

The joint resolution (S. R. 47) to authorize the Secretary of War to cause a survey or surveys to be made to determine the practicability and cost of a tide-water ship canal across the State of Florida was read twice, and considered as in Committee of the Whole.

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 PRESIDENT pro tempore. Senate bill 2908 will be postponed indefinitely.

WILMINGTON (DEL.) HARBOR IMPROVEMENT.

Mr. GALLINGER, from the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the concurrent resolution submitted yesterday by Mr. BALL, reported it without amendment; and it was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring). That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, directed to cause a survey to be made of the Wilmington Harbor, Delaware (including the Christina and Brandywine rivers), with the view to their improvement and to insure the permanency of the channel in the Christina River to the depth of at least 21 feet.

BRUNSWICK (GA.) HARBOR IMPROVEMENT.

Mr. CLAY. I am directed by the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (S. 3924) for survey and estimate of cost of deepening Brunswick (Ga.) inner harbor and outer bar, to report it adversely; and in lieu thereof I report a concurrent resolution, which I ask may be adopted.

The concurrent resolution was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring therein). That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, directed to cause a survey to be made of the outer bar of Brunswick, Ga., and of the inner harbor of Brunswick, Ga., and to furnish therefrom estimates showing the cost of obtaining a channel of ample width to accommodate the commerce of said port, and extending from the wharves in said inner harbor, through said outer bar, to the ocean, and of the following depths at mean high tide, to wit, 27 feet, 28 feet, 29 feet, and 30 feet; that is to say, the Secretary of War is directed to furnish a separate estimate of the cost of obtaining a channel at each of said depths; and the Secretary of War is hereby further directed to report whether or not in his opinion it is advisable, if these increased depths, or any one or more of them, shall be obtained, that the present channel across said outer bar should be straightened.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Senate bill 3924 will be postponed indefinitely.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. BALL introduced a bill (S. 4312) to correct the military record of W. H. Cleaden; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 4313) to correct the military record of Ezekiel Stewart; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. COCKRELL introduced a bill (S. 4314) to pay Joseph Hunter certain arrearages of pension; which was read twice by its title.

Mr. COCKRELL. To accompany the bill I present a copy of the military record of Dr. Joseph Hunter, of Clinton, Mo., late of Company F, One hundred and twenty-sixth Regiment Illinois Volunteers; also a copy of private act No. 716, granting a pension to Joseph Hunter, M. D., and Senate report No. 2068, Fiftyeth Congress, first session. I move that the bill and accompanying papers be referred to the Committee on Pensions.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. DRYDEN introduced a bill (S. 4315) for the relief of George B. Hughes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut introduced a bill (S. 4316) providing for the appointment of additional judges in the Indian Territory, and to establish a court of appeals therein, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also introduced a bill (S. 4317) granting an increase of pension to Sarah L. Augur; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. DIETRICH introduced a bill (S. 4318) granting an increase of pension to Augustus E. Orbeton; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. ELKINS introduced a bill (S. 4319) to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads, and persons living or doing business in the vicinity thereof, by prohibiting common carriers engaged in interstate commerce from transporting gunpowder and other high explosive compounds over their lines, except under certain conditions, and so forth; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. BURNHAM introduced a bill (S. 4320) granting a pension to Melvina R. Chesley; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. TELLER introduced a bill (S. 4321) for a public building for the United States Geological Survey at Washington, D. C.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. SIMMONS introduced a bill (S. 4322) making an appropriation for the purchase from Forsyth County of a site and building for a post-office and other Government offices in Winston-Salem, N. C., and to authorize the sale of the present post-office site in Winston-Salem to Forsyth County; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. SCOTT introduced a bill (S. 4323) granting a pension to Daniel Perdew; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. KEARNS introduced a bill (S. 4324) granting an increase of pension to James Veitch; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 4325) granting an increase of pension to William Q. Anderson; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. HALE introduced a bill (S. 4326) for the relief of certain enlisted men of the Navy; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. CULLOM introduced a bill (S. 4327) placing Hugh T. Reed on the retired list with rank of captain; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 4328) granting a pension to Nathan Bighan; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. CLAY introduced a bill (S. 4329) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Nesmith; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. DANIEL introduced a bill (S. 4330) to complete the Jefferson memorial object-lesson road; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. HANSBROUGH introduced a bill (S. 4331) granting an increase of pension to Lydia A. Patch; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

ADMISSION OF NEW MEXICO.

Mr. MITCHELL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 878) to enable the people of New Mexico to form a constitution and State government and be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States; which was referred to the Committee on Territories, and ordered to be printed.

PRINTING FOR DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COMMITTEE.

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

Resolved. That the Committee on the District of Columbia be, and is hereby, authorized to have printed and bound such papers and documents for the use of said committee as may be deemed necessary in connection with subjects considered or to be considered by the said committee.

COMPILATION OF NAVAL APPROPRIATION ACTS, ETC.

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

Resolved. That there be printed and bound in cloth 300 copies of Senate Document No. 100, Fifty-eighth Congress, second session, for the use of the Committee on Naval Affairs of the Senate.

LOUISIANA PURCHASE EXPOSITION.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States; which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Select Committee on Industrial Expositions, and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith a report from the Secretary of State covering a statement showing the receipts and disbursements of the Louisiana Purchase Exposition Company for the month of December, 1903, furnished by the Louisiana Purchase Exposition Commission in pursuance of section 11 of the "Act to provide for celebrating the one hundredth anniversary of the purchase of the Louisiana territory," etc., approved March 3, 1901.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

WHITE HOUSE, February 11, 1904.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

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

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After four hours and ten minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had dis-

agreed to certain amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 10954) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in the appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1904, and for prior years, and for other purposes; agrees to the amendment of the Senate numbered 47 to the bill, and agrees to the amendment numbered 10 with an amendment; asks a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. HEMENWAY, Mr. VAN VOORHIS, and Mr. LIVINGSTON managers at the conference on the part of the House.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

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

A bill (H. R. 7023) to amend an act to regulate the height of buildings in the District of Columbia; and

A bill (H. R. 7024) to name streets, alleys, highways, and reservations in that part of the District of Columbia outside of the city of Washington, and for other purposes.

THE PANAMA CANAL.

Mr. MORGAN. I desire to give notice that to-morrow morning, after the routine morning business, I shall address the Senate on the resolutions relating to the Panama Canal.

URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 10954) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in the appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1904, and for prior years, and for other purposes, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. ALLISON. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments to the bill, that it disagree to the amendment of the House of Representatives to amendment numbered 10, and that it agree to the conference asked for by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses.

The motion was agreed to.

By unanimous consent, the President pro tempore was authorized to appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate; and Mr. HALE, Mr. ALLISON, and Mr. TELLER were appointed.

Mr. PETTUS. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, February 12, 1904, at 12 o'clock m.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 11, 1904.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

Assistant Naval Constructors Henry Williams and Henry T. Wright to be assistant naval constructors in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant, from the 1st day of January, 1904.

Lieut. Robert B. Higgins to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 11th day of October, 1903.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) William D. Leahy to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 31st day of December, 1903.

To be lieutenants.

Irwin F. Landis.
Wilbur G. Briggs.
Fletcher L. Sheffield.
Henry C. Dinger.

To be lieutenants (junior grade).

Lloyd S. Shapley.
Adolphus E. Watson.
Chauncey Shackford.
Charles B. Hatch.
Zachariah H. Madison.

SURVEYORS OF CUSTOMS.

William Vincent, of Illinois, to be surveyor of customs for the port of Galena, in the State of Illinois.

John M. Lenihan, of Iowa, to be surveyor of customs for the port of Dubuque, in the State of Iowa.

POSTMASTERS.

MINNESOTA.

Jesse A. Maxwell to be postmaster at Fulda, in the county of Murray and State of Minnesota.

NEW YORK.

Charles O. Sprague to be postmaster at Prince Bay, in the county of Richmond and State of New York.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, February 11, 1904.

The House met at 12 o'clock m.

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

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

NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. FOSS, by direction of the Committee on Naval Affairs, reported the bill (H. R. 12220) making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1905, and for other purposes, which was ordered printed and referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I reserve all points of order.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

By unanimous consent, reference of the bill (S. 2345) to make applicable the provisions of the naturalization laws of the United States to Porto Rico, and for other purposes, was changed from the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

LEAVE TO PRINT.

Mr. SHULL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. George Howell be permitted to extend his remarks in the RECORD. That request was made yesterday, but I think the Speaker did not understand it.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent that Mr. Howell be granted the privilege of extending his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

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.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Speaker, pending that motion, I desire to say that there are a great many gentlemen on this side of the House who would like to speak for a few moments in favor of this proposition. It will be impossible for them to do so unless the time can be extended. I have been requested to ask unanimous consent that the time for taking the vote be fixed at 2.30 instead of at 2 o'clock, and that the time be divided equally between the two sides, and I make that request at this time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota, pending the motion of the gentleman from Indiana, asks unanimous consent that the time for debate be extended until 2.30 p. m., the time to be divided equally between those in favor and those opposed to the amendments under discussion. Is there objection?

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Speaker, I am advised that there are several gentlemen who expect to be absent from the House shortly after 2 o'clock. I therefore object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa objects. The question now is on the motion of the gentleman from Indiana, 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.

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

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the urgent deficiency bill, with Mr. CURRIER in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER] is recognized for eight minutes.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Chairman, I believe that Congress ought to adopt a different policy from that heretofore pursued in relation to the question of expositions. It seems to me that the proper policy for Congress to pursue is to make one exposition a national affair about once in each generation, and to withhold appropriations from the public fund for all expositions that are essentially local in their character. Too much money has been wasted in appropriations to aid local expositions. They are too frequent to have a national interest, and Federal aid ought to be withheld from them excepting, perhaps, a sufficient amount to make a proper Federal exhibit. The Federal Government ought to pursue the same policy toward them as is pursued by the several States, aside from the one in which they are held. But the Louisiana Purchase Exposition is essentially a national enterprise.

It is not local beyond the element of habitation. Of course all expositions must be located somewhere; but that enterprise has been nationalized by action of Congress by making the appropriation of \$5,000,000 in the first instance and by the creation of a commission to act as an advisory board in respect to the installation and management of the institution.

The question of the constitutionality of the proposed legislation has been raised during this discussion. I do not believe, Mr. Chairman, that there is anything at all in that question. If Congress had the power in the first instance to appropriate \$5,000,000 toward promoting the enterprise, it has the power now to appropriate \$4,600,000 to promote the same end. The only distinction between the two appropriations is that the present one is not a donation and adequate provision is made for the return of the money to the public Treasury, and I respectfully submit that that element does not make it unconstitutional.

The power to appropriate—the power to donate, if you please—carries with it the power to make a loan; and I repeat, this has come to be a national enterprise.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. Does the gentleman think that the first appropriation for this object makes the second one constitutional?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I am not discussing the relative constitutionality of these appropriations. They are in line with appropriations that have been made by every Congress for perhaps the last fifty years. It is not a constitutional function of the Federal Government to bestow benefactions or to administer charities; yet it is a frequent thing for Congress to vote money out of the Federal Treasury for such objects. It is not in line with appropriations carrying out express constitutional functions of the Federal Government, but Congress has unlimited discretion in determining what objects are proper for the expenditure of public money.

Mr. Chairman, it was originally contemplated that this enterprise could be made a complete success with the sum of \$15,000,000. But during the process of its construction and development it has become evident that it will require a greater amount of money.

Such has been the demand for space and privileges that it has expanded and developed into a much larger affair than its promoters originally dreamed would be possible. The question now before the House is, Shall the undertaking be made a splendid, complete success? There is no doubt that it will be a creditable affair, even if the Federal Government refuses to appropriate or to loan a single additional dollar to the undertaking. But can the people of this country, who all have a pride in this great institution, afford to permit only a partial or moderate success? There will be collected at this exposition the best intellect, the best enterprise, the most splendid genius of the civilized world; and the prestige of this great country will in some respects be measured by the display that will be made at this mighty gathering.

The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN] criticised the proposition on the ground that this is a local affair. He said that the people of St. Louis ought to bear this additional expense, ought to be required to provide the necessary funds. What have the people of St. Louis already done? They have put into the enterprise \$10,000,000, aside from the expenditure of almost an equal amount in putting their municipal household in order that they may creditably receive the people of the United States and the representatives of the arts and industries from all parts of the civilized world. They have expended \$10,000,000 directly, and that amounts, according to the census of 1900, to \$16 for every man, woman, and child within that city; it amounts to about \$75 for every man 21 years of age or upward within that city.

The Federal Government, whose enterprise this is, has already appropriated \$5,000,000. That amounts to 6½ cents per capita of all the people in the country; and if we loan this additional \$4,600,000, our constituents will have to expend less than 12½ cents per capita by reason of this appropriation, while St. Louis has already put into the enterprise, an essentially national enterprise, \$16 per capita from her own citizens.

Mr. Chairman, I have examined the amendment with a good deal of care; and I have no doubt that it provides a valid, legal lien in favor of the Federal Government upon the gross receipts of the exposition; and under the operation of the amendment, when adopted, it will be the imperative duty of the Secretary of the Treasury, in the event that the managers of the enterprise fail to make the payments provided for, to insist upon a supervision of the collection of the gate receipts and the application of the money toward the payment of this loan.

Even if this were an absolute gift, if I regarded it as necessary for the complete success of this great undertaking, I should vote for it. But I believe this appropriation to be only a loan; and I have no doubt that every single dollar of it will be paid—that adequate security has already been provided, so that the loan is amply and abundantly safeguarded.

The question, Mr. Chairman, is: Shall the Federal Government add this mere pittance to the burdens of the people of the country in order to make a complete success of this enterprise, or shall we remit the question to the city of St. Louis, whose people have already been taxed so heavily to promote this common undertaking?

[Here the hammer fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BARTHOLOLT] is recognized for two minutes.

Mr. BARTHOLOLT. Mr. Chairman, in the brief time allotted to me it is impossible to meet the various objections which have been raised to the pending proposition or to do simple justice to its real merits. Therefore, I shall not stop to inquire into the constitutional objections which have found expression on this floor, nor shall I attempt to answer those who haughtily find fault with the efforts of the friends of the amendment to secure votes for its adoption. Nor will I even occupy my time with those who are busily engaged to defeat it because of personal grievances and disappointments. I merely want to call attention to the inconsistency of all these wise critics who, while fondling the child and admiring its beauty and praising its parents, are about to clutch its throat and strangle it to death.

Certain it is, Mr. Chairman, that we shall not have attained to the height of national development and civilization of which we are wont to boast until expenditures for a universal exposition to be held on American soil will be regarded just as legitimate under our Constitution and laws as the expenditures for armies and navies and for war purposes. Fortunately, and to the credit and glory of our institutions and of the framers of the Constitution, be it said that there is nothing in that great charter which could be so construed as to prohibit a function such as we here ask the Government to exercise.

We have no national university. We have no national theater. We do not endow any institution of learning except West Point and Annapolis, where the picked youth of the land are being trained and drilled in the arts of war. What, I ask, are we doing as a Congress, a Government, and a nation for the arts of peace? What are we doing to prevent war? What are we doing for the cause of international arbitration? What are we doing to encourage the sciences, the arts, and the industries? What are we doing to stimulate, by peaceful rivalry of our Commonwealths and by comparisons with other nations, the latent forces of American genius? Nothing, except it be by Uncle Sam extending his aid to and thus lightening the burdens, the responsibilities, and the sacrifices of those who are engaged in organizing and inaugurating for the benefit of the whole country that gigantic undertaking, the world's fair of 1904. This, if any constituent should ask the question, is the real justification for our affirmative vote on the original appropriation as well as on this temporary loan.

It has been suggested on this floor by no less a person than the distinguished gentleman from Iowa, Mr. HEPBURN—and never has his eloquence been made to serve a more uncharitable cause—that the city of St. Louis assume the additional burden. No one who is at all familiar with the sacrifices already made by that city will seriously advance such a proposition. Shall I recount them? We first raised \$5,000,000 by individual subscription. Have you a realizing sense of the enormity of this task? If in your communities and cities you have ever attempted to raise, for any charitable or public purpose, an amount equivalent to a contribution of \$8 from every man, woman, and child, then you know, and not until then, what it means to collect \$100,000 fifty times over. But that is not all, Mr. Chairman. The municipality then taxed the property of its citizens to the extent of \$5,000,000 more, and in addition to that more than ten millions have been invested by our citizens in street improvements, new hotels, and other enterprises in connection with the fair.

This makes a grand total, raised in one single American city, of over \$20,000,000, or \$32 to each head of the population. Is there an example in history of public spirit, civic pride, and patriotism to equal this? And, gentlemen, this does not exhaust the sacrifices made by my city upon the altar of the nation. She has given up her largest and most beautiful park, which in area is second only to Fairmount Park in Philadelphia, for this great national purpose. A forest was cut down which can not be replaced in an hundred years. Superb trees, whose mighty crowns looked down as mute but approving witnesses upon the very beginnings of our national life, upon the transfer of Louisiana Territory and upon the first log houses which marked the site where the great metropolis of the Mississippi Valley now stands, were cut down to make room for the execution of the nation's mandate. All the money in the Treasury could not repay our citizens for the loss of this beautiful forest and for what they have thus freely given to the country and the world. And can you estimate in dollars and cents the sum total of energy and time which the unpaid high officials of the exposition company and the hundred prominent citizens of St. Louis who compose the board of directors have expended for years to make the fair a success, their only compensation being the thought that they were engaged in an effort which would redound to the credit and glory of their country? Instead of criticism and censure, these gentlemen, it seems to me, deserve the highest approbation.

We are no beggars. When, a few years ago, in the district

which I have the honor to represent, nearly 3,000 houses were partially or wholly destroyed by a cyclone causing a calamity as great as the appalling loss of property at Baltimore, we did not hold out our hands either to the nation or to individuals, but declined all outside aid and helped ourselves. This example of local pride demonstrates to the satisfaction, I hope, of every fair-minded man on this floor that if it was in our power we would surely help ourselves in this instance. And if Congress, after due deliberation, should refuse to aid us, though the Government itself is known to be a partner in the concern, could anyone name a private banker that would?

Fifty-four foreign governments are participants in the fair with exhibits and structures and an expenditure of over \$10,000,000. The representatives of all nations, races, and creeds are now getting ready to comply with the invitation extended to them by the President of the United States upon the authority of the Congress. What if to-day the news were flashed across the oceans that the American Congress has refused even a temporary advance to make possible the completion of the exposition and the opening of the doors at the specified time? Would it exonerate the American Government and people in the eyes of the civilized world, even if all the criticism you heap upon the exposition management were deserved and just? God forbid such a disgrace and humiliation!

All these reasons, Mr. Chairman, which impel me, as the representative of a St. Louis constituency, to vote for this amendment, appeal with equal force to the representative of every other constituency, because, let us repeat it again and again, it is not a St. Louis or a Missouri fair. It belongs as much to Maine and California, to Texas and Michigan, as it does to my city and State. It is an exposition authorized by and carried on under the auspices of the Government of the United States, and its success is consequently the concern of every American citizen. And who has profited from it so far? Why, over 90 per cent of the timber required for the nineteen great exhibit palaces and the countless other structures have been furnished by the Southern States; twenty Commonwealths are interested in the building contracts, and nearly the whole Union has contributed material, labor, and experts for the great undertaking.

Mr. Chairman, we have gloried in the evidences of a reunited country when the Spanish war broke out, but the great work of peace organized at St. Louis will demonstrate more emphatically and more beautifully the idea of one common country and a union indissoluble and inseparable, because all sections and elements of our population have a common interest in it, and all are contributing the results of their best endeavors in every field of human activity.

We marvel at the magnificent structures of ancient Greece and Rome, and in beholding their ruins to-day we are bound to reverently acknowledge the public spirit which was the inspiring motive of their construction. Let the United States in 1904 give evidence to the world that the same public spirit actuates the people of this Republic; that it is born of and a necessary corollary of our free institutions, and do not let this House by its vote to-day veto the proposition that this lesson, this message to the world, shall be the crowning glory of the universal exposition of 1904. [Applause.]

THE CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. HINSHAW] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this appropriation for several reasons. One reason is that the last Congress has already appropriated something like \$6,000,000 in aid of this project, which is certainly ample, and the exposition should have kept within the bounds of that appropriation. I am opposed to it further because this appropriation, if made, in my judgment, will not be a loan, but will be a gift, and before this session expires, or at the next session, this Commission will come back here and ask for a further appropriation for deficiencies.

I would suggest that instead of spending this money in this manner it should be appropriated for more useful purposes. I know how well the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations [Mr. HEMENWAY] and the other members of his committee have sought to hold down the appropriations in this Congress. They have made a splendid effort in that direction. I know how well the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. OVERSTREET], chairman of the Post-Office Committee, has attempted to hold in proper check the appropriations through his committee.

I know the wonderful onslaught that has been made upon the Post-Office Committee for necessary appropriations in the line of rural free delivery, and I want to say to you that it is of more importance that this Congress should do something toward properly compensating the 20,000 rural carriers of this country, who are not adequately paid, than it is to give this money to the exposition at St. Louis. The amount proposed to be expended here would pay our 20,000 carriers \$225 per year additional to what they now receive. They are the most poorly paid men in the serv-

ice of the United States. This appropriation would give them almost a sufficient amount for two years to come in the way of additional pay, which they so sorely need all over this country. Nothing projected by the American Congress has so come home to the hearts of the people of this country as the rural carrier service. It is a more beneficent thing, it is a greater thing for education, than the St. Louis exposition. Nor do I believe that the St. Louis exposition will be crippled in any manner by the failure of this Congress to make this appropriation.

As the gentleman from Indiana has said, it will be a creditable showing in any event. It has received money enough. There are other purposes for which this money could be more beneficently used. There have been introduced into this Congress a large number of bills for the purpose of giving service pensions to the soldiers of this Republic. I know how well the Speaker of this House has sought to curtail appropriations. I think he is doing a splendid service in that regard, but there is a great demand all over this country for additional appropriations for soldiers of this Republic who have not been adequately cared for by the Pension Bureau of this great Government, and I would say to you that it would be a better thing if this four and one-half million dollars should be given to the soldiers of the nation who so bravely served in the war of the rebellion than to give it for this purpose.

We shall soon be called upon to appropriate \$10,000,000 to pay the Panama Republic the money going to that Republic for the Panama Canal. The sum of \$40,000,000 more will be paid to the French company to extinguish their title to this property. I say this money would better be applied to the partial payment of this \$50,000,000 than for this purpose.

It seems to me that this money is needed in a thousand ways, in far more urgent matters than for the expansion of this already large appropriation. I can not support this measure because I believe the money would be improvidently expended. [Applause.] [Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. BURKETT. Mr. Chairman, in the short time that I shall take I shall not discuss the constitutional phase of this question. I will say, however, in reference to this, that if it is not unconstitutional it ought to be unconstitutional. I want to say in the beginning that there is no one here, I take it, disposed in any way to cripple the St. Louis Exposition. There is no one but wants it to go on and be the great success that it promises and that we hope it will be; and if anyone will read the hearings before the committee in reference to this exposition he will find that it is going on whether this appropriation is made or not.

The question shifts itself simply down to this proposition: Are we going to loan them money without interest from the Government Treasury, or are they to go somewhere else, into the money markets, and borrow \$4,600,000, the same as Buffalo did, the same as Chicago did, and the same as all the other expositions have done?

The exposition is not in peril, as the officers themselves say. The question is only, Where shall they get the money they now need, of the Government or of private parties? They can not come to us and say they can not do this, for they have told us how much more ground they have, and how many more of exhibits they will have, and how much greater the exposition is going to be in every particular than any heretofore. Take the case of the other expositions. Chicago borrowed \$5,000,000 in 1893, and certainly the conditions are better for borrowing money now than they were then. Buffalo borrowed \$2,000,000 with which carry out their exposition.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to ask this question of every Member on this floor who has received a telegram to-day—and all these telegrams have been one way, of course—and let me say this proposition has seemed to have behind it not only a most gigantic lobby, but also a very energetic one. From all sections of the country paid telegrams have been sent in here telling us how to vote on this proposition. Now, the question is: Have you heard from all the people of your district who are interested in the proposition of where the money from our Federal Treasury is going to? I have here their estimation of the population of the United States at \$4,000,000 of people, as given by the president of the exposition in his remarks before the committee. There are 84,000,000 of people that are going to pay this \$4,600,000 we are asked to appropriate. According to their estimation only one in eighteen of all the total population of the United States is going to attend this exposition. That is their estimate, made under conditions that favored their making it as large as possible. They estimate that 5,000,000 people will attend this exposition that 84,000,000 people will pay for.

Now, the question comes, Whose money are we using, and who are we using it for? Is it not our duty to consider the 84,000,000 people interested in this question who pay the taxes that make up this stupendous fund, rather than the few who are interested in St. Louis?

Now, I took up the statistics in reference to the different expo-

sitions that have been held in this country, and I want to call the attention of the committee to them, for the figures are significant. They show the enormity of this proposition, for to all the other expositions we have ever held in this country the Congress has appropriated \$10,650,937—for all of them put together! This St. Louis Exposition has already had given to it by Congress \$6,483,000. This, together with the \$4,600,000 now asked for, will make a total of \$11,083,000 for this one exposition! Compare now, if you will. All other expositions heretofore have had altogether \$10,650,937. St. Louis, if this bill goes through, will have \$11,083,000. I want to show the stupendous amount of nerve it requires, or perhaps gall, for a community to come in here, after having been so liberally treated as the people of St. Louis have been by Congress, and ask us further to put up an additional \$4,600,000.

I can not quite accept all that has been said with reference to the frugality and economy in the conduct of matters down there. As brought out by the gentleman from Iowa, \$5,000,000 of the expenditures already made goes for permanent improvements, benefiting the people of St. Louis. On looking over the report of the United States Commission I found out some more things that they had spent money for that, perhaps, may be interesting and that has resulted to the benefit of that city alone. They say that the whole world is anxious to come here to St. Louis to celebrate this great event. They speak of it as a great patriotic duty that St. Louis has had imposed upon her of caring for this exposition. They tell of the sacrifices that St. Louis has made for the benefit of the world and mankind and that all men and all nations and all States are interested. Let me tell you just how interested they are. Let me tell you of that anxiety from their own statement.

They have taken nation after nation and State after State by the very throat, as it were, and dragged them into the proposition from the beginning. No such gigantic scheme of promotion has ever been undertaken, it may be said to their credit as promoters of this fair. They began by calling the governors of various States together, as has been stated, and from that time to this the cost of exploitation has been an enormous one. Five hundred and forty-eight thousand four hundred and seventy-eight dollars and twenty-three cents so far has been paid out for the exploitation of this St. Louis Exposition. They have been lobbying the world in the interest of this exposition and it has cost that amount. Do not lay the responsibility on the world or on the States or the National Government. It originated in St. Louis, and it has taken three years and more than half a million dollars to get the rest of the world interested. Last spring \$219,608.82 was spent in the dedication of these exposition grounds out there. Does the committee disclose what right they had to spend the money appropriated for the exposition for dedicatory exercises that resulted only in bringing crowds to St. Louis and thus redounding to her benefit? Sir, it was not given for such things as entertainments and bringing people to St. Louis. Two hundred and nineteen thousand dollars and over of the money which we appropriated went for the dedication of the grounds last spring.

In this same report of the Commission I find that they paid out as a preliminary expense \$34,314.28. They paid out in one sum, as shown in this report, for entertainment of guests \$18,312.62; for other ceremonies they have paid out \$14,137.68, making a total in exploitation, dedications, entertainments, and miscellaneous ceremonies there of \$894,851.63. And now they come in here with empty pockets, with an impoverished treasury. I should think their treasury would be empty. And now, after that enormous and preposterous expenditure, they ask this Congress to appropriate out of the people's money \$4,600,000 to carry on that same sort of régime and that same class of expenditures.

I want to say to you, as has been suggested, that there are public buildings required in this country that we are unable to build. I remember that there are four post-offices in this country that have been brought to our attention where the people are walking from the first floor to the fourth floor and the fifth floor because we have thought we did not have money enough to build elevators to take the people up. I remember the condition of the post-office at Los Angeles, and we know the condition over in New York City. We know the demands the rural free-delivery carriers are presenting to us, and I have hoped their bill could be passed and their salaries raised as they ask, but we are met with the proposition and we had it told to us so eloquently when this bill was first taken up by the chairman of the Appropriation Committee that we must be economical in this session of Congress or we would have a deficiency in the Treasury confronting us.

I ask you, how are you going to meet your people when you go home? How will you meet the patrons of rural free delivery and others interested in the extension of that splendid service? What will you say to the rural carriers if their salaries are not made adequate and just? We are informed that it has been decreed that no river and harbor appropriations will be made this session because the watchword is economy. The people of the West are anxious that a couple of hundred thousand dollars or more be ex-

pended to take snags out of the Missouri River and to protect its banks, in order that we might have a great waterway from the Dakotas down by St. Louis to the Gulf of Mexico and out to the sea in that way, and also that millions of dollars of property may be saved from being washed away. We are met with the proposition that the Government has not sufficient funds, and it can not undertake to open that great interstate highway because we must be economical.

Mr. THAYER. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. BURKETT. I can not yield; my time is so limited. There is another exposition to occur out across the continent, in the western portion of this country, and we will be met with the same proposition when it comes in the House. How are you going to excuse yourselves to your people when you can not get an appropriation for more than a Government building and an exhibit for your exposition out there when you have appropriated \$11,000,000 and over of the money of the Treasury in this country for this exposition in St. Louis? Yet, sir, in my judgment, if this appropriation goes through the Lewis and Clark Exposition will be cut off with very little appropriation. I say it is too big; it is too large; it is preposterous to ask the representatives of the people to pay out this money in the face of all that confronts us.

Only this morning I received a letter, as I presume many of you have received similar ones, calling my attention to the fact that the experiment stations at the agricultural colleges of the various States of the Union were asking for a little more money in order that they might broaden their experiments in agriculture, so as to be of more benefit to the farmers, and yet we are told all along the line, in the agricultural bill, in all the appropriation bills that have come in, that we must cut down all these expenses, that we must limit these expenditures to the minimum. Why? Because we will have a deficiency in the Treasury, as the chairman of the Appropriations Committee said.

We have been taught this economy by the great leaders of the House; we have been taught to be careful and conservative in our disposition of the public funds. I say it is a wrong time now to change front. It is a question that is bound to come home to every one of us. It is your welfare, and the people's welfare. This four and one-half millions would build a public building in every Congressional district in this country. We want one in my district, and almost every one of your districts needs one and ought to have it, and yet we have heard that we can not have a public-building bill, because we must be economical, and yet at the same time we are asked to vote to appropriate more than \$11,000,000 for one place, one locality. Gentlemen, it is too large; it is too much to ask of us. Congress has already been liberal beyond measure. Let St. Louis put her shoulder to the wheel and take care of the remainder.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the rest of my time to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER].

Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I am much obliged to the gentleman from Nebraska for this opportunity. For the past eight years it has been said to us by men in whom we have confidence in this House that we are the trustees of the people's money. There is not a court in the United States that would not be impeached if it authorized a trustee to make a loan of the money in his hands belonging to another upon such security as is offered by this bill. It is admitted by the chairman of this commission that this money can not be borrowed except security is offered, unless it is borrowed from the United States. The admission is made by him in his printed statement that unless this Government takes this risk and loans money upon which no security is offered it can not be borrowed unless private security is given.

This Government has been induced to go into the show business at St. Louis. There are three parties to the agreement: St. Louis is one, the Government of the United States is another, and a corporation is a third. And yet the city of St. Louis and this corporation have the effrontery to ask this Government to loan all this money upon no security whatever. I submit to the people who advocate this loan that it is but fair toward our Government, and toward our Treasury, and toward the interests we have obligated ourselves to keep, that each one should loan one-third of the money; that if we have an interest equal to one-third the Government should not be called upon to loan more than one-third of the money necessary to pay present indebtedness and discharge that of the future.

Furthermore, Mr. Chairman, the figures show that four million and a half dollars will not pay the expenses incurred and yet to be incurred to enable this great exposition to open without debt or liability. Forty millions of dollars will be the expenditure. The different appropriations made by all parties and institutions interested amount to but \$33,000,000. If the appropriation asked for here should pass, there will yet remain unpaid \$2,400,000 when the gates of this show open. Where is the balance to come from? The question has not been answered; and, furthermore, the information

has been refused by the chairman of this exposition corporation. The chairman of the St. Louis exposition has neglected to submit to this House the information what the expenses amount to and to whom disbursements have been paid. No prudent person lives, Mr. Chairman, who would make a loan upon any such security as that offered here.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH] is recognized for fifteen minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, three objections have been made to the Senate amendment with reference to the St. Louis Exposition. First, that it authorizes a loan and that the Government has no legal right to make a loan; second, that the security is inadequate; third, that there are no sufficient reasons for making the loan. It is indeed strange that at this late day it should be asserted that the Government of the United States has no legal authority to make a loan. In the first Administration under the Constitution the Government entered upon a policy of loaning money to banks, and specifically to the United States Bank. A few years rolled away, and after elaborate arguments upon the constitutional questions involved, this Government loaned \$28,000,000 to the States of this Union. After the establishment of the present system of national banks, the Government of the United States entered upon a policy of loaning money to those banks, and to-day has \$160,000,000 so loaned to them.

At the time of the construction of the transcontinental railways the Government loaned to those railways the bonds of the United States. Surely if it can loan bonds it can loan money.

Mr. HARRISON. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. In view of the brief time I have, I do not wish to be interrupted now. After I get through, if there is any time remaining, I will be happy to answer questions.

In 1876, when the first international exposition was given in this country, the entire aid furnished to Philadelphia was a loan, and nothing but a loan. This Government has proceeded upon the policy of making loans for various purposes, from the Administration of George Washington until this hour. [Applause.] It is therefore a strange doctrine to hear preached now that there is no power in the Government of the United States to make loans.

I admit that I have not sufficiently fine reasoning faculties to be able to understand the proposition that this Government can advance money to expositions to be kept forever, but has not the constitutional power to advance money to exhibitions to be returned. The distinction in a constitutional sense is too refined for me to comprehend.

I turn, then, to the question, Is this loan reasonably safe? I want to call attention in that connection to some of the figures with reference to the Chicago Exposition. I have here a telegram from the auditor of the Chicago Exposition, from which it appears that the receipts from that exposition, exclusive of the after-exposition admissions and of wreckage, were \$14,195,645. That the entire expense of carrying on the exposition, from the day it opened until it closed, was \$3,471,000, leaving net receipts of \$10,724,440 for distribution to pay the debts of the corporation and dividends to the stockholders of the corporation.

By reason of that fact the Chicago Exposition succeeded in paying a bonded and floating indebtedness upon it at the day it was opened of \$9,268,358. It has paid \$1,086,000 in dividends to its stockholders. It has paid \$1,000,000 in clearing the grounds and in after-exposition expenses, and it has \$500,000 still in the treasury and undistributed. This exposition as planned at St. Louis will in every respect exceed in magnitude the Chicago Exposition. The Chicago Exposition was up to that time the most wonderful in the history of the world, but the Chicago Exposition had under roof 85 acres of ground, while the St. Louis Exposition has under roof 128 acres of ground, or 50 per cent more than the exposition at the city of Chicago. The grounds at Chicago were 680 acres; the grounds at St. Louis are 1,240 acres.

It thus appears that even should there be a tremendous falling off in receipts this exposition would be abundantly able to pay this money back to the Government. The Chicago Exposition opened, as I have stated, with more than \$9,000,000 of indebtedness. This exposition, far greater in magnitude, will open with only \$4,600,000 of indebtedness. The Chicago Exposition paid all of its indebtedness and had a large amount to pay in dividends upon the stock. How can it be conceived that this exposition, so much greater than the Chicago Exposition, will fall so much below it in receipts as not to be able to pay \$4,600,000 of indebtedness, less than half the indebtedness of the Chicago Exposition and more than 50 per cent a greater exposition? But that is not all.

The Chicago Exposition was held in the year of the panic. This exposition is about to be held in highly prosperous times, and by reason of the high price of cotton in that great region tributary to this great exposition the people to the south of it are more prosperous than they have ever been in their history. Is it to be

believed that with increased prosperity everywhere, and a much greater prosperity to the south, that this exposition, 50 per cent greater in magnitude and in some respects a hundred per cent greater, will fall far below the receipts at Chicago? But if these receipts fall off \$6,000,000 from the receipts of Chicago, and if the expenses were as high as Chicago, still every dollar of this indebtedness would be paid back to the Government of the United States before Congress convened in next December. As expenses are made greater by greater attendance, it is inconceivable that there could be a falling off of six millions in receipts without a falling off in the expenses of administration.

It takes twice as many gate keepers to let a million people pass through as it does to let half a million pass through, and the expenses necessarily fall off as the crowd falls off. So that it is safe to say that if this exposition had half the attendance of Chicago it would still pay back every cent of this money to the Government of the United States before Congress convenes next winter. It seems to me that this is an answer to the suggestion made upon the floor the other day that perhaps the 60 per cent of the receipts left to this company would not be sufficient to pay the running expenses of the institution. At Chicago the running expenses were less than 25 per cent of the receipts, and more than 75 per cent of the receipts were left for the payment of debts and of dividends.

Now, I want to pass from that question to the question of the permanent improvements in the city of St. Louis. It seems to me that the statements that have been made on that subject are unintentionally unfair. In the first place, it is claimed that great buildings have been erected for the Washington University. Washington University had purchased 110 acres of land, now part of the grounds of this exposition, nearly ten years ago. It had erected upon this land magnificent granite buildings, worth nearly a million of dollars. These grounds were necessary in the exposition grounds, and these buildings could be used in connection with the exposition. The exposition management therefore made a contract by which they leased that property which had cost about a million and a half, exclusive of interest, for \$750,000 for three years, upon the stipulation that the whole \$750,000 was to be put into the erection upon these grounds of buildings, and the grading of the grounds to make them suitable for exposition purposes, and that these buildings were also to be used by the exposition management.

Thus the exposition management, for a rental of \$250,000 a year, rented property worth more than \$2,000,000 that was of as much use to this exposition as if the buildings had been constructed by it. This was a highly profitable enterprise for the exposition management.

Now I turn for a moment to the question of the \$3,000,000 alleged to have been expended for permanent improvements for the benefit of the city of St. Louis. There is not any \$3,000,000; the aggregate of underground improvements is \$2,497,000. Let me refer to some of the items which are embraced in this sum of \$2,497,000.

Fire protection, 50 miles of pipe, \$550,000.

Domestic water supply, 60 miles of pipe, \$220,000.

Little or none of that can be of any value in a forest park.

Gas pipe, 25 miles, \$30,000.

Substantially none of that can be of any permanent value in a forest park.

Plumbing, \$250,000.

Walks and roadways, 75 miles, 20 feet wide, \$400,000.

Of what utility can walks arranged with reference to the location of these buildings be as a permanent improvement to the city of St. Louis?

Fences, entrances, ticket booths, \$80,000.

Grading, 2,000,000 cubic yards, to adapt this park to the situation of these buildings, \$500,000.

These are the "permanent" accessions to the city of St. Louis from the expenditure of the alleged \$3,000,000.

But it is also asserted that a million and a quarter of dollars has been put into a permanent art hall. I want to say that this hall is of brick, and it is absolutely indispensable in order to obtain there the art treasures proposed to be exhibited. And it does not approximate in quality or in beauty that splendid Memorial Hall which still embellishes Fairmount Park in the city of Philadelphia.

Nothing whatever has been expended in permanent improvements except what was absolutely indispensable for the purpose of giving this exhibition; and but a trifling part of these improvements can be of any permanent value to the people of the city of St. Louis. So much for this charge that the city of St. Louis has obtained \$5,000,000 for local purposes out of this exposition.

I say this loan is a safe one. Then why should we make it? We should make it because the city of St. Louis has only half as much banking capital as the city of Chicago had at the time of the Chicago exposition and only a fourth as much of bank deposits. This city, without the bank assets that the city of Chicago had at the

time of its exposition, has succeeded in financing this institution until it is ready to open, within \$4,600,000, while the people of Chicago were compelled to open their exposition with \$9,200,000 of indebtedness. The people of St. Louis have done wonders. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH] has expired. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. RICHARDSON] for five minutes.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, in the short time allowed me I shall confine my remarks to the proposition so earnestly contended for on this floor that the Government ought to take money out of the Treasury and loan it to the Louisiana Purchase Exposition. This proposition is simply to loan \$4,600,000 to a corporation, to be repaid within a certain time. Now, if it were conceded, Mr. Chairman—which I do not—that there is constitutional warrant and authority for the Government to do this, yet I would contend in opposing this proposition that it is absolutely unfair and unjust and unwise, from a business standpoint, to vote the money of the people away in this manner, and based on such security as is offered. This proposition, presented as it is with a pledge or security for the repayment of the money, should be treated as a business matter, subject to business rules.

Is it possible that any man or any institution in this country familiar with business matters who has money to loan as a safe and reliable investment would risk his money in such a loan as this? It appears that this exposition has by mismanagement, misgovernment, and bad business principles and unparalleled extravagance rushed on into bankruptcy. Can such an institution as that come fairly and justly under such conditions and appeal to business men to loan money to put it upon its feet? What guaranty have we that this money will be paid back? If we judge the future from the past, it is but a slim one. What, I ask, is the financial condition to-day of the Louisiana Purchase Exposition? Let me call attention to the evidence of the director-general of this institution before the Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions. Here is what he says on page 34 of the hearings before that committee:

Mr. FRANCIS. Gentlemen, a great amount of this money that we are asking has already been earned and is due upon contracts. There will be over \$2,000,000 of this money that we will have to pay on contracts already signed. I had \$122,000 in vouchers when I left that I could not pay because we did not have the money. We had about \$200,000 left, but we had to reserve that to pay our day laborers on Saturday. Then, there is a great deal of work we will have to do as soon as the spring opens that we can not let out by contract. This four and a half million dollars will enable us to open the exposition, and we can not do it on any less.

Mr. Chairman, here is a great industrial exposition that this Government has helped that comes and admits through its director-general that its expenditures have been, it seems to me, in many respects reckless, and that after the expenditure of \$15,000,000, if the Government does not come forward and advance four and a half millions more in addition to the \$5,000,000 already advanced by the Government, this exposition will hardly be able to throw open its gates. The argument is that because the Government has advanced heretofore \$5,000,000, now the duty devolves on Congress to put up \$4,600,000 more to save the enterprise from a failure. Why not apply that argument and reasoning to the stockholders of the Louisiana Purchase Exposition and the municipality of St. Louis, who jointly have subscribed \$10,000,000 to the exposition? The stockholders and the city of St. Louis are each to receive one-third of the net profits after all expenses are paid. Why come to Congress as a business matter and ask Congress to put up enough money to protect the interest of the other joint stockholders? That is the direct question and a practical one.

Mr. Chairman, on such a proposition as this we are acting here in the nature of a fiduciary capacity, and there is not a court in any State in this Union that would not hold responsible in damages an agent acting in a fiduciary capacity who would loan money under these conditions, and make him actionable in damages. It would be declared that the agent had loaned the money of his principal in a reckless manner and without due care. Mr. Chairman, there are other matters I should like to refer to. I heard yesterday with profound amazement the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COWHERD] say that this proposition was constitutional, and being constitutional that this money ought not to be loaned by the Government to any institution save a large and great one that was expending a great deal of money.

I have great respect for the ability of the gentleman from Missouri, but I would be glad, indeed, if he would be so kind as to refer me to any section or paragraph or word in the Constitution that warrants such a use of the public money as is here proposed.

I find that section 8 of the Constitution says:

The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States, but all duties, imposts, and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

Again, the Constitution says the Congress shall have power "to borrow money on the credit of the United States."

It can not be that the distinguished gentleman from Missouri believed that this proposed loan was authorized under the "general welfare" clause of the above section, because he said, as I recall his language, that the money should not be loaned by the Government to anything but these large, expensive, and glittering expositions. It is true that the people who get up the county and State fairs and expositions bear the burden of the taxes that contribute the money as a loan to carry on these splendid expositions, but the Constitution discriminated against your county and State fairs and no money can be loaned you by the Government, but it must all go to Louisiana Purchase Exposition and expositions of like nature.

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that the Government ought ever to occupy the position of a lender of its money to any individual or corporation or to any enterprise, local or national. I believe this to be a fundamental principle of our Constitution. I with hesitancy concede that conditions might arise that would excuse or justify a donation by Congress, when some great calamity has befallen the people or where some great enterprise of general benefit to the people claims such a donation. Congress already has complied with this condition in an appropriation of \$5,000,000 to the Louisiana Purchase Exposition; but this proposition is to ask Congress to make a straight-out loan.

I do not, Mr. Chairman, propose to say one word that would be harmful to the success of the St. Louis Exposition, but it behooves us to meet the situation as it is presented to us fairly and boldly, discuss it as we would were we as individuals approached as a business matter for the loan of money. That is the way to test this loan proposition fairly. I have already pointed out to the committee that to-day the Louisiana Purchase Exposition Company is behind on its contracts to the enormous amount of \$2,000,000, and that this amount will be used out of the loan now sought from the Government to restore the financial credit and standing of the exposition company. That is the condition to-day.

We are earnestly assured if we make this loan, with these discouraging conditions staring us in the face, that every dollar of the money the Government loans will be paid back according to the stipulated agreement and conditions provided in amendment "10," made by the Senate on the urgent deficiency bill of the House. We are to be paid out of the gross receipts of the exposition company.

Governor Francis, the director-general, makes his estimate that there will be 30,000,000 paid admissions at 50 cents each. The concessions, he says, will amount to \$6,000,000, making a grand total of \$31,000,000. How does he arrive at these estimates? It is an easy matter when a man wants to borrow money to make an estimate of profits, and I say, after reading the evidence given by Governor Francis before the committee, if his judgment and business estimates are as bad in the matter of gate receipts as it has been in the mistaken judgment and estimates that he has made in the past as to the costs of the exposition, that there will be nothing in the way of receipts to reimburse the Government for its loan of \$4,600,000.

I call the committee's attention to the spectacular basis upon which the estimate of receipts is made up:

He bases this estimate upon the population of the tributary country. The population of our country during the Chicago Exposition was 69,000,000 in round numbers. In eleven years we think it is safe to calculate upon an increase of 25 per cent in population. Twenty-five per cent of 69,000,000 is a little over 17,000,000—17,250,000. Add that to 69,000,000 and you have 86,250,000. We base this calculation upon a population of 84,000,000. That does not include the increased population caused by our new possessions; it does not count the Filipinos or the Hawaiians or the Porto Ricans.

You are familiar with the immigration statistics and know how the population has been increasing in that way during the past year. A population of 84,000,000, basing the increase on an average increase throughout the country, will give to the States contributory to St. Louis, running no farther east than Indiana and no farther west than Colorado and taking in the Mississippi Valley, a population in that territory of 26,000,000 people.

We think it fair—indeed, we think it very moderate—to estimate that of the 26,000,000 people inhabiting those States 4,000,000 will visit the exposition, and that those 4,000,000 people will go into the exposition an average of five times. That takes in all St. Louis and all East St. Louis and the cities on the east side of the Mississippi River and all of the territory immediately contiguous to St. Louis.

If that is correct, if 4,000,000 people out of 26,000,000 people enter the exposition, and enter its gates an average of five times, that will be 20,000,000 alone. Now, taking the 26,000,000 from the 84,000,000 population, we have 58,000,000 left. That takes in the Atlantic seaboard; that takes in the country west of the Rockies, and takes in the country as far west as Indiana. In that territory are 58,000,000 people. We think a very moderate estimate is that 1,000,000 of those 58,000,000 will attend the fair and, coming a longer distance, they will stay longer than the people who come a shorter distance, and will enter the exposition, we say, seven times. If so, that will add 7,000,000 people to our 20,000,000 people, making 27,000,000 people.

Now, we estimate that there will be 100,000 visitors from foreign countries. That includes the entire Orient and all the European countries and includes Mexico and Canada, which have close and direct rail connection with St. Louis; that includes all of Central and South America. Our information is to the effect that they are making preparations in those countries to visit the exposition in large numbers, and we have the same reports from Europe, namely, that large numbers are coming from there and other parts of the world as well. If 100,000 come that distance, we think it is safe to estimate

that they will go on an average of twenty times each. That will make 2,000,000 more in addition, making a total of 29,000,000 people. At 50 cents each that would be \$14,500,000.

I ask, in all sincerity, Is not all this chimerical, mere talk? The director-general seems to forget in his lurid and extravagant calculations that the people of the United States have become somewhat wearied and tired of expositions, because when you see one you see generally what all others have.

This ought to be a large factor in his estimate. Would any man of business judgment risk his money on such conjectural estimates? Why, Mr. Chairman, bad weather or the war between Japan and Russia could easily upset and undo the entire estimate, and then, as a matter of course, the company would come back to Congress and ask to be discharged from its contract to repay the Government. That is the usual road all such matters travel.

Mr. Chairman, there is another view that I have of this matter outside of the constitutional objection and the business matter, and that is this: It is well understood that the spirit of economy is predominating in this Congress, so much so that it has already been announced that there would be no river and harbor bill, no public buildings bill, made up during this present Congress.

I would myself infinitely prefer to see this large sum of \$4,600,000 appropriated by the Government to the improvement of our rivers and harbors and to building Government buildings for the use of the people as post-office buildings and court-houses than to see it loaned to the St. Louis exposition.

Why, Mr. Chairman, if this sum that is to be loaned by the Government was used in building a good, comfortable post-office building at county seats, say at a cost of \$10,000 or \$12,000 each, how many people of our country would be made happy by having a good, comfortable post-office building? They would far exceed in numbers the magnificent estimates made by Governor Francis on the paid admissions.

The people all over the country are aroused about the matter of Government aid for the improvement of their public roads. I am an earnest advocate of this aid being given by the Government, safeguarded in the proper way. But the objection comes up already that it is unconstitutional to help the people improve their public roads with money from the common Treasury. Suppose, Mr. Chairman, that this \$4,600,000 that we are asked to loan to this exposition—with scarcely a ray of hope of its repayment—should be used in the improvement of the public roads in four of the States of the Union. What a transformation it would make. What a happy, prosperous, and contented people we would find when this amount of money had been spent on their public roads. They would hold up their hands and call their Government blessed.

So it is if this amount were placed on the internal waterways of some of the States it would increase the commercial traffic and prosperity of the people bordering on these waterways a hundred fold. I do not, Mr. Chairman, refer to these matters in a complaining or carping spirit, but the demand is justly coming up from all sections of the country, north, south, east, and west, that some at least of the immense revenues of the country must be used at home and for the commercial benefit of the interests of the masses of our people. These matters it behooves the Congress to heed.

THE CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Chairman, I assume that no one will dispute the probable grandeur of the St. Louis Exposition and that there is no American who will not be proud of the success of that exposition. But this is not a question that is to be settled to-day by reference to fountains, pictures, rhetoric, and all that sort of thing. It is a plain, practical, business question, and as representatives of plain, practical, business people we ought to deal with it as such.

What is the question? The St. Louis Exposition Society is a private corporation of the State of Missouri. It is engaged in a great work. It has been recognized as a national work. Congress has given to the aid of that private corporation in this national work \$5,000,000, and given it upon the pledge made on this floor that if the \$5,000,000 were given the United States would not be called upon to give anything more. I set that aside, however. I set aside the question of the constitutionality of the loan, and I come down to the plain, practical, business question, Can you justify to your constituents the loaning of \$4,600,000 to this private corporation out of the Treasury of the United States, in view of the obligations now resting upon that Treasury?

Let us look at it a moment. This money is to come out of the Treasury of the United States. There are certain prior claims upon that Treasury. Can these prior claims be satisfied and this \$4,600,000 be safely loaned? That is the question. Let me quote to you from the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. This is his statement as to the condition of the Treasury:

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 \$727,474,206.79.

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 \$704,472,060.72. Estimates in excess of the probable total revenues, \$42,845,862.07.

Then the chairman further goes on to say:

The present net cash balance in the Treasury amounts to \$224,000,000. This sum is likely to be materially diminished in the near future (1) by payment on account of the isthmian canal, \$50,000,000; (2) by requisition on account of unexpended balances of appropriations, which are: For increase of the Navy, \$27,000,000; for rivers and harbors, \$37,000,000; for public buildings, \$17,000,000; total, \$131,000,000.

Thus if all outstanding obligations fixed by appropriations already made were liquidated the net cash in the Treasury would be reduced to the dangerously low-water mark of \$93,000,000, a sum less than it has reached at any period since the era of depression that antedated the beginning of Mr. McKinley's first Administration.

There yet remains to be appropriated to meet contract obligations authorized chiefly by the last Congress on account of public works as follows:

For increase of the Navy.....	\$82,718,659.00
For rivers and harbors.....	36,623,964.89
For public buildings.....	17,161,609.34
Total.....	136,500,233.23

The estimates of appropriations required to be made at this session on account of the foregoing are:

For increase of the Navy.....	\$38,226,860.00
For rivers and harbors (engineers' estimates).....	13,540,753.00
For public buildings.....	9,087,208.00
Total.....	60,854,821.00

There should be no legislation passed reducing revenues, and this Congress must exercise economy, not refusing any necessary item to meet the growing expenses of this great country, but to strike from the estimates and from the appropriation bills reported to this House every superfluous item. We must keep within the revenues.

That is to say, taking into account the estimates for the running of the Government, for the ordinary conduct of its affairs from day to day, at the end of this fiscal year there will be a deficit in the Treasury of \$42,000,000.

Now, we have many things conceded to be necessary that we can not appropriate for because of the condition of the Treasury and the demand for economy.

For instance, you go up here to the War Department to have an interview relating to your official business with an officer of that Department, and you are told that he is to be found down on Pennsylvania avenue somewhere in the second story of a rented building. Why is he not provided with an office? Because we must exercise economy. And that is only one instance, of which there are many. To cite another: There is, in my district, according to the report of the engineer in charge, a public work that, unless immediate appropriation be made for its repair, will collapse and destroy the entire navigation of a river. I can not get an appropriation for it. Why? Because we can not afford a river and harbor bill.

There are demands of many kinds, believed by those making them to be legitimate demands, that no response can be made to because we must exercise economy.

In that we all acquiesce. But how shall we satisfy our constituents when we further acquiesce in withholding appropriations from their legitimate projects and in giving \$4,600,000 to St. Louis for its exposition?

Oh, but, it is said, this is a loan. I venture to say that no man familiar with our dealings with expositions in the past believes in his heart that any cent of this money will ever be repaid. The next thing that we will be called upon to do will be to release our claim.

I am opposed to this measure as extravagant and unjustifiable. THE CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RODENBERG] is recognized for ten minutes.

Mr. RODENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I can not refrain from expressing my surprise and also my regret at the peculiar character of some of the objections that have been urged against the adoption of this amendment. I do not agree with the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] that the only question involved in this proposition is merely one of dollars and cents. The question that presents itself to us is this: Shall we, the representatives of the people, confronted as we are with an honest and straightforward presentation of the unavoidable difficulties that have been encountered in carrying through this great national enterprise—shall we refuse to do our duty by the people and the people's exposition simply to preserve a reputation for questionable and

wholly indefensible economy in legislation? Shall we for the first time in our history do violence to that magnificent spirit of national liberality which has always characterized the American people in order to maintain the delusion that parsimony is an attribute of statesmanship?

I believe in economy. I believe in protecting the Treasury of the United States against all unwarranted and unjustifiable expenditures. I have no sympathy, however, and but little patience, with that peculiar brand of inconsistent and contradictory economy which so often manifests itself in this House, and which earnestly and pathetically advocates an appropriation for some purely local and wholly unimportant purpose, and in the same breath denies fair and proper treatment to some great national enterprise in whose success every public-spirited citizen of the United States has an intense personal interest.

Mr. Chairman, the Louisiana Purchase Exposition is not a sectional undertaking. It does not belong, as some seem to think, to the city of St. Louis. Its glories are not confined to the narrow limits of the State of Missouri. Its influence reaches far beyond the boundaries of that splendid domain which to-day stands as an enduring monument to the constructive genius and statesmanship of Thomas Jefferson. It is your exposition; it is my exposition; it is an American exposition; it is a universal exposition; it will be an epitome of American thought, American genius, American advancement, and American civilization.

I believe that President Francis and the gentlemen associated with him, who are charged with responsibility for the successful inauguration and completion of this gigantic enterprise, are engaged in a great and patriotic work. Instead of censure we should give them praise; instead of abuse they should receive encouragement; instead of meeting with objections in this Chamber they should receive our cordial support and enthusiastic cooperation. I know and you know that they are not working for personal glory or aggrandizement. Theirs is altogether a labor of love. They are performing patriotic and laborious service for you and for me and for every American citizen.

Mr. Chairman, the surprising statement has been made in this debate that the citizens of St. Louis have not discharged their full duty toward this exposition; that they have been derelict in the loyalty of their support of this great project. It has been argued that the city itself will enjoy such special and extraordinary advantages by reason of the holding of this exposition within its corporate limits that the people there should be compelled to pay out of their already depleted finances the sum necessary to complete this great undertaking.

Mr. Chairman, I deny the accuracy of that statement and characterize it as an unfair, an unjust, and an ungenerous reflection on the public spirit of the citizens of the metropolis of the Mississippi Valley. St. Louis has done her full duty. She has been weighed in the balance of civic and national pride and not found wanting.

Does any gentleman believe for a moment that the \$10,000,000 donated to the fair itself is all that the city of St. Louis has invested in that enterprise? Do you count for naught the disinterested and devoted services of 100 of her most distinguished and progressive citizens? Do you intend to refuse to give her credit for the millions upon millions of dollars invested in additional railroad and street car facilities, in new hotels, restaurants, and apartment buildings whose construction is made necessary in order to feed and house the visitors to the fair? Do you remember Buffalo? Do you recall the experience of Chicago? Do you remember the miles upon miles of stately buildings that remained vacant for years after the Columbian Exposition closed its doors?

Ah, gentlemen, you may speak of the special and extraordinary advantages that accrue to a city in which an international exposition is held, but the fact remains that the dreary record of special and extraordinary advantages of the Columbian fair, so far as the city of Chicago was concerned, will be found in the fore closure proceedings in the chancery courts of Cook County. I have heard it estimated by conservative business men of Chicago, and I have no doubt the statement will be borne out by the representatives of that wonderful city in this Chamber, that the financial loss occasioned by that fair was not less than \$20,000,000 in excess of her voluntary donations. But Chicago's loss was the nation's gain. A new impetus was given to our export trade. Our foreign commerce was expanded, and to-day the people of the United States realize that the investment was a profitable one for them as a whole.

You ask why does not the management borrow these \$4,600,000 in the city of St. Louis. I answer by saying that the drain on the financial resources of the city has been exceptionally severe. The per capita cost of this exposition to the people of St. Louis already approximates \$30 for every man, woman, and child. I maintain that it is not right, it is not fair, to ask her to assume this additional and tremendous burden at this time. I do not believe that we should insist on taxing the generosity of her citizenship to the point of absolute injustice and imposition. The world can not

but admire the pluck and patriotic determination of any city that will cheerfully undertake an international contract of this magnitude.

The distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN], for the brilliancy of whose intellect and eloquence of speech I have a more sincere admiration than for that of any other gentleman in this Chamber, in his speech last Monday also directed the attention of the House to an item of \$5,000,000 which he says has been invested in permanent improvements to be used for all time to come by the city of St. Louis. I want to emphasize the statement of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COWHERD] that three-fifths of that amount, or \$3,000,000, have been expended in grading the grounds, digging sewers and water courses, filling up depressions, laying pipes and mains, and inaugurating a perfect and complete system of sanitation. While these improvements may be regarded as permanent in their nature, I would like to know of what practical value they will be to St. Louis after the great fair is numbered with the historical events of the past? Forest Park, in which this exposition is located, marks the extreme western limits of the city. It is far removed from the center of population, and the site is hardly available for any permanent public purpose.

If the value of this kind of investment to future generations can be computed in dollars and cents, then I would like to know what were the lasting benefits that accrued to the city of Chicago by reason of her compulsory investment in this same character of permanent improvements in Jackson Park?

There is an item of \$1,250,000 for a permanent art building. In justification of that item I want to say that the great artists of the world, as well as the owners of famous and invaluable works of art, declined to exhibit their priceless paintings and rare sculpture unless such exhibition could be made in a building of architectural beauty and absolutely fireproof in every way. The action of the management in complying with this reasonable request is certainly worthy of commendation. The play of Hamlet without the melancholy prince would be even more interesting than a universal exposition in which the progress of art was not a distinctive feature.

The other item of \$750,000, which has been paid to Washington University, can not properly be classed as a permanent improvement. Washington University is not a State university. It is an endowed educational institution, and one of the best in the western country. The money paid to the university is in the nature of rental for three years' use of the commodious granite buildings for the offices of the World's Fair management. And I maintain that if the management had been compelled to construct its own administration buildings, supply the heating and lighting apparatus, pay the insurance and repairs, etc., it would have cost far in excess of \$750,000.

So that after all the single item of \$1,250,000 remains as an available permanent improvement to remind the citizens of St. Louis and of the country of the glories of an exposition, in the building of which there were spent approximately \$40,000,000.

Mr. Chairman, we are fond of boasting of the wonderful development of our national resources and the large increase in our material wealth. I have been riveted to my seat for hours by the inspiring eloquence of the gentleman from Iowa when speaking of our wonderful industrial and commercial progress. We claim to-day, and justly so, not only commercial supremacy, but also preeminence among the nations of the earth in the field of art, literature, invention, and scientific research. But when we are called upon to present to the world and to civilization the practical evidence of our remarkable achievements, there are those among us who object, and when we analyze their objections we find that they may be summed up in the question, Does it pay? Looking at it from this standpoint, from the commercial standpoint, I say: Yes, it will pay the nation as a whole. It will prove a profitable investment for the United States. It will bring financial returns to the country at large a hundred fold.

The great Columbian Exposition at Chicago, in which the civilized nations participated, gave to them the first practical demonstration of the superiority of the product of the American mine, the American farm, and the American workshop. It was there that the Englishman first learned of the superior construction and durability of our locomotives. It was there that the Korean first conceived the idea of inaugurating an American electric railway system in his own far-away country. It was there that the Frenchman learned to use our silks and drink our wines. It was there that the people of every country under the sun first became impressed with the importance and the necessity of entering into closer trade relations with the United States. Let us continue this glorious system of education which has proved of such incalculable advantage to us in the past. Ten years have passed since the Chicago fair. Let us show the world what a decade of real, live American progress means.

You are not asked to vote an additional appropriation for this exposition. You are simply asked for a loan of \$4,600,000 to com-

plete this enterprise under restrictions which amply secure the Government against the possibility of a loss. I believe as firmly as I believe anything that every dollar of that loan will be repaid into the Treasury of the United States.

Gentlemen, the eyes of the world are upon us to-day. We have invited all nations to participate in this universal exposition. Our invitation has been accepted. It was extended not at the instance of the exposition management, as the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN] seems to think, but at the instance of the enlightened public sentiment of the American people, at the instance of that commendable spirit of comity, of courtesy, and good will that prevails among all friendly powers. By our own act, on the 1st day of next May we will become the proud host of the civilized world. As for me, I am in favor of extending a royal welcome to our guests and preparing for them a feast that will be commensurate with the dignity, the greatness, the wealth, and the grandeur of the American Republic. [Loud applause.]

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LAWRENCE] is recognized.

Mr. LAWRENCE. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the Government has gone to the very limit in appropriating money for exposition purposes. I am opposed to any further appropriations for the St. Louis Exposition, and I am equally opposed to any so-called loan. If we are to aid that exposition still further, I think we should do so by a gift and not deceive ourselves or anyone else by calling it a loan. It is a grave question whether we, the guardians of the people's money, have any right to make an appropriation of this character for a purpose which is not a governmental purpose. But I realize that the Government is committed to the policy. Other expositions are on the way, and Congress will undoubtedly continue to make appropriations for them until the end of time.

There is, however, every reason why such appropriations should be most carefully considered and made with due regard for economy. When the initial appropriation of \$5,000,000 for the St. Louis Exposition was made it was a most generous one; it was all that could be asked or expected. We clearly understood that no more would be asked for. I think there can be no doubt that the managers of the exposition so understood it themselves. Consequently they come now before Congress asking, not for an appropriation, but for a loan. It would have been more businesslike and shown more convincing evidence of good faith if the managers had made some effort to secure this money in the usual way from banking institutions. The evidence given before the Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions shows that no such attempt was ever made.

That fact at least raises a suspicion that the security is not good or that there is no expectation of the debt ever being paid. Personally I can not believe that there is any chance of its payment. I admire the optimism of some of the friends of this exposition. I firmly believe that it will, in a general way, be a great success. I certainly hope so; but, Mr. Chairman, expositions are not a financial success, and it will be a perfect marvel if this one proves to be such. There will certainly be some hard-luck story which the managers can tell as a reason why they were unable to pay this debt, why the exposition was not a financial success, and why it is necessary for Congress to make a still further appropriation to make up a deficit.

We are told that our surplus is likely to become a deficit, and that it is necessary to practice economy in governmental expenditures. The Panama Canal, it is estimated, will cost \$200,000,000. As a matter of fact, it is likely to cost very much more. The expense of maintaining and constructing our Navy is an enormous one, and it is now said by those in a position to know that we need not expect hereafter any naval appropriation bill which will carry an appropriation of less than \$100,000,000. A service-pension bill is on the way, which, if passed by Congress, will add about \$50,000,000 more to our annual expenditures.

Surely some one should call a halt, and economy is, in fact, being observed in certain directions. There is to be no general river and harbor bill at this session of Congress, in spite of the fact that in various sections of our country there is a most urgent demand for appropriations in behalf of needed improvements in aid of our growing commerce. There is to be no public-building bill, in spite of the fact that in various parts of the country buildings are absolutely needed for the proper transaction of the public business. The Members of this House have unanimously, with a heroism rarely equaled and never surpassed, declined to accept the mileage to which they were legally entitled. Let the good work go on. If the rule of economy is to be applied—and I believe it should—it should certainly be applied to the proposition

now before the House. Let us save this \$4,600,000 for purposes which are demanded in the interests of the people. I hope the Members of the House will emphatically refuse to make this appropriation. To my mind it is an extravagant, unwarranted, and unjustifiable use of the people's money. [Applause.]

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. GROSVENOR having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, 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.

SENATE AMENDMENT TO URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. SHERMAN] is recognized for ten minutes.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I favor concurrence in the Senate amendment with the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota, chairman of the Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions. I take it, Mr. Chairman, that no one seriously contends that the Constitution prohibits our passing this provision. My fervid and eloquent friend from Nebraska [Mr. BURKETT] says that if the Constitution does not prohibit it, it ought to do so. Recognizing, as he must at that time have noted, the absence of my lovable and learned friend from Georgia [Mr. BARTLETT], the custodian of the Constitution, and he, the gentleman from Nebraska, acting as custodian of the Treasury, I was surprised that he did not at the time ask unanimous consent that the Constitution be amended.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. SHERMAN. My time is brief, and I do not wish to be interrupted.

Mr. BARTLETT. The gentleman has referred to me, and I think it is but fair that he should let me interrupt him.

Mr. SHERMAN. Oh, very well; I will yield to the lovable gentleman.

Mr. BARTLETT. The gentleman has misunderstood everything I said if he believes that I took the position that Congress was prohibited by the Constitution from making this appropriation. I never said so, and if the gentleman had given attention to my speech he would know that I declined to say so.

Mr. SHERMAN. I am very glad to know that the gentleman thinks that we have the right to make the appropriation, although he does not think it proper. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN] insists that the amendment here is in violation of the rules of the Senate. I am surprised that that statement should be made on the floor at this time. That statement can frequently be made about appropriations that come into this House from the Senate, but in this instance the point of order was raised against the amendment in the Senate, and the presiding officer held that the amendment was in order.

I think the proposition before us is, Is there any obligation on the part of the Government to make this appropriation? Is it reasonable that we should make it? Is there reasonable probability that the loan will be returned?

As to the obligation of the Government, it seems to me that after we had passed the first bill, which committed this Government to the expenditure of \$5,000,000—a proposition which had the support of the gentleman from Iowa, but had my opposition in its inception—after we had passed that, then I believe we were obligated, in all reason and all fairness, to do all things that we could to see this exposition through to a finish. I ought not to be surprised at the position of the gentleman from Iowa in having advocated embarking on this proposition and then abandoning it, because I noticed the other day in the public press that he made the assertion that he never yet had embarked in any business enterprise whatever which yielded one cent of profit, saving the purchase of a cow for \$50, which his wife sold for \$70. [Laughter.]

I believe, Mr. Chairman, that the Government is under a moral obligation to loan its credit to the St. Louis Exposition because of the original declaration of Congress. I believe that the obligation of the St. Louis exposition is all we need and require to insure the return of this money. I speak of the obligation separate from the lien which is proposed upon the gate receipts. The obligation, sir, is the obligation of a great corporation with great assets, and even were the lien not created, I believe the obligation would be sufficient to insure the return to the Treasury of the money now advanced. The experience of all expositions held in this country—all great expositions and some small ones—warrants the belief that the amount of receipts at St. Louis will be vastly in excess of the amount required to repay every cent that the Government now is asked to advance in aid of this exposition.

The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BURKETT] suggests, Mr. Chairman, that the exposition will be seen by only one of every

sixteen of the citizens of this country, and therefore he concludes that it will be of benefit to only one-sixteenth of the population of the Government. That is a very narrow view to take. The exposition will be of benefit not merely to the few who go to St. Louis, not merely to the citizens there, but to every citizen in this country. Expositions always are. Let me read to you the words McKinley uttered at Buffalo while the death messenger was waiting outside his door:

Expositions are the timekeepers of progress; they record the world's advancement; they stimulate the energy, enterprise, and intellect of the people and quicken human genius; they go into the home; they broaden and brighten the daily life of the people; they open mighty storehouses of information to the student. Every exposition, great or small, has helped to some onward step. Comparison of ideas is always educational, and as such instructs the brain and hand of man.

Mr. Chairman, believing as I do that this Government is morally obligated to see this exposition through to a finish; believing as I do that every cent advanced by this provision will be returned to the Treasury of the United States; believing as I do that this grand exposition will be of lasting benefit, not only to the St. Louis people and to the people of Missouri alone, but to all the citizens in this country, I earnestly advocate the concurrence in the amendment of the Senate.

Now, the balance of my time I desire to yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LOVERING].

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. SHERMAN. I have already yielded my time to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. LOVERING. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of concurring in the Senate amendment because I believe that, as amended by the House, every dollar of the loan which it carries will be returned to the United States Treasury before the close of the exposition.

I am in favor of this amendment because I believe that the people of this country will be paid many times more than the mere amount of the loan and many times more than the entire cost of the exposition in the benefits that will come to them.

Great expositions mark great epochs in our history. They mark the great onward progress in civilization, science, mechanics, art, architecture, and the welfare of the people. Take, for instance, the exposition of 1876, in Philadelphia. There were many features of that exposition, either one of which was an ample warrant for its being held, and either one of which has conferred benefits upon the people worth many times the whole cost of the exposition.

I will cite but one or two features—domestic architecture. A great step forward in domestic architecture of the country dates from this time. The English Government built on the grounds of the exposition a model domestic home, which was the inspiration of all architects who have since contrived and designed attractive, beautiful, comfortable, and inexpensive houses. It was a model of harmony in its lines and proportions, and it has been many thousand times reproduced in principle if not exactly on the same plans.

Since that time homes tastefully decorated and well furnished have been possible for people of small means.

Another great feature in the exposition of 1876 was a revelation in sanitation. The knowledge diffused throughout the country at that time was, and has ever since been, of incalculable value to the people of our country. In this one department alone the people were benefited to an extent many times more than the entire cost of the exposition.

I could refer to many other features which are hardly of less value than those I have named. I believe that every exposition that has been held in our country, whether it has been financially successful or not, has benefited the whole people far beyond any extent that is measured by the cost.

So far from their being extravagancies or luxuries with only a local value, I believe that they are economic necessities, and to do them justice we should deal with them not with a niggardly but a bountiful hand.

[Here the hammer fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Chairman, I had hoped that I might find myself in a position to vote for this measure. My hope was fallacious. I have listened very attentively to the arguments made here to-day. I was very forcibly struck by the argument of the gentleman from New York [Mr. SHERMAN], who closed his remarks a few moments ago, when he said that the Constitution of the United States did not prohibit this loan. The burden of showing the propriety of this loan is upon the other side of this question, and it is the first time that I have ever heard a lawyer argue that that which is not prohibited in the Constitution is granted to the Congress as a power. I do not care whether Congress has the power or not. There is no grant in the Constitution,

no word of the Constitution that justifies the position of the gentleman from New York.

The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH] points out a great number of loans and gifts that the Government has given to the people. We gave, for instance, to the suffering people of South Carolina, and we have given to a great many charitable objects. There is no provision of the Constitution justifying that. I admit all of that. But here comes a very different sort of question, a question to which I am going to refer in but one direction. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH] says that this is a grand money-making scheme, and he demonstrates by those figures which he read to the House that there is an abundance of money. If it is so easy to figure out an enormous profit, I suggest that it would be well enough to let some of those gentlemen interested in the work and who pledged themselves that they would not come here and ask for any more money take hold of that very profitable and very promising scheme and loan the money. Then comes the gentleman from Illinois, and he says that they are poor—the representative of the local interests out there at East St. Louis—and he describes them as in a condition of practical bankruptcy.

Now, which are we to believe? Are we to loan this money to these people because they are rich and independent, or are we to loan it to them because they are poor and bankrupt? Let me point out a suggestion in regard to this security. The Government of the United States is entitled under the former gift to one-third of the net profits, to be paid back to the United States. Now, these gentlemen come very kindly forward and say this: "It is very true that we pledged you one-third of the profits and we promised that the five millions should be the last dollar we would ever ask for; still we want you to give us four and a half millions more, and if we make any money we will pay one-third of it to you out of your own money." That is the proposition exactly, and no man can state it differently. They propose to take the money that they have promised to pay on the five million dollar loan and pay it back to us on the four and a half million dollar loan.

Suppose that they undertake to carry this out. Let us see where we may land. The United States is already entitled to the net one-third profits. The corporation out there, or each of its stockholders, holds an indefeasible right to every dollar that is earned by that corporation. These gentlemen come here unauthorized, so far as I can see, and, without any act of the corporation, pledge the entire gate receipts to the extent of four million and a half dollars, ousting all those men who have put up their money from any participation in the proceeds of the gate receipts. Suppose there is a default made and the Secretary of the Treasury, making an unheard-of proposition, goes out there and undertakes to sequester the gate receipts, undertakes by some process to seize the gate receipts. How long do you think it would be until the whole concern would be placed in the hands of a receiver under the control of the United States court to settle the rights of all the people who have put their money into that concern? What right has this corporation or its agent to come here and pledge the receipts that belong to the men who have contributed their money? The whole thing is unfortunate, and I shall not vote for it.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. FIELD. Mr. Chairman, I admit that great advantages will result to the State of Texas, which I in part have the honor to represent, from the St. Louis Exposition. I know and appreciate the intimate and extensive commercial relations of my State with this great and enterprising city, and while, from a business standpoint, I would be justifiable in rejecting this proposition to loan to a private corporation \$4,600,000 on the precarious security offered, yet so strong is my inclination to aid in this great enterprise that notwithstanding this objection I might support the amendment if I were not sincerely convinced that Congress has no right, under the Constitution, to make any such loan of money. I belong to the old school of Democracy and believe in a strict construction of the Constitution, and while some Democrats now assert that for ten years past we have recognized the constitutional right of Congress to make donations of this kind, however strong my inclination might be I have never been able to find any warrant in the Constitution for Congress to loan the money of the people to any individual or corporation for any purpose whatsoever.

During this discussion I was humiliated, as a Democrat, when the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN], a leader of his party and a Republican of Republicans, from the vantage ground he occupied, pointed out to Members on this side of the Chamber the well-known position of the Democratic party on such questions and tauntingly charged them with inconsistency.

Mr. Chairman, but a few years ago the question of the right of the Government to loan money to the people on security was discussed in every schoolhouse in the South and the West. At that time the price of farm products was so depressed as to no longer

return to the potent farmer the cost of production, and in their dire distress a large number of this most worthy class of our citizens turned to the Government for relief, asking that the Government, from its overflowing Treasury, make them temporary loans on their farm products, a character of security much better than that now offered.

The Democratic party, true to its principles, opposed this policy, and on account of the apparent reasonableness of the demand were unable to satisfactorily answer its opponents until it entrenched itself behind the Constitution and insisted—and rightly, too—that Congress had no right under the Constitution to loan the money in the Treasury, and in this impregnable position Democrats were able to overcome all opposition.

The same principle is involved in the amendment offered; and it seems to me if we support it, we stultify ourselves and contradict our past Democratic record, for I repeat that we have no constitutional right to take from the Treasury the money of the people and loan it to an individual or corporation on any kind of security. It would be a departure from the strict construction of the Constitution, as given to it by our fathers, and break down the defense behind which our party has stood during its lifelong struggle for economy in the administration of the Government. [Loud applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] is now recognized for fifteen minutes.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, the growth of "the show business" or "the show industry," to borrow a common phrase, in the United States has been marvelous. In 1876 we celebrated the greatest event in our history, the birth of the nation, by an exposition at Philadelphia. Then no one interested in it thought of coming to Congress and asking for an appropriation of \$5,000,000 or for a million and a half; but they begged Congress to loan them a million and a half of dollars, to be paid out of the profits of the undertaking; and that money was paid, I believe, at the end of litigation in which one of the Members of the House figured at that time.

Next came the exposition at Chicago—that wonderful exposition—the largest and grandest ever undertaken in the world up to that time. Chicago received an appropriation from the General Government; and then the people interested in that exposition went to work to complete the enterprise. On the threshold of the opening they found themselves, as St. Louis finds herself to-day, lacking \$5,000,000—yes, lacking \$9,000,000, as it appeared then, in order to open the gates. What did they do? They did just what every business corporation should do. They borrowed the money themselves. They went to private individuals; they went to bankers; they pledged their gate receipts. But they borrowed \$5,000,000 and went on with their exposition. And this five million was afterwards repaid.

The next exposition of importance was that at Buffalo. And I want to speak of Buffalo, because if I do not somebody else will. I see that my friend from Indiana is now taking notes. They started in for the Pan-American Exposition; they raised their money; they built their buildings; they prepared to open. They borrowed in the first place, I think, \$2,000,000, pledging their gate receipts for that amount. They did not come to the Congress of the United States. They went to individuals and to bankers in a little city half the size of St. Louis and borrowed their \$2,000,000 on their gate receipts. They then came down here to Washington to ask Congress to loan them \$500,000, and they went home again, hardly daring to bring the proposition before the Congress of the United States, because they were met with such a cold shoulder. And then they put up \$500,000 more and mortgaged their gate receipts again for the second \$500,000. They went to work and carried out their exposition.

Of course, we remember the pall that fell over the exposition. McKinley was assassinated there, and the gate receipts did not increase as they had everywhere else, and the exposition association was left with a large debt upon them. They owed \$500,000 to small contractors and mechanics, and they came here and asked Congress to appropriate that \$500,000. That was not all their indebtedness. The men who put the second \$500,000 on the gate receipts never got a dollar. The men who put up the first \$2,000,000 got \$1,900,000. There were other and large contractors over and above the \$500,000 that never got a dollar. No man who subscribed for the stock ever got a dollar in return. They stood their loss. We gave them the \$500,000 appropriation, and I voted for that appropriation. I can not say that I did it cheerfully, because it was the most reluctant vote that I ever gave in my life; but I did it to pay up the debts that they owed to laborers and to small contractors.

Well, now comes along the St. Louis Exposition. Gentlemen come here and say that we are responsible for that show. Why? The gentleman from Minnesota attempted to show that the nation had forced it upon St. Louis; that eighteen governors met there, and it was their sentiment that the show should be held and that St. Louis should be the spot. If I remember correctly,

the governor of Missouri invited the eighteen governors to come there, and the governor of Missouri was asked to invite them by the prominent citizens of the city of St. Louis for the purpose of booming the show at the very outset. Forced upon St. Louis! Why, they wanted it.

Mr. THAYER rose.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. PAYNE. No, I can not yield; I have not time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. PAYNE. They wanted to get the exposition. Now, are they going to get anything back for the money they have expended? The gentleman from Iowa on my right [Mr. HEPBURN] figured out \$5,000,000 in permanent improvements. The other gentleman from Iowa on my left [Mr. SMITH] thought there was not over \$1,000,000 in permanent improvements that they were getting back. How, then, will they get their money back? Why, I was talking with a Representative from the city of Buffalo only yesterday and he said although these Buffalo men lost every dollar that they put into the exposition they got the money back, some of them from the increased rents during the year of the exposition, some in one way and some in another, and the city of Buffalo had over twenty new factories established within the next year, attracted there because the people were present at the exposition at Buffalo.

Oh, it is not altogether a losing operation. It is said we are bound to vote this money because we recognized the enterprise and because we passed the act by which the exposition was inaugurated. Well, we did pass it, and we put these words into it:

That nothing in this act shall be so construed as to create any liability of the United States, direct or indirect, for any debt or obligation incurred, nor for any claim for aid or pecuniary assistance from Congress or the Treasury of the United States in support or liquidation of any debt or obligation created by said Commission.

They say we are bound to help them because we passed that act, when it was nominated in the very bond itself that we should not be called upon for a dollar in the way of liability for expenses.

Mr. HEPBURN. Read the thirteenth section. It is a great deal stronger.

Mr. PAYNE. The thirteenth section says:

That the United States shall not in any manner nor under any circumstances be liable for any of the acts, doings, proceedings, or representations of the said Louisiana Purchase Exposition Company, its officers, agents, or employees, or any of them, or for the service, salaries, labor, or wages of said officers, agents, servants, or employees, or any of them.

Mr. BARTLETT. Read the twenty-fourth section.

Mr. PAYNE. I can not read the whole act. These limitations are all through the act. Yet we are asked to appropriate this money because, they say, we are responsible in some way.

Mr. Francis says that we are not responsible for the increased expenses unless it be that when they sent their agents abroad the ambassadors and the consular agents did what they could for them.

So we are not responsible for this money. Why did they not get it from private sources?

Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania. Because they say they can not get it.

Mr. PAYNE. Not that they can not get it, for they have not tried to get it.

Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania. They say they can not borrow it unless they give security.

Mr. PAYNE. They have never made any effort to borrow it.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. There is nothing to show that they have.

Mr. PAYNE. No; they have conferred among themselves about it, and they have concluded that if we do not give them the money they will raise it.

Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania. And will have to give security.

Mr. PAYNE. They will have to raise it. They may have to give personal security.

Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania. They say they will.

Mr. PAYNE. But the gates will open all the same, though Congress does not loan them a dollar. It shows that they know they can get the money in the city of St. Louis, that the money is there. Well, if there is any hesitancy about loaning the money it is because the bankers of St. Louis have not yet gone into the pawnbroker business of taking pledges of gate receipts for four million and a half of money.

But they can get it. The show will go on if we do not appropriate this money. Why do they ask for the money? Governor Francis says: "We are asking for a loan for which we propose to offer undoubted security"—that if we do accept this proposition the Government will incur no risk whatever. "We ask only for a loan, and we think we are offering a security here that is not only ample, but on which any of us would lend if we had the money to lend."

Why, if the security is undoubted, and considered so in St. Louis, they know where they can get the money on undoubted security. Why do they not do as Chicago did? Why do they not do as Buffalo did, pledging her gate receipts to go on with her

exposition? Why do they come here? Oh, Mr. Francis says they think it is for the interest of the people of the United States and of the Government to put this money into circulation. It is deposited now in the national banks, and deposited on the security of bonds of the United States, and he thinks it is for the interest of the people to put that money into circulation. Why, does he not know that money is deposited in the banks for the very purpose of putting it into circulation among the people by the banks loaning it out? It goes out among the people, and it is circulating now and has been circulating ever since it was put in the banks. He fails to show any good reason why the Government of the United States should loan that money to him. Why should we give up our good security, the gilt-edge bonds of the United States, for even the "good security" he has—the gate receipts of this exposition?

Mr. Chairman, I confess I can not understand the figures presented by this commission. Why, they do not say that this \$4,500,000 will find the gates open free of debt. They fail to show anywhere that when the gates are open the institution will be out of debt, and every man knows that it can not be out of debt.

Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania. It is \$3,000,000 in debt now.

Mr. PAYNE. The Chicago Exposition cost \$22,000,000 up to the time of the opening of the gates. This will cost \$2,000,000 more than Chicago for labor. They boast here that their roofs cover 50 per cent more acreage than they had in Chicago. They boast that they have doubled the number of acres, including the parks, that they had in Chicago. They have built roads, they have built bridges and walks, and they have built reservoirs, and they have covered up \$5,000,000 in these grounds.

In every way it should cost more than it did at Chicago. Twenty-two millions and \$2,000,000 for labor, \$24,000,000; 50 per cent more of roofing over buildings—\$30,000,000 to open this exposition. They are very careful not to get down to the facts and figures and show just what they have expended and what they have got to do in the future. When they get this open and the show running, then there are other expenses they are looking into to see how they can provide for them. A million dollars for the entertainment of foreign jurors. They are considering the question now as to whether they can pay these jurors or not.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PAYNE. I ask leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

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

Mr. HEMENWAY. Mr. Chairman, the gentlemen who have argued this question are all begging the question, commencing with my distinguished friend from Pennsylvania.

The gentleman from Nebraska said that the free rural delivery carriers could not have their salaries increased and a pension bill could not pass; another gentleman says that public-building bills can not pass, and the gentleman from New York gets up and states that Chicago mortgaged her gate receipts for \$5,000,000. Every cent of it was paid and \$9,000,000 was paid, and \$1,068,000 was paid to the stockholders afterwards, and there is \$500,000 in the treasury.

Then gentlemen—the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. DARZELL, the gentleman from Nebraska, Mr. BURKETT, the gentleman from Nebraska, Mr. HINSHAW, and others—who stand here and argue if this appropriation passes there can be no public-building bill, there can be no increased salaries for rural free-delivery carriers, there can be no other appropriation are begging the question. They are not meeting it fairly. The only question is, Will this money be paid back and ought the Government under the circumstances loan it to this world's fair exposition? Now, where are we? The Government is a one-third stockholder in this transaction. We are the owners of one-third of the stock, the city of St. Louis is the owner of one-third of the stock, and the citizens of the city of St. Louis are the owners of the other one-third of the stock.

In other words, there is \$15,000,000 invested—\$5,000,000 by the Government, \$5,000,000 by the city of St. Louis, and \$5,000,000 by the citizens of the city of St. Louis. They thought this money was sufficient to build the buildings necessary and open the gates of this world's fair; but what happened? Why, Germany came along and demanded more space than anyone ever dreamed they would demand, as well as Italy and France. Germany, Belgium, and Japan recently threatened to withdraw their exhibits unless they were given more space. What could the men in charge of this exposition do—either give them more space and give to the country the greatest exposition the world has ever known or say they would not do it.

Now, the gentlemen opposing this loan are quarreling with the city of St. Louis. I am sorry they can not broaden out and see that this is a great national exposition. That magnificent city is the metropolis of the Mississippi Valley, with Indiana, Illinois, Missouri, Iowa, Kansas, and the Southern States surrounding her. They are wasting their time quarreling at this great city.

They can not get beyond the bark and get to the heart of this proposition and realize that fifty-three foreign countries are to be represented at the world's fair; that the eyes of the whole world are upon the United States, and a failure of the exposition means a failure of this country, and the success of the exposition means the success of the United States; and every schoolboy who visits the fair, if it is a success, will be proud of the fact that he lives in the United States and that we gave to the world such an exposition. [Applause.]

Let us get away from this little quarrel about St. Louis. Let us get away from this little quarrel whether some one man or other out at St. Louis is going to make a dollar. Let us look at it as we ought to look at it—from the standpoint of a great country never satisfied with giving the world as good an exposition as any country ever did. The people of the United States are not satisfied with that kind of an exposition. We are only satisfied when we can give them the greatest exposition that has ever been known to the history of the world. Now, what has happened? Demands for space have come, demands that this thing be broadened out along every line—

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. HEMENWAY. I can not be interrupted, because I have only a few minutes. Forty-two States are exhibiting there, ten more than ever exhibited before at any exposition. Fifty-three foreign countries are to have exhibits at St. Louis. Are the fifty-three foreign countries invited to the United States? Are they there to please St. Louis or did they come here to exhibit in an international exposition at the invitation of the Government of the United States? They are not looking to St. Louis to make this exposition a success, but these fifty-three foreign nations are looking to the United States to make it a success; and I want to say to you that in Congress this very day we ought to give these people the power to make it the greatest success ever known in the world in the way of an exposition, and it does not cost us a dollar to do it. Why, there is absolutely no doubt on earth but what every single cent of this money will be paid back. Why? The provision in this bill is that 40 per cent of the gross receipts of the exposition shall be paid upon this debt, and if on July 15 the payments do not amount to \$500,000 then they are to take enough money out of the money they have received to pay the \$500,000.

Then on the 1st day of August they are to pay \$500,000 more, on the 15th of August \$500,000 more, and continuing to pay \$500,000 every fifteen days until the debt is paid. Some one says: "What if they do not pay?" Then if they do not pay it becomes the duty of the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States to take charge of the exposition, take charge of its gates, and take charge of its receipts; take every dollar that is necessary to pay this loan. In view of the fact that at Chicago over \$14,000,000 of money was taken in from May 1 to November 1, in view of the fact that the expenses of conducting that exposition from May 1 to November 1 was only three and a half million dollars, it stands to reason that the United States will get back every dollar of this money.

Then when you say that you can not have a public-building bill, you can not have that or you can not have this if you vote this money out of the Treasury, you are begging the question, because you know that every dollar of this money will come back into the Treasury. The passing of this item will not stop for one second any appropriation that ought to be passed by this House. I have heard gentlemen say, "Why, HEMENWAY, do you stand for this when you have been all the time advocating economy?" Yes; I have advocated economy, but I will not go so far upon that line that I forget my country. [Applause.] I will not go so far that I will forget the foreign countries that are here, who have been invited here and depend upon us to make the exposition a success. We invited them here and we are going to take care of them, and I sincerely hope that Congress will grant this loan of \$4,600,000.

Yes; gentlemen say it is a little matter, but when it was coming to some of the great Eastern States some of the gentlemen so vigorous to-day were not quite so vigorous then.

Mr. PAYNE. Where were you at that time?

Mr. HEMENWAY. I was against the \$500,000 for Buffalo, and I will vote against giving this exposition one dollar of money, but I will not vote against loaning the money in view of the fact that it is absolutely certain that it will come back again to the Treasury of the United States. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time fixed for closing debate has arrived. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota.

The question was taken and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee recommend concurrence in Senate amendment No. 10 as amended.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. UNDERWOOD) there were 137 ayes and 87 noes.

Mr. BARTLETT. Tellers. Mr. Chairman.

Tellers were ordered; and the Chair appointed Mr. TAWNEY and Mr. BARTLETT as tellers.

The question was again taken; and the tellers reported 161 yeas and 95 noes.

Mr. HEMENWAY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill to the House with the recommendation that Senate amendment No. 47 be concurred in; that Senate amendment No. 10 be concurred in as amended, and that all other amendments be nonconcurred in.

Mr. HEPBURN. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HEPBURN. Does this motion include a separate vote on amendment No. 10?

Mr. HEMENWAY. No.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that that is a matter for the House.

The motion of Mr. HEMENWAY was then 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, with Senate amendments thereto, and had directed him to report that the committee recommended concurrence in Senate amendment No. 47, concurrence with an amendment in Senate amendment No. 10, and nonconcurrence in all the other amendments.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. HEPBURN. I demand a separate vote on amendment No. 10.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. BARTLETT. I rise for the purpose of demanding a separate vote on Senate amendment No. 10 as amended.

The SPEAKER. The first question is on the recommendation of the committee to concur in Senate amendment No. 47.

The question was taken, and Senate amendment No. 47 was concurred in.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on nonconcurrence in all other amendments except amendment No. 10.

The question was taken, and all other amendments except Senate amendment No. 10 were nonconcurred in.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on concurring in Senate amendment No. 10 as amended.

Mr. BARTLETT. Upon that question, Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 172, nays 106, answered "present" 8, not voting 96, as follows:

YEAS—172.

Adams, Wis.	Dunwell,	Land,	Rodenberg,
Alexander,	Dwight,	Lindsay,	Ryan,
Badger,	Emerich,	Littauer,	Scott,
Baker,	Esch,	Little,	Scudder,
Bartholdt,	Flack,	Livingston,	Shackelford,
Bell, Cal.	Fordney,	Lloyd,	Shafroth,
Benny,	Foss,	Longworth,	Sherley,
Benton,	Foster, Ill.	Lorimer,	Sherman,
Birdsall,	French,	Loud,	Shiras,
Bowie,	Gibson,	Londenslager,	Shober,
Brazzale,	Gillet, N. Y.	Lovering,	Sibley,
Brick,	Glass,	McAndrews,	Small,
Brooks,	Goebel,	McLachlan,	Smith, Ill.
Brownlow,	Goldfogle,	McLain,	Smith, Iowa
Brundidge,	Goulden,	McMorran,	Smith, Samuel W.
Buckman,	Graff,	McNary,	Southall,
Burke,	Griffith,	Macon,	Spalding,
Burleigh,	Hamlin,	Marsh,	Spight,
Butler, Mo.	Haugen,	Marshall,	Steenerson,
Calderhead,	Hearst,	Martin,	Sterling,
Caldwell,	Hedge,	Maynard,	Stevens, Minn.
Candler,	Hemenway,	Metcalf,	Sullivan, N. Y.
Cassel,	Henry, Conn.	Meyer, La.	Salzer,
Clark,	Hermann,	Moon, Pa.	Talbot,
Cochran,	Hill, Miss.	Morgan,	Tawney,
Connell,	Hopkins,	Mudd,	Taylor,
Cooper, Wis.	Houston,	Murdock,	Thayer,
Cowherd,	Howell, Utah	Otis,	Thompson,
Crowley,	Hughes, N. J.	Otjen,	Vandiver,
Crumpacker,	Humphrey, Wash.	Patterson, Pa.	Van Duzer,
Currier,	Humphreys, Miss.	Porter,	Van Voorhis,
Curtis,	Hunt,	Powers, Me.	Volstead,
Daniels,	Hunter,	Powers, Mass.	Vreeland,
Davey, La.	Jackson, Md.	Pujo,	Wade,
Davis, Minn.	Jackson, Ohio	Rainey,	Watson,
De Armond,	Jones, Wash.	Ransdell, La.	Weems,
Denny,	Kelher,	Reeder,	Weisse,
Dinsmore,	Kennedy,	Reid,	Wiley, N. J.
Dixon,	Knopf,	Rider,	Williams, Ill.
Douglas,	Lamar, Fla.	Rixey,	Williamson,
Dovener,	Lamb,	Robb,	Wilson, Ill.
Draper,	Landis, Chas. B.	Robertson, La.	Woodyard,
Dresser,	Legare,	Robinson, Ark.	Young.

NAYS—103.

Acheson,	Bowers,	Burleson,	Conner,
Adams, Pa.	Brandegoe,	Burton,	Cooper, Pa.
Aiken,	Brantley,	Butler, Pa.	Cooper, Tex.
Bartlett,	Brown, Wis.	Byrd,	Dalzell,
Bassett,	Burgess,	Campbell,	Field,
Beall, Tex.	Burkett,	Cassingham,	Finley,

Fitzpatrick,	Johnson,	Moon, Tenn.	Slemp,
Foster, Vt.	Jones, Va.	Needham,	Smith, Pa.
Fowler,	Kinkaid,	Norris,	Smith, Tex.
Gaines, Tenn.	Kitchin, Claude	Olmsted,	Snook,
Garner,	Kitchin, Wm. W.	Overstreet,	Sperry,
Gillespie,	Kline,	Padgett,	Stafford,
Gillett, Mass.	Klutz,	Pago,	Stephens, Tex.
Granger,	Knapp,	Parker,	Sullivan, Mass.
Gregg,	Lacey,	Patterson, N. C.	Tate,
Grosvenor,	Lanning,	Payne,	Thomas, Iowa.
Harrison,	Lawrence,	Perkins,	Thomas, N. C.
Haskins,	Lester,	Pinckney,	Tirrell,
Hay,	Lever,	Randell, Tex.	Underwood,
Henry, Tex.	Lilley,	Richardson, Ala.	Warnock,
Hepburn,	Littlefield,	Robinson, Ind.	Webb,
Hinsaw,	Livernash,	Russell,	Wiley, Ala.
Hitchcock,	McCarthy,	Scarborough,	Williams, Miss.
Hogg,	McCreary, Pa.	Sheppard,	Wright,
Holliday,	Maddox,	Shull,	Wynn.
Howell, N. J.	Mann,	Sims,	
Huff,	Miers, Ind.	Slayden,	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—8.

Adamson,	Griggs,	McCall,	Roberts,
Flood,	Howard,	Mahon,	Trimble.

NOT VOTING—96.

Allen,	Dayton,	Hughes, W. Va.	Pou,
Ames,	Deemer,	Hull,	Prince,
Babcock,	Dick,	James,	Rhea,
Bankhead,	Dickerman,	Jenkins,	Richardson, Tenn.
Bates,	Dougherty,	Kehoe,	Rucker,
Bede,	Driscoll,	Ketcham,	Ruppert,
Beidler,	Evans,	Kyle,	Smith, Ky.
Bingham,	Fitzgerald,	Lafean,	Smith, Wm. Alden
Bishop,	Fuller,	Lamar, Mo.	Smith, N. Y.
Boutell,	Gaines, W. Va.	Landis, Frederick	Snapp,
Bowersock,	Garber,	Lewis,	Southard,
Bradley,	Gardner, Mass.	Lucking,	Southwick,
Broussard,	Gardner, Mich.	McCleary, Minn.	Sparkman,
Brown, Pa.	Gardner, N. J.	McDermott,	Stanley,
Burnett,	Gilbert,	Mahoney,	Sulloway,
Capron,	Gillett, Cal.	Miller,	Swanson,
Clayton,	Gooch,	Minor,	Townsend,
Cousins,	Greene,	Mondell,	Wachter,
Croft,	Gudger,	Morrell,	Wadsworth,
Cromer,	Hamilton,	Nevin,	Wallace,
Cushman,	Hardwick,	Palmer,	Wanger,
Darragh,	Hildebrandt,	Patterson, Tenn.	Warner,
Davidson,	Hill, Conn.	Pearre,	Wilson, N. Y.
Davis, Fla.	Hitt,	Pierce,	Zenor.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

For the session:

Mr. WANGER with Mr. ADAMSON.

Mr. BOUTELL with Mr. GRIGGS.

Mr. DEEMER with Mr. SHULL.

Until further notice:

Mr. BEIDLER with Mr. HOWARD.

Mr. KYLE with Mr. GARBER.

Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia with Mr. KEHOE.

Mr. TOWNSEND with Mr. LUCKING.

Mr. PALMER with Mr. CLAYTON.

Mr. BROWN of Pennsylvania with Mr. WALLACE.

Mr. FREDERICK LANDIS with Mr. STANLEY.

Mr. DAVIDSON with Mr. FITZGERALD.

Mr. HILDEBRANT with Mr. RUCKER.

Mr. BATES with Mr. PATTERSON of Tennessee.

Until Thursday:

Mr. HILL of Connecticut with Mr. GAINES of Tennessee.

Until Friday:

Mr. HAMILTON with Mr. LAMAR of Missouri.

Until the 15th:

Mr. GAINES of West Virginia with Mr. SMITH of Kentucky.

For this day:

Mr. WARNER with Mr. DOUGHERTY.

Mr. JENKINS with Mr. JAMES.

Mr. MILLER with Mr. WILSON of New York.

Mr. DARRAGH with Mr. CROFT.

Mr. HITT with Mr. DAVIS of Florida.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan with Mr. GILBERT.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH with Mr. RUPPERT.

Mr. WADSWORTH with Mr. SWANSON.

Mr. DICK with Mr. GUDGER.

Mr. BABCOCK with Mr. McDERMOTT.

Mr. WACHTER with Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee.

For this vote:

Mr. COUSINS with Mr. BANKHEAD.

Mr. SMITH of New York with Mr. GOOCH.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts with Mr. HARDWICK.

Mr. ROBERTS with Mr. RICHARDSON.

Mr. LAFEAN with Mr. TRIMBLE.

Mr. BINGHAM with Mr. MAHONEY.

Mr. BEDE with Mr. BURNETT.

Mr. CUSHMAN with Mr. POUL.

Mr. BISHOP with Mr. ZENOR.

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota with Mr. McCALL.

Mr. GILLET of California with Mr. SPARKMAN.

Mr. GARDNER of New Jersey with Mr. DICKERMAN.

Mr. GREENE with Mr. RHEA.

Mr. SNAPP with Mr. PIERCE.

Mr. KETCHAM with Mr. FLOOD.

Mr. DAYTON with Mr. LEWIS.

Mr. SOUTHWICK with Mr. MAHON.

Mr. GRIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I notice that I am paired with the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. BOUTELL. Therefore I should like to change my vote from "no" to "present."

The name of Mr. GRIGGS being again called, he answered "present."

Mr. McCALL. Mr. Speaker, I voted "no," but I am in doubt whether the pair that I made with the gentleman from Minnesota, Mr. McCLEARY, is still "on;" so I should like to change my vote and answer "present."

The name of Mr. McCALL being again called, he answered "present."

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I should like to be noted as present. I am paired.

The name of Mr. TRIMBLE being again called, he answered "present."

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Speaker, did the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. WANGER, vote?

The SPEAKER. He did not.

Mr. ADAMSON. Not having been advised as to his position on this question, I wish to withdraw my vote and answer "present."

The name of Mr. ADAMSON being again called, he answered "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above stated.

CONFEREES APPOINTED.

Mr. HEMENWAY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House request a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the urgent deficiency appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER announced the appointment of Mr. HEMENWAY, Mr. VAN VOORHIS, and Mr. LIVINGSTON as conferees on the part of the House.

EXPENDITURES OF LOUISIANA PURCHASE EXPOSITION COMMITTEE.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions, and ordered to be printed.

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith a report from the Secretary of State covering a statement showing the receipts and disbursements of the Louisiana Purchase Exposition Company for the month of December, 1903, furnished by the Louisiana Purchase Exposition Commission in pursuance of section 11 of the "act to provide for celebrating the one hundredth anniversary of the purchase of the Louisiana Territory," etc., approved March 3, 1901.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

WHITE HOUSE, February 11, 1904.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT.

Mr. WACHTER, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had presented this day to the President of the United States, for his approval, joint resolution of the following title:

H. J. Res. 79. A joint resolution for the transportation of Porto Rican teachers to the United States and return.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. WACHTER, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the following titles; when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 7023. An act to amend an act to regulate the height of buildings in the District of Columbia; and

H. R. 7024. An act to name streets, alleys, highways, and reservations in that part of the District of Columbia outside of the city of Washington, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. PARKINSON, its reading clerk, announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles; in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 1834. An act granting an increase of pension to John W. Paul;

S. 2123. An act granting a pension to Ashley C. Riggs;

S. 727. An act granting a pension to George W. Wetherell;

S. 3862. An act granting an increase of pension to Daniel H. Wallace;

S. 935. An act granting a pension to Mary S. Clark;

S. 1796. An act granting an increase of pension to Matthew Woodworth;

S. 1803. An act granting an increase of pension to John M. Morgan;

S. 3480. An act granting an increase of pension to Swepston B. W. Stephens;

S. 3415. An act granting an increase of pension to Manluff W. Reynolds;

S. 2322. An act granting a pension to Adolphus N. Pacetty;

S. 2359. An act to correct the military record of James W. Houser;

S. 1272. An act granting an increase of pension to Samuel Rollins;

S. 2490. An act granting a pension to Naomi Green;

S. 2278. An act granting an increase of pension to Harriet H. Howlett;

S. 1392. An act granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Hughes;

S. 1280. An act granting an increase of pension to Henry Wilfong;

S. 3527. An act granting an increase of pension to Jerneingham Boone;

S. 2367. An act granting an increase of pension to Mary V. Carson;

S. 2043. An act granting an increase of pension to Andrew J. Williams;

S. 3569. An act granting an increase of pension to John A. Chamberlain;

S. 2338. An act granting a pension to Louisa Lyon;

S. 1642. An act granting an increase of pension to Blanche L. Chunn;

S. 3339. An act granting an increase of pension to George B. Abbott;

S. 360. An act granting an increase of pension to Mary Lucetta Arnold;

S. 1530. An act granting an increase of pension to Theron T. Lamphere;

S. 3656. An act granting an increase of pension to William Turner;

S. 2966. An act granting a pension to William Conover;

S. 2321. An act granting a pension to Carlotta E. Hooper;

S. 2969. An act granting a pension to Henry Dority;

S. 294. An act granting a pension to Vincent de Frietas;

S. 3470. An act granting an increase of pension to Richard Wilks;

S. 3405. An act granting an increase of pension to Mary F. Pentzer;

S. 3413. An act granting a pension to Henry P. Howard;

S. 2363. An act granting an increase of pension to David C. Coleman;

S. 2200. An act granting an increase of pension to Charles R. Collins;

S. 1257. An act to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of George F. Harter;

S. 2817. An act to remove the charge of desertion against George W. Posey;

S. 3945. An act granting an increase of pension to Lewis Lewis;

S. 819. An act granting an increase of pension to John B. Glover;

S. 2563. An act granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth M. Banta;

S. 3397. An act granting an increase of pension to George B. Christy;

S. 4141. An act granting an increase of pension to Samuel A. Dickey;

S. 1554. An act granting an increase of pension to John D. Pickard;

S. 3431. An act granting an increase of pension to J. E. Harrison;

S. 2649. An act granting an increase of pension to William S. Burch;

S. 4091. An act granting an increase of pension to Nathan M. Gove;

S. 4090. An act granting an increase of pension to Charlotte J. Folsom;

S. 4052. An act granting a pension to Alice K. Seligson;

S. 562. An act granting an increase of pension to Emeline F. Emmons;

S. 354. An act granting an increase of pension to Clara B. Griswold;

S. 3950. An act granting an increase of pension to Edward Blaisdell;

S. 3893. An act granting an increase of pension to John L. Rogers;

S. 3085. An act granting an increase of pension to Alexander Lane;

S. 3488. An act granting an increase of pension to Charles E. McIntire;

S. 3534. An act granting an increase of pension to John S. Parker;

S. 1591. An act granting an increase of pension to James Hahn;

S. 2179. An act granting an increase of pension to Thomas Harkison;

S. 268. An act granting an increase of pension Annie B. Johnson;

S. 3053. An act granting an increase of pension to Emma E. S. Wright;
 S. 2959. An act granting an increase of pension to Ada Johnson;
 S. 1616. An act granting an increase of pension to Michael Donovan;
 S. 1944. An act granting an increase of pension to John S. Stanger;
 S. 3887. An act granting an increase of pension to Charles J. Clark;
 S. 3902. An act granting a pension to George F. Smith;
 S. 2662. An act granting an increase of pension to John H. Carrow; and
 S. 3812. An act granting an increase of pension to Charles Wheatland.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendments bills of the following titles; in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

H. R. 5367. An act granting an increase of pension to Franklin Moore;
 H. R. 8376. An act granting an increase of pension to Jonathan J. Smith;
 H. R. 5865. An act granting an increase of pension to Joshua Harlan;
 H. R. 2809. An act granting an increase of pension to John Watt;
 H. R. 4526. An act granting an increase of pension to William J. Shepard;
 H. R. 4136. An act granting an increase of pension to Caleb Arnett;
 H. R. 6582. An act granting an increase of pension to Harry Haller;
 H. R. 4045. An act granting a pension to Minnie Gusler;
 H. R. 2019. An act granting a pension to Mary Gwynn;
 H. R. 6352. An act granting a pension to Mary Huff;
 H. R. 5555. An act granting an increase of pension to James R. Hauptly;
 H. R. 9583. An act granting an increase of pension to James H. Hargis;
 H. R. 2923. An act granting an increase of pension to John G. Fairchild;
 H. R. 2920. An act granting an increase of pension to Daniel W. Huffman;
 H. R. 3032. An act granting an increase of pension to William Pittenger;
 H. R. 8058. An act granting an increase of pension to William M. Underhill;
 H. R. 8850. An act granting an increase of pension to Thomas Joyce;
 H. R. 6705. An act granting an increase of pension to Edwin A. Fornan;
 H. R. 2477. An act granting an increase of pension to Frank J. McLaughlin;
 H. R. 865. An act granting an increase of pension to Charles C. Chase;
 H. R. 6089. An act granting an increase of pension to Emma L. Nagle;
 H. R. 4251. An act granting an increase of pension to Joseph Hinkle;
 H. R. 6426. An act granting an increase of pension to David Z. Beidler;
 H. R. 6025. An act granting an increase of pension to John Herzog; and

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

H. R. 3616. An act granting an increase of pension to James W. Davis;
 H. R. 6023. An act granting an increase of pension to Charles Wigert;
 H. R. 4365. An act granting a pension to Barney L. Brookins;
 H. R. 4887. An act granting an increase of pension to George N. Thorpe;
 H. R. 3815. An act granting an increase of pension to Hester E. Mooney;
 H. R. 3617. An act granting an increase of pension to Charles M. Everett;
 H. R. 8187. An act granting an increase of pension to George Jeffrey;
 H. R. 6562. An act granting an increase of pension to Frances A. Thompson;
 H. R. 5611. An act granting a pension to Juliette Westbrook;
 H. R. 6547. An act granting a pension to John Holzer;
 H. R. 8920. An act granting a pension to Harriet A. Tucker;
 H. R. 7756. An act granting an increase of pension to Charles Schroder;
 H. R. 8342. An act granting an increase of pension to Horace E. Davis;

H. R. 3665. An act granting an increase of pension to Henry C. Jones;
 H. R. 703. An act granting an increase of pension to Robert P. Baker;
 H. R. 7072. An act granting a pension to Mary McCall;
 H. R. 5538. An act granting a pension to Jane Elizabeth Bullock;
 H. R. 937. An act granting an increase of pension to Mark A. Shelton;
 H. R. 5372. An act granting a pension to Mariah Kuechler;
 H. R. 2427. An act granting a pension to Cynthia Thomas;
 H. R. 4031. An act granting an increase of pension to Samuel Wasson;
 H. R. 5972. An act granting an increase of pension to Edward A. Wilber;
 H. R. 6085. An act granting a pension to Anna M. Maier;
 H. R. 4325. An act granting an increase of pension to John A. Sills;
 H. R. 3367. An act granting an increase of pension to George W. Kerby;
 H. R. 8207. An act granting an increase of pension to Charles Johnson;
 H. R. 681. An act granting an increase of pension to Ella P. Kersteter;
 H. R. 7757. An act granting an increase of pension to Cyrus Davidheiser;
 H. R. 5634. An act granting an increase of pension to Robert L. Miles;
 H. R. 5471. An act granting an increase of pension to A. Marion Gamble;
 H. R. 5609. An act granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Grigsby;
 H. R. 3407. An act granting an increase of pension to Frank Lewis;
 H. R. 3298. An act granting a pension to Mary E. Pennock;
 H. R. 7439. An act granting an increase of pension to Helen M. Bates;
 H. R. 4937. An act granting an increase of pension to Emily Conklin;
 H. R. 3299. An act granting a pension to Medie M. Flanders;
 H. R. 1497. An act granting an increase of pension to Dora Cook;
 H. R. 1294. An act granting an increase of pension to William McBrien;
 H. R. 1487. An act granting an increase of pension to Dexter T. Drake;
 H. R. 6701. An act granting an increase of pension to John A. Reeds;
 H. R. 7682. An act granting an increase of pension to William H. Howard;
 H. R. 8717. An act granting an increase of pension to Henry Edwards;
 H. R. 6036. An act granting an increase of pension to John Shafer;
 H. R. 6032. An act granting an increase of pension to Charles S. Bellows;
 H. R. 7594. An act granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Miller;
 H. R. 610. An act granting an increase of pension to Samuel Alexander;
 H. R. 7095. An act granting an increase of pension to Harrison H. Hakes;
 H. R. 5699. An act granting an increase of pension to James P. Johnson;
 H. R. 7447. An act granting an increase of pension to William Bailey;
 H. R. 6091. An act granting an increase of pension to John W. Brown;
 H. R. 4578. An act granting an increase of pension to Catherine M. McClanahan;
 H. R. 138. An act granting an increase of pension to Henry Hale;
 H. R. 7732. An act granting an increase of pension to Mary Chenoweth;
 H. R. 529. An act granting a pension to Emma H. Higley;
 H. R. 5199. An act granting an increase of pension to Emma M. Johnson;
 H. R. 6588. An act granting an increase of pension to James H. Cummings;
 H. R. 1156. An act granting an increase of pension to John Pangratz;
 H. R. 7355. An act granting an increase of pension to Henry Barrett;
 H. R. 3435. An act granting an increase of pension to John M. Pratt;
 H. R. 5528. An act granting a pension to Maria Lindhorst;