	French,	Lorimer,	Smith, Ill.
Brooks,	Fuller,	Loud,	Smith, Iowa
Brown, Pa.	Gardner, Mass.	Loudenslager,	Smith, Samuel W.
Brown, Wis.	Gibson,	Lovering,	Smith, Wm. Alden
Brownlow,	Gillet, N. Y.	McCarthy,	Smith, Pa.
Buckman,	Gillet, Cal.	McCreary, Pa.	Spalding,
Burke,	Gillet, Mass.	McLachlan,	Sperry,
Burkett,	Goebel,	McMorran,	Steenerson,
Burleigh,	Graff,	Mahon,	Sterling,
Burton,	Greene,	Marsh,	Stevens, Minn.
Butler, Pa.	Grosvenor,	Marshall,	Sulloway,
Calderhead,	Haskins,	Martin,	Tawney
Campbell,	Haugen,	Metcalf,	Thomas, Iowa
Cassel,	Hedge,	Moon, Pa.	Tirrell,
Conner,	Hemenway,	Morgan,	Van Voorhis,
Cooper, Pa.	Henry, Conn.	Morrell,	Volstead,
Cousins,	Hepburn,	Mudd,	Vreeland,
Crumpacker,	Hermann,	Murdock,	Wadsworth,
Currier,	Hinshaw,	Needham,	Wanger,
Curtis,	Hogg,	Nevin,	Warnock,
Cushman,	Holliday,	Norris,	Weems,
Dalzell,	Howell, N. J.	Olmsted,	Wiley, N. J.
Daniels,	Howell, Utah	Otis,	Williamson,
Darragh,	Huff,	Otjen,	Wilson, Ill.
Davis, Minn.	Humphrey, Wash.	Overstreet,	Woodward,
Deemer,	Jackman, Md.	Palmer,	Wright,
Dick,	Jackson, Ohio	Patterson, Pa.	The Speaker.
Dixon,	Jones, Wash.	Payne,	

NAYS—148.

Adamson,	Finley,	Lanning,	Russell,
Aiken,	Fitzpatrick,	Legare,	Ryan,
Badger,	Flood,	Lester,	Scarborough,
Baker,	Foster, Ill.	Lever,	Scudder,
Bankhead,	Garner,	Lind,	Shafroth,
Bartlett,	Gilbert,	Lindsay,	Sheppard,
Bassett,	Gillespie,	Little,	Sherley,
Beall, Tex.	Glass,	Livernash,	Shiras,
Bell, Cal.	Goldfogle,	Livingston,	Shober,
Benny,	Goulden,	Lloyd,	Shull,
Benton,	Granger,	McAndrews,	Sims,
Bowers,	Gregg,	McDermott,	Slayden,
Bowie,	Griffith,	McLain,	Small,
Brantley,	Griggs,	McNary,	Smith, Tex.
Breazeale,	Gudger,	Macon,	Snook,
Broussard,	Hamlin,	Maddox,	Southall,
Brundidge,	Hardwick,	Maynard,	Spight,
Burgess,	Harrison,	Meyer, La.	Stephens, Tex.
Burleson,	Hay,	Moon, Tenn.	Sullivan, Mass.
Butler, Mo.	Hearst,	Padgett,	Sullivan, N. Y.
Byrd,	Henry, Tex.	Page,	Sulzer,
Caldwell,	Hill, Miss.	Parker,	Swanson,
Candler,	Hitchcock,	Patterson, N. C.	Tate,
Cassingham,	Hopkins,	Pinckney,	Thayer,
Clark,	Houston,	Pujo,	Thomas, N. C.
Clayton,	Hughes, N. J.	Rainey,	Thompson,
Cochran,	Humphreys, Miss.	Randell, Tex.	Trimble,
Cooper, Tex.	Hunt,	Ransdell, La.	Underwood,
Cowherd,	Johnson,	Reid,	Van Duzer,
Crowley,	Jones, Va.	Richardson, Ala.	Wade,
Davey, La.	Keliher,	Richardson, Tenn.	Wallace,
De Armond,	Kitchin, Claude	Rider,	Webb,
Dickerman,	Kitchin, Wm. W.	Rixey,	Weisse,
Dinsmore,	Kline,	Robb,	Wiley, Ala.
Dougherty,	Klutz,	Robertson, La.	Williams, Ill.
Emerich,	Lamar, Fla.	Robinson, Ark.	Williams, Miss.
Field,	Lamb,	Robinson, Ind.	Wynn,

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—4.

Howard,	Jenkins,	Taylor,	Watson.
---------	----------	---------	---------

NOT VOTING—72.

Alexander,	Gaines, Tenn.	Landis, Frederick	Ruppert,
Bede,	Gaines, W. Va.	Lewis,	Shackleford,
Beidler,	Garber,	Littauer,	Smith, Ky.
Bingham,	Gardner, Mich.	Lucking,	Smith, N. Y.
Boutell,	Gardner, N. J.	McCall,	Snapp,
Bowersock,	Gooch,	McCleary, Minn.	Southard,
Burnett,	Hamilton,	Mahoney,	Southwick,
Capron,	Hildebrandt,	Mann,	Sparkman,
Cooper, Wis.	Hill, Conn.	Miers, Ind.	Stafford,
Croft,	Hitt,	Miller,	Stanley,
Cromer,	Howell, Pa.	Minor,	Talbot,
Davidson,	Hughes, W. Va.	Mondell,	Townsend,
Davis, Fla.	Hull,	Patterson, Tenn.	Vandiver,
Dayton,	Hunter,	Pierce,	Wachter,
Denny,	James,	Pou,	Warner,
Evans,	Kehoe,	Prince,	Wilson, N. Y.
Fitzgerald,	Kyle,	Rhea,	Young,
Foster, Vt.	Lamar, Mo.	Rucker,	Zenor.

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. EVANS with Mr. TALBOTT.

Mr. MILLER with Mr. WILSON of New York.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

SWEARING IN OF A MEMBER-ELECT.

William Connell, a Representative-elect from the Tenth Congressional district of Pennsylvania, appeared before the bar of the House and took the oath prescribed by law.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

A message, in writing, from the President of the United States was communicated to the House of Representatives by Mr. BARNES, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that the President had approved and signed bills of the following titles:

On February 8, 1904:

H. R. 8686. An act to amend section 1895 of the Code of Law for the District of Columbia.

On February 9, 1904:

H. R. 4344. An act for the relief of Vincenzo Gerardi, of Washington, D. C.

On February 10, 1904:

H. R. 8688. An act to transfer jurisdiction of reservation No. 32, in the city of Washington, D. C.

URGENT DEFICIENCY BILL.

Mr. HEMENWAY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the urgent deficiency bill, and I ask, Mr. Speaker, before putting that motion, unanimous consent that all debate on the item now pending be closed at 2 o'clock to-morrow.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana asks unanimous consent that all debate upon item No. 10 be closed to-morrow at 2 o'clock. Is there objection?

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask the gentleman from Indiana, or rather call his attention to the fact that the matter pending is the amendment to the Senate amendment which I offered, and the request, I think, should be that all debate on the Senate amendment and amendments thereto be closed at 2 o'clock.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies his request, and the Chair understands he asks unanimous consent that all debate on the amendment and amendments to the amendment be closed to-morrow at 2 o'clock.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. BARTLETT. I want to make a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BARTLETT. I desire to know whether the gentleman from Indiana means, if that request is granted, to limit all debate—general debate and debate under the five-minute rule—in the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union when it considers this proposition? The committee has proceeded thus far as though we were having general debate. We have not had any debate up to this time under the five-minute rule.

The SPEAKER. The Chair understands that the request is that all debate shall close at 2 o'clock.

Mr. HEMENWAY. If the gentleman will permit me, I have made inquiries of parties who are interested as to the time that would be necessary. Some of those in opposition to the item thought that an hour would be sufficient, and others thought two hours would be sufficient. So I ask unanimous consent that we might have two hours and forty-five minutes.

Mr. BARTLETT. I have no objection to that.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to know what division of time is proposed.

Mr. HEMENWAY. I should say the time should be equally divided between those in favor of the item and those in opposition. Mr. UNDERWOOD. Then, Mr. Speaker, I ask that the leader on this side, Mr. WILLIAMS, may control half of the time and the chairman of the committee the other half.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Oh, no; let the gentleman from Georgia control it.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I ask, then, that one-half of the time be controlled by the chairman of the committee and the other half by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARTLETT], who is opposed to the item.

Mr. HEMENWAY. As far as I am concerned, if I should control the time, I should simply turn it over to the parties interested on the one side and the other of this amendment, so that the time will be equally divided between those who oppose and those who favor the amendment.

Mr. BURKETT. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BURKETT. When we closed the consideration of this on Monday evening I had the floor and there was some time remaining to my credit.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman had twenty-six minutes remaining.

Mr. BURKETT. If this proposition is accepted, will I be entitled to that time?

The SPEAKER. The Chair is of opinion that unanimous consent referred to would cut the gentleman off unless he gets a new recognition. Is there objection?

Mr. PAYNE. One moment, Mr. Speaker. I hope the gentleman from Alabama will not insist on his request. This is not a matter that is divided by party lines. Those who are opposed to the proposition have taken most of the time on that side of the House.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I was going to suggest that I thought there would be no difficulty in the way of an agreement, providing it is understood that the time will be equally divided between those in favor of the item and those opposed to it.

Mr. PAYNE. I think with that proposition there would be no objection.

Mr. TAWNEY. If the gentleman from Georgia is to control the time in opposition because of his being a ranking minority member of the committee that reports in favor of it, I think the chairman ought to control the other half.

Mr. PAYNE. Suppose we leave that out and simply divide the time.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. But who shall determine which gentleman is to have time?

Mr. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana moves that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, before that motion is put, I would like to get an agreement, for I think we can get one.

The SPEAKER. The regular order has been demanded.

Mr. CLAYTON. With the assurance of the leader on this side, Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi, that we can probably get an agreement, Mr. Speaker, which the leader on the other side, Mr. PAYNE, was not able to do, I withdraw my request for the regular order.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Now, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the time for closing the debate upon the amendment and the amendment to the amendment be fixed at 2 o'clock to-morrow, and that the time for debate be controlled by the Chair, the Chair to divide the time equally between those in favor and those opposed to the pending amendment.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request made by the gentleman from Mississippi? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The motion of Mr. HEMENWAY was then agreed to. Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. CURRIER in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is now in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the urgent deficiency bill.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield—

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does not understand that the gentleman from Minnesota controls the time.

Mr. TAWNEY. That is true, Mr. Chairman, but I want to state that before that agreement was made, when it was proposed that the gentleman from Georgia and I would control the time, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COWHERD] asked for the first recognition.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Missouri. How much time does the gentleman want?

Mr. COWHERD. I do not know, Mr. Chairman. I suppose I am recognized for an hour.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a parliamentary inquiry. Under the agreement that was entered into just before we went into the committee, the division of the time was left with the Chair. Is it not possible for the Chair, under that agreement, to apportion out the time as the Chair sees fit and not give one full hour to any particular individual who is recognized?

Mr. COWHERD. Mr. Chairman, I will say that I did not intend to occupy one hour.

Mr. SHERMAN. I did not suppose the gentleman did, but I would like to get this thing settled.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks he has that right. Of course the friends of the proposition are entitled to recognition now, and such time as the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COWHERD] consumes will be taken from their time.

Mr. SHERMAN. I understood that, Mr. Chairman. I do not wish to curtail the gentleman at all, only I wanted it understood

as to whether or not the Chair held that any gentleman who was recognized was recognized for an hour. If so, there could be only two gentlemen speak.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does not hold that way, and in the future will limit the time.

Mr. COWHERD. Mr. Chairman, I would be glad to make an arrangement right now, if any gentleman on the other side wishes to talk, to divide the time we will consume this evening.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Chairman, I will make a proposition myself. Let us take fifteen minutes at a clip on each side. That is perfectly fair, it seems to me. [Applause and laughter.] The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COWHERD] wants more than that. He already has the floor. But after that time let it be divided so that each side will have fifteen minutes at a clip, and either toe the mark or quit talking.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has recognized the gentleman from Missouri, and with the consent of the gentleman from Missouri he would be glad to make that ruling.

Mr. COWHERD. I am perfectly willing. I suppose that would have to be by unanimous consent.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri is recognized for fifteen minutes.

Mr. COWHERD. Mr. Chairman, this proposition has already been debated at some considerable length, and I take it that the objections offered by the gentlemen who have opposed the measure cover the ground that will be taken by the opposition. If I rightly understand them, two arguments only are advanced against the measure—first, that the loan is unconstitutional, and, second, that St. Louis having already been the recipient of substantial favors should bear this burden herself. I want to say to the distinguished gentlemen who have raised the constitutional question that it seems to me they are talking about ten years too late, at least. Long ago this question was settled in the United States. When the great Chicago Exposition was held that matter was thrashed out on the floor of this House. Some of the ablest lawyers of the United States discussed it, and by an overwhelming majority Congress decided that it was constitutional, and that decision has stood until this day and has been repeated over and over again by the action of Congress upon similar appropriations.

If there was any question as to the constitutionality of this measure, I want to submit to the gentlemen here representing the various constituencies of all the States in the Union that this matter has been settled in another way that should at least offer some salve to the conscience of those who fear the Constitution is being violated. If it were desired to amend the Constitution, you would pass a resolution, submit it to the States, and when approved by the legislatures of three-fourths of the States it would become the highest law of the land. Forty-three out of the forty-five States of this Union have passed upon this proposition, and by their legislatures have said to you, their Representatives upon this floor, that they believe in the constitutionality of such an appropriation, and they likewise believe in the expediency of it; so I say to the gentlemen who question the constitutionality of the measure the very legislatures vested with the power to make constitutional law have approved such appropriations, and that should be sufficient to satisfy your quibbles.

It seems to me, therefore, that the constitutional argument must fade both because it is barred by limitation and because it is overridden by the will of the people of the United States expressed through the legislatures of the various States of the Union. Then, what remains of the objections to the granting of this appropriation? I take it, Mr. Chairman, that the first and foremost of all, the one that appealed most strongly to the gentlemen upon the floor, was the argument of the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN], who always makes the best speech that can be made upon any subject, and it little affects the quality of the speech whether it be on the right side or the wrong side of the subject. But was he fair in dealing with the great city that is here appealing for this aid? What was his argument, or the strongest portion of it? His contention was that, although St. Louis had done her part in putting up ten millions to the Government's five for the purpose of holding this national fair, although the need for more money admittedly came from the demand for additional space made largely by the foreign nations we had invited to exhibit there, although the management of the exposition company had been beyond criticism, yet he contended that \$5,000,000 had been spent by that management in permanent improvements for the city of St. Louis, and therefore that city should advance the money needed to carry this national enterprise on to its full fruition.

Let us look at the facts and see on what this argument is based. The gentleman said first that the evidence shows that \$3,000,000 has been spent there (as the chairman of the Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions said) "under the ground;" therefore the gentleman from Iowa assumed that it was for a sewerage system and a permanent improvement. Mark you, gentlemen, that exposition is to be held upon a portion of the great Forest

Park, of St. Louis, a park of 1,350 acres of ground, and when this park was turned over to the exposition company it was compelled to give a bond, a personal bond signed by the directors of that company, that when this exposition is over they will remove the buildings and restore the park to its original condition, fit for the purposes for which it was intended to be used.

Suppose you had \$3,000,000 spent on sewerage there. I appeal to you whether it is not within the intelligence of any boy in any village of the United States who ever saw a park that you could not spend \$3,000,000, or \$1,000,000, or even one tithe of that amount in a sewerage system for Forest Park and make it a permanent improvement? What do you want with a sewerage system in a forest park? As a matter of fact, these gentlemen have got to take out the improvements that the gentleman from Iowa says are a permanent gain to the city of St. Louis.

This \$3,000,000 was not spent for sewerage. A small portion went for that; a considerable portion was spent in laying the conduits for the millions of electric lights that are to flash there in myriad shape along the façades of those great buildings, beneath the dancing waters of the cascade, over all the grounds, delighting the eyes of the millions of people from all over the world who will come there. Are the conduits, carrying these innumerable wires, to be any permanent improvement to a forest park? Can you use those millions of lights when those exposition buildings are razed and the land turned back to the purpose for which it was originally intended—a park for the city? These temporary buildings had to be equipped with a costly system of water pipes to protect them from fire. When the buildings are razed will those standing pipes be a permanent improvement for a forest park in the city of St. Louis?

A large sum has been spent in paving, laying out avenues and courts, and building walks. When these buildings are torn down those highways and streets must be dug up; the material in them must be carted off, the place must be refilled, and the green-sward must grow there to cover the scars that the demolition of these buildings will have left. Is that a permanent improvement for the city of St. Louis? Yet that was the great argument of the great debater of this House—the argument on which we are asked not to vote this loan. I admit that the Fine Arts Building will be a permanent structure—not for the advantage of St. Louis, but because they had to put up a fireproof structure in order to get the owners of those priceless treasures of art to lend them for exposition purposes.

Now, the only other buildings that are at all permanent in their nature were put on the Washington University grounds—put there because by building four buildings they got the use of nine for three years, with 100 acres of land, more cheaply than they could have erected the nine buildings of a temporary character.

So, as a matter of fact, the gentleman's contention of \$5,000,000 spent in permanent improvements for the city of St. Louis dwindles to one art building—and that building had to be a fireproof structure in order to secure for that exposition the art treasures of the world.

I shall not follow the gentleman in his tirade against the city because of the increased price of labor. I heard the gentleman from Iowa and the gentleman from Illinois argue here but a few days ago that the price of labor had increased all over the land, and because the St. Louis company had to meet that condition, as people engaged in building have had to meet it everywhere, he finds a reason to vote against this measure.

The fact is that this exposition company had to do its work within a specific time. If the cost of labor was raised somewhat by the fact that in that locality there was a great demand to be met within a short time, then labor did no more than the cotton growers of the South are doing to-day; no more than the wheat growers of the West and the cattle raisers of Texas will do next month if war in foreign countries increases the demand for their commodities.

The exposition company simply met a serious situation as fairly as they could in the spirit in which reasonable men would meet it anywhere, and they got the best terms possible for the smallest concession.

But it is said St. Louis has already profited by the expenditure of this money and must profit immensely in the future.

The city of St. Louis has appropriated \$10,000,000—\$5,000,000 from the city, \$5,000,000 raised by its citizens. The city of St. Louis in addition to that has expended out of the funds of its citizens, drawn largely from its banks, \$10,000,000 more in improvements in the city and improvements on the streets to get ready to act in fitting manner as the hostess of the nation to visitors from all the world.

I want to say here that no man who has ever studied the history of international expositions would ever ask that one of them be brought to his city with the idea that there was going to be an immediate commercial profit as distinguished from that which the advertisement might bring in the future. The great exposi-

tions have not been paying ventures to the cities that have held them, with possibly few exceptions. Paris is peculiarly situated. Paris is the one visiting point of all France, and every tourist and every traveler who touches the Continent or crosses the ocean goes to Paris, whether there is an exposition there or not. Therefore some of the Paris expositions have been successful. Yet even there some have not been successful as money-making enterprises. I think every man in this House who is a resident of the city of Chicago will bear me out in the statement that the great world's fair of 1893 was not a successful commercial enterprise for the city of Chicago. I have been told it was years before she recovered from the reaction which followed. These great expositions are beneficial commercial enterprises for the nation in which they are held, but for the city that bears the brunt of the burden in preparing for them; for the city that spends, as St. Louis does, \$20,000,000 out of its own pocket to make ready for it; for the city that suffers, as every great city has suffered, from a building boom that builds beyond the present needs of the community and leaves its capital lying idle for the four or five years succeeding the exposition; for that city an exposition is as likely to prove a commercial disaster as a commercial success.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. COWHERD. I will ask that I have about three minutes more. I thought I had until a quarter to 5.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Chairman, I excepted Mr. COWHERD especially from the fifteen-minutes arrangement.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair did not so understand.

Mr. CLARK. I ask that the gentleman have ten minutes, to be taken out of our time.

Mr. COWHERD. Five minutes is all I care for.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. COWHERD. Mr. Chairman, while I believe there is no question of the constitutional right to make appropriations for a national exposition, I do not believe we ought to appropriate for any exposition except one national in character.

I would be willing to see adopted a policy under which we would have in this country a great national exposition every fifteen or twenty years, to be held in some one of the great cities of the country large enough to accommodate the crowds that gather on such occasions, and would be willing to commit the Government to the policy of appropriating any reasonable sum for the purpose of fostering that exposition upon the condition that the city where it was to be held should raise double the amount appropriated by the Government, as has been done in the city of St. Louis. I do not believe, however, that any exposition local in its character or less than international in its scope is entitled to receive any consideration at the hands of Congress. Holding to this belief, I am not startled nor terrified when gentlemen talk of the magnitude of this appropriation. As I have said, it is in my opinion only these expositions of sufficient magnitude to demand a large appropriation that are entitled to our consideration.

The St. Louis Exposition is to be the greatest the world has ever seen, and that you may appreciate this fact, let me call your attention to some statistics I have gathered regarding former expositions that were considered of world-wide importance at the time when they were held.

I believe it is conceded that the first world's fair, in the proper sense of the term, was the one held in London in 1851, organized by Prince Albert, Queen Victoria's royal consort. And in my humble judgment that great man did nothing in the course of his exceedingly useful life that more entitled him to be held in the memory and affection of his people than the work he did in connection with that great exposition. It brought the nations of the earth nearer together and turned the steps of the English people toward those paths of peace in which his royal wife toiled for so many years to hold them.

This exposition was held in the Crystal Palace, erected for that purpose, which cost but \$965,000 and occupied less than 8 acres of land. The Paris exposition of 1855 cost \$5,000,000. London held a world's fair again in 1862, which covered 24 acres of ground and cost two million three hundred thousand. Paris in 1867 covered with its exposition buildings 45 acres of ground, with about 70 acres more used for agricultural and floral purposes. Vienna in 1873 occupied in total area of ground within its exposition fence 686 acres. The cost of the buildings was \$7,850,000.

The Centennial, held at Philadelphia in 1876, inclosed within its fence 285 acres of ground. The cost I can not give accurately, but suppose it was about \$4,000,000, because that was the amount contributed by the State and city, including the million and a half borrowed from the Government.

The Paris Exposition of 1889 occupied 173 acres of ground, with a total cost of \$8,300,000. The Chicago Exposition of 1893 held under roof a space of 86 acres and inclosed within its fence 690 acres, with a total cost when it was opened of about \$22,000,000.

At St. Louis this year there will be under roof 128 acres of ground, while the exposition grounds proper will cover 1,240 acres, about twice the area of the Chicago and as much as the Chicago, Paris, and Buffalo expositions combined.

From these figures one may derive some idea of the magnitude of the task that St. Louis has undertaken on behalf of the people of the United States. I do not agree with the gentlemen who contend that this is a waste of money. I believe that a great exposition, holding within itself an epitome of the highest industries of the people of the earth, bringing together the best products of hand and mind from all the nations of the earth to contend in friendly rivalry for the prizes offered, presenting to its visitors in the concrete the story of the world's progress and civilization—such an exposition I believe is the greatest education that the mind of man has yet conceived for the benefit of humanity. The country still feels the impetus that was given alike to our science and commerce by the great fair held in Chicago ten years ago. There is not a country village in all the land where architecture was not improved or encouraged and love of learning stimulated by that great exposition. I believe, too, that these expositions are a benefit not only commercially and from an educational standpoint, but that they promote comity among the nations of the earth and bring us nearer to that peace of which the angels sang above the manger at Bethlehem.

I believe that every dollar of this loan will be honestly accounted for and returned. I believe it is better, in the present condition of the money market, to take the money from the idle accumulation in the vault of the Treasury than to draw it from the active channels of trade. And I believe that every man who votes for this measure now, so that we may fittingly celebrate the centennial of the Louisiana purchase, the second greatest epoch in the history of the nation, will have the approval of his constituents to-day and their earnest congratulation when they view, this summer at St. Louis, that wondrous city, the fairest vision that was ever conceived by the mind of magician or wrought by the hand of artist from senseless stone and plaster into a thing of life and beauty. [Loud applause.]

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman, I had not intended to be drawn into this debate upon the proposed loan of \$4,600,000 to the St. Louis Exposition, and I have asked for only five minutes on the question. I have no intention of making an extended speech on the subject, but as a member of the Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions I have thought it only proper to make two points in answer to the speech made by the chairman of our committee, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. TAWNEY]. I would like to say in the first place that I yield to no man upon this floor in my admiration for this exposition company and for the magnificent work they are attempting. I hope with all my heart that this great exposition will be the success that its friends anticipate. But at the same time I can not allow the opportunity to pass to correct an impression of the gentleman from Minnesota, as stated in his speech, that all the members of our committee, even those who are opposed to the bill, are satisfied as to the security offered.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the management of this exposition company have come here to us and offered what they consider a business proposition. Under these circumstances it is unfair so to appeal to the House of Representatives as to stir up sentiment. We are appealed to as business men and not as sentimentalists. From that point of view I for one, as a member of this committee, am not satisfied that the United States will under all circumstances get back the \$4,600,000 that we are now asked to lend this exposition company. To be sure, if the exposition is a success the Government will get this money back; if the exposition is a failure, we will not only fail to get our money back, but we will probably have the same gentlemen come here and ask us to make up the deficiency. In that sense we are invited to speculate.

Mr. Chairman, my objection is based also upon another ground. I am unable to see any warrant for calling this loan constitutional. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COWHERD] who spoke last has referred to the constitutionality of this proposed loan as being based upon the action of almost all of the various State legislatures in appropriating funds of their respective States for State exhibitions at the exposition in St. Louis. That is not at all relevant to the question of the constitutionality of a proposition to have the United States lend money to the exposition company. We can not be convinced of that, nor do I know of any precedents which will warrant any such action on our part.

The United States has under the Constitution the right to gather this money by taxation and to appropriate it for any and every governmental purpose; but nowhere do I find any authority for the loan of this money to any corporation for any purpose.

Now, the gentleman from Minnesota has cited as a precedent for action on our part the action of the Congress of the United States in appropriating money as a pro forma loan to the Centennial Exposition in 1876. I say, gentlemen, much as I respect his judgment, that I do not consider that appropriation a loan. If you will

allow me, I shall read a few words from the act appropriating the money for the Centennial Exposition. The act says:

That the sum of \$1,500,000, to complete the centennial buildings and other preparations, be, and the same is hereby, appropriated out of any moneys in the United States Treasury not otherwise appropriated. * * * *Provided*, That in the distribution of any moneys that may remain in the treasury of the centennial board of finance after the payment of its debts * * * the appropriation herein made shall be paid in full into the Treasury of the United States, before any dividend or percentage of the profits shall be paid to the holders of said stock.

Mr. Chairman, this seems to me to have placed the United States at that time, not in the position of a creditor, but of a preferred stockholder. In that sense they were practically upon the same footing as we are in our original appropriation of \$5,000,000 to the St. Louis exposition. This entitles us to share in one-third of the profits there and then after the payment of all debts of the exposition company. The appropriation for the Centennial Exposition entitled the United States to be paid back their money after the payment of all debts and before the common stockholders, so to speak, received any dividend on their stock. In other words, I consider that this first appropriation was not a loan such as can now be cited as a precedent, but was distinctly an appropriation out and out, with the provision that under certain conditions the money should revert back to the United States. [Loud applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLETT] is recognized for ten minutes.

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, we all agree with the enthusiastic feelings of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COWHERD] about the success of this fair. Nobody, whatever their views about this loan, has any question or any difference about that. I am sure, too, that every Member of this side of the House enjoyed the novel constitutional argument of the gentleman from Missouri, and I am sure we will be in the future very apt to refer to it and commend it to his associates.

But it seems to me that the argument which is made in favor of this appropriation is a severe indictment of the gentlemen who are managing this fair. We are told that they need this \$4,600,000 in order to open the fair successfully. We are told all the nations of the world have been invited to come here, and if we do not give this money we will be disgraced, because the fair can not be properly opened. If that is so, Mr. Chairman, if the gentlemen who are managing this exposition have been so improvident, so reckless, so shortsighted; if they, knowing what money they had, knowing what work they had to do, knowing its scope, having the duty of calculating its probable growth and shaping their resources accordingly, have expended all their funds and exhausted all their credit before they are able to even open the fair, then I think they have been reckless and improvident; and if the nations of the world and the monarchs who have been invited should come here and find no fair, it is not the Congress of the United States or the people of the United States who will in the first instance be disgraced, but it is the management of this fair.

Mr. TAWNEY. Will the gentleman permit an interruption right there?

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. Certainly.

Mr. TAWNEY. It was expressly stated both on the floor—

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. I only yielded for a question, as I have only ten minutes.

Mr. TAWNEY. Does the gentleman know that the plan originally contemplated involved an expenditure of only \$15,000,000, the amount which they had, and this additional expenditure is the result of increased space demanded by foreign nations and by States which was not contemplated and could not be contemplated at the time the expenditure started?

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, that does not affect the argument at all.

Mr. TAWNEY. It affects the question of extravagance, however.

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. These gentlemen knew all the time what they had to do. They knew what applications were coming in, and if they did not have money enough and could not see how to get money enough to meet them they ought to have refused them. It was their duty to make their resources and their expenditures balance. They were not given indefinite authority to contract for anything they wished, and they had no business to enter into obligations unless they had some means of meeting them. They would not do it in their own business affairs, and any man who enters into an obligation and does not have some idea how he is going to meet it except by applying for charity, as they are doing here, is wholly lacking in business judgment.

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. I can not yield.

But, Mr. Chairman, I do not believe at all that these gentlemen are so improvident, so reckless as the advocates for this appro-

priation would have us think. I do not believe this argument which is made in their favor is genuine. I know the gentlemen, many of them, and I have a great respect and admiration for them. I believe that this fair has thus far been managed with remarkable ability, energy, and enterprise. I believe the gentlemen who are managing it are farsighted; I believe that those nine gentlemen representing the United States are not simply ornamental, although they are certainly that; I believe they are useful, and I believe that this management has not gone recklessly on and expended all their money and exhausted all their credit so that they can not open this fair unless the United States Treasury is opened to them. I believe they know, if they do not get this money from us, where they can get it. I notice that a gentleman said on the floor of the House that they had made no requests elsewhere for this money.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that is a mistake. I believe these gentlemen have business foresight, and I believe before they would be left entirely without funds to open this fair they would provide some avenue where they could replenish their exchequer in case the United States Congress does not grant them what they want. If this bill is really the only resource to prevent bankruptcy, if they say they have no other method of getting this money, if they have gone forward and spent all their money and exhausted all their credit without knowing where they are going to get enough to open the fair respectably, if they have come to the end of their resources and are really butting their heads against the wall of bankruptcy, I say this amendment ought to have on it a condition that they should resign and that business men of foresight should have the expenditure of this four million and a half dollars who would cut their garment according to their cloth. But I do not believe that any such condition exists. I believe they can get this money elsewhere, and they know where they can get it. I believe, and I know, that they are men of sagacity and ability, and that they have not come here because this is their only refuge from insolvency. They can borrow it as Chicago did, but of course they come first to the United States Congress. I do not blame them. Everybody does the same. We are easy. They would like to get the money without paying interest. They would like to get the money without any obligation, so that in a case of conflagration or pestilence they or their friends are not the losers. But it is not a fair business proposition. I think we ought to stand by what we have already done.

And I must confess, Mr. Chairman, that it excites my indignation the way men come and get one appropriation from Congress on the express statement that that is all they will ask, and then come again before a great while and because we have given some make that very fact the ground for demanding more. I think we ought to stop it. There seems to be something connected with all these exhibitions that rather demoralizes us. I do not know of any cases in my Congressional career where votes have been cast so much from personal feeling and so little because of the merits of the proposition as on these fairs. It seems to me that there has been more rounding up of Members, not upon the merits of the question, but from friendship and good-fellowship, in these matters than any other. I think it ought to stop. It is hard for us to have colleagues come right to us and press us to vote for their bill and refuse it. And yet the danger of it is that it involves not simply the bill that we pass, but it carries behind it a whole train of other bills.

It demoralizes our sentiments; it gets us in the habit of voting for questions, not on their merits, not because they are right, but because there is a lobby right on the floor of Members constantly besieging and begging us to vote. Moreover, it leads not only to that one vote, but we know that other votes depend upon it, and that men vote for one measure not because they approve it, but because somebody has voted for their measure. I read recently, and I presume you all have, that a Member of Congress said he believed that the law was unconstitutional, and he thought it was illegal, but that he should vote for it because he voted for the bill for his own State, which he thought was also unconstitutional and illegal, and got his "steal," and therefore he felt, as a matter of reciprocity, that he must vote for succeeding "steals."

That was expressed in rather more frank and brutal language than we often hear, but we all know that trouble pervades all these measures. Now, I think in this case, when we all know what was said at the beginning, that they would make no further request, it is audacious for them to come and ask for more; it is unbusinesslike, and we are setting an exceedingly bad precedent. Whether you get the money back again or not nobody knows; but I do not think we ought to give the aid asked, because I believe the energetic and sagacious men who are running this fair know where they can get the money and that they ought to keep their faith and borrow it as a business transaction and stand by their original proposition to be satisfied with the first generous appropriation.

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

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose, and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. CURRIER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 10954, the urgent deficiency bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

CARRIAGES AND HORSES MAINTAINED BY DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was ordered printed and referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the State Department:

To the House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith the response of the Secretary of State to the resolution adopted by the House of Representatives on January 25, 1904, calling for information in regard to carriages, horses, etc., maintained at Government expense by the Department of State.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

WHITE HOUSE, February 9, 1904.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows: To Mr. CLAYTON, indefinitely, while acting as a member of the subcommittee taking testimony in Florida in the impeachment proceedings against United States Judge Swayne.

To Mr. PATTERSON of Tennessee, indefinitely, on account of illness in his family.

To Mr. ALLEN of Maine, for four days, on account of important business.

To Mr. CUSHMAN, for five days, on account of important business.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

By unanimous consent, reference of the Senate joint resolution No. 37, providing for the editions to be printed of the annual and special reports of the Librarian of Congress, was changed from the Committee on the Library to the Committee on Printing.

ADJOURNMENT.

Then, on motion of Mr. HEMENWAY (at 5 o'clock and 4 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned until to-morrow at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, with a copy of a communication from the Acting Commissioner of Indian Affairs, papers relating to the claim of Lone Wolf—to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions of the following titles were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several Calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. TAWNEY, from the Select Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 11135) amending an act approved March 3, 1901, entitled "An act to provide for celebrating the one hundredth anniversary of the purchase of the Louisiana territory by the United States, by holding an international exhibition of arts, industries, manufactures, and the products of the soil, mine, forest, and sea, in the city of St. Louis, in the State of Missouri," reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 893); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. DIXON, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 6787) to confirm and validate patents to certain lands situated in the Bitter Root Valley, State of Montana, above the mouth of the Lo Lo Fork of the Bitter Root River, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 895); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 121) granting additional lands adjacent to its site to the University of Montana, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 896); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 719) granting an increase of pension to John H. Willey, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 892); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 10688) for the relief of Johann A. Killian, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 894); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. WILEY of Alabama, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 11345) granting a pension to Joseph H. Huie, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 897); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BROWN of Pennsylvania, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 11021) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Weems, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 898); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 8849) to pension James S. Lauderdale, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 899); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DRAPER, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 5849) granting an increase of pension to Catharine R. Brown, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 900); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BROWN of Pennsylvania, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 8771) granting a pension to Walter F. Horner, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 901); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 9587) granting an increase of pension to Bartlett S. Haggard, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 902); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 8923) granting a pension to Martha E. Nolen, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 903); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HOUSTON, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 7368) granting a pension to Annie G. Norwood, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 904); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. RIXEY (by request): A bill (H. R. 12139) providing for a school of practical agriculture for the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BROWNLOW: A bill (H. R. 12140) to increase the efficiency of the Army of the United States, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RODEY (by request): A bill (H. R. 12141) to protect ancient ruins on the public domain—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12142) to amend an act entitled "An act to establish circuit courts of appeals and define and regulate in certain cases the jurisdiction of the courts of the United States, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1891—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATTERSON of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 12143) to abrogate the treaty of August 20, 1899, made and entered into between John C. Bates, brigadier-general, United States Volunteers, and the Sultan of the Sulu Archipelago—to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. JONES of Virginia: A bill (H. R. 12144) to establish a light and fog-signal station at Ragged Point, Potomac River, Virginia—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12145) to establish a lighted beacon at the mouth of Pungoteague Creek, Chesapeake Bay, Virginia—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12146) to establish a light on the shoal off Cherry Point, Piankatank River, Virginia—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KLUTTZ: A bill (H. R. 12147) to amend chapter 749, second session Fifty-seventh Congress, approved February 23, 1903, being "An act to establish United States courts at Wilkesboro, N. C."—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FOWLER: A bill (H. R. 12148) to provide for the verification of papers by national banking associations—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WILSON of New York: A bill (H. R. 12149) to establish a national military park at Fort Reno, District of Columbia, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DARRAGH: A bill (H. R. 12150) to establish storm-warning stations at St. James, Beaver Island, Lake Michigan—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. COCHRAN: A bill (H. R. 12151) appropriating \$80,000 for the improvement of the Missouri River at St. Joseph, Mo.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. LOUDENSLAGER: A bill (H. R. 12152) relating to the payment and disposition of pension money due to inmates of the Government Hospital for the Insane—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FULLER: A bill (H. R. 12153) granting pensions in certain cases to widows of soldiers and sailors who served in the Union Army or Navy during the war of the rebellion—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12154) granting a pension to soldiers and sailors in certain cases, and so forth—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAMS of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 12155) granting a pension to Nancy Hill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12156) granting an increase of pension to Nina Holvenstot—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12157) granting an increase of pension to Asher D. Bice—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BIRDSALL: A bill (H. R. 12158) granting an increase of pension to L. L. Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BOWERSOCK: A bill (H. R. 12159) granting an increase of pension to R. M. Nesbitt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BOWIE: A bill (H. R. 12160) for the relief of the legal representatives of Henry Fulenwider, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. COCHRAN: A bill (H. R. 12161) for the relief of John F. Tyler—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12162) granting a pension to Mary B. Root—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12163) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Rea—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12164) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Davis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CROWLEY: A bill (H. R. 12165) granting a pension to Sarah A. Gillham—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12166) granting a pension to Isaac M. Ashford—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12167) granting a pension to Elizabeth Burnett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12168) granting a pension to Emaranda Somerville—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12169) granting an increase of pension to C. McCord—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12170) granting an increase of pension to Joseph H. Whitehead—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12171) granting an increase of pension to John Davis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12172) granting an increase of pension to John L. Parrott—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12173) granting an increase of pension to Thomas J. Mahan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12174) granting an increase of pension to John Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12175) granting an increase of pension to William H. Rupert—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12176) granting an increase of pension to Henry V. Stewart—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.