

Mr. SPINOLA moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

RESPONSIBILITY FOR PUBLIC PROPERTY.

Mr. TOWNSHEND. I call up from the House Calendar a bill (S. 2519) to make enlisted men of the Signal Corps responsible for public property.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, from and after the passage of this act, every officer of the Signal Corps, every non-commissioned officer or private of the Signal Corps, and all other officers, agents, or persons, who now have in possession, or may hereafter receive or may be intrusted with any stores or supplies, shall quarterly or more often, if so directed, and in such manner and on such forms as may be prescribed by the Chief Signal Officer, make true and correct returns to the Chief Signal Officer of all Signal Service property and all other supplies and stores of every kind received by or intrusted to them and each of them, or which may, in any manner, come into their and each of their possession or charge. The Chief Signal Officer, subject to the approval of the Secretary of War, is hereby authorized and directed to draw up and enforce in his bureau a system of rules and regulations for the government of the Signal Bureau, and of all persons in said bureau, and for the safe-keeping and preservation of all Signal Service property of every kind, and to direct and prescribe the kind, number, and form of all returns and reports, and to enforce compliance therewith.

Mr. TOWNSHEND. I suppose there will be no objection to the passage of this bill. It simply provides that officers of the Signal Corps shall be responsible for property intrusted to them. As it is now the Chief Signal Officer is held responsible for all property, no matter where it may be. I ask the bill be put upon its passage.

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

Mr. TOWNSHEND moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The bill (H. R. 9907) on the same subject will be laid upon the table.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

FRESH AIR IN ENGINE-ROOMS OF STEAMERS.

Mr. TOWNSHEND. How much time have I remaining?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman has ten minutes.

Mr. TOWNSHEND. I will yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CRAIN] to introduce a bill.

Mr. CRAIN, by unanimous consent, introduced a bill (H. R. 11510) to compel owners of steamers to supply fresh air to the engine-rooms; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. TOWNSHEND. I move that the House now resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union to consider bills reported from the Committee on Military Affairs.

The motion was agreed to.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole, Mr. McMILLIN in the chair.

MILITARY RESERVATION, PLATTSBURGH, N. Y.

Mr. TOWNSHEND. I call up for present consideration the bill (H. R. 11252) to construct a road from the village of Plattsburgh, N. Y., through and along the Government military reservation in said village.

The bill was read at length.

Mr. TOWNSHEND. I move that the bill be laid aside—

Mr. KILGORE. I do not think I would be in a condition to agree to that to-day unless there is a quorum present. [Laughter.]

Mr. TOWNSHEND. Of course, if the gentleman insists upon a quorum, although I think it a meritorious bill, and if my friend would examine it he would reach the same conclusion; but I understand the situation, and withdraw the bill.

I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MAISH].

NATIONAL CEMETERY, FREDERICKSBURG, VA.

Mr. MAISH. Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to call up for present consideration the bill (H. R. 1907) to provide for macadamizing the road from the railroad to the national cemetery in the city of Fredericksburg, Va.

The bill was read at length.

Mr. MAISH. I move that this bill be laid aside to be reported to the House with a favorable recommendation.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. Speaker, I have no objection to having the sense of the House taken upon the motion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania to lay this bill aside with a favorable recommendation.

If everybody votes for it and I against it, I will have to call a quorum. If you want to go that far I have no objection.

Mr. MAISH. The gentleman from Texas will not call a quorum, I understand.

Mr. KILGORE. Oh, yes, I will. [Laughter.]

Mr. STRUBLE. That is quite a difference of opinion.

Mr. MAISH. Then I withdraw the bill.

Mr. KILGORE. All right.

Mr. MAISH. The gentleman says he has no objection to my withdrawing it.

Mr. KILGORE. None whatever.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. TOWNSHEND. Mr. Chairman, the bills we have marked for consideration to-day are of such a character as perhaps would be objected to by the gentleman from Texas or other gentlemen, who have declared that they do not wish bills of this class to be passed without a quorum. I will therefore move that the committee now rise. It is useless to present bills and have to withdraw them because of the question of no quorum being raised.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and Mr. CRISP having resumed the chair as Speaker *pro tempore*, Mr. McMILLIN reported that the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union having had under consideration sundry bills, had come to no resolution thereon.

BONDS OF DISBURSING AND OTHER OFFICERS.

Mr. TOWNSHEND. Mr. Speaker, I now call up the bill H. R. 8873, with Senate amendment, a bill in relation to bonds of disbursing or other officers, and to monthly payments of the Army.

The Senate amendment was read.

Mr. TOWNSHEND. This bill is one that will probably provoke some considerable discussion, and as there is but little time now remaining of the hour, not enough to consider the bill, I ask unanimous consent that it may go over until the next hour, and that the morning hour of to-day may be considered as having expired.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The morning hour has expired.

Mr. McMILLIN. I move that the House do now adjourn.

The question was taken; and the Speaker *pro tempore* announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. HOLMAN. I demand a division.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 45, noes 16.

So the motion was agreed to; and accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 53 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned.

PRIVATE BILLS INTRODUCED AND REFERRED.

Under the rule private bills of the following titles were introduced and referred as indicated below:

By Mr. HOLMAN: A bill (H. R. 11511) granting a pension to George Pulskamp—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LAFFOON: A bill (H. R. 11512) for the relief of W. M. Rhea—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11513) for the relief of William McGriyer—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. J. J. O'NEILL: A bill (H. R. 11514) granting a pension to Fredericka Werheide—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11515) granting a pension to Charles G. Sanders—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11516) granting a pension to Julius Sauer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. O. B. THOMAS: A bill (H. R. 11517) for the relief of William Miller—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ATKINSON: A bill (H. R. 11518) granting a pension to George Chappel—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, September 27, 1888.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. J. G. BUTLER, D. D.

NAMING A PRESIDING OFFICER.

Mr. MANDERSON called the Senate to order and said: The Secretary will read a communication from the President *pro tempore* of the Senate.

The Secretary of the Senate [Mr. ANSON G. MCCOOK] read as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE, Washington, D. C., September 27, 1888.

I name the Senator from Nebraska, Mr. MANDERSON, to perform the duties of the Chair to-day.

JOHN J. INGALLS,
President *pro tempore*.

Thereupon Mr. MANDERSON took the chair as Presiding Officer for to-day.

THE JOURNAL.

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

YELLOW-FEVER SUFFERERS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MANDERSON). The Chair lays before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the joint resolution (S. R. 110) in aid of the sufferers from yellow fever. The amendment of the House of Representatives will be stated.

The SECRETARY. Strike out all after the resolving clause and insert: That the sum of \$100,000 be, and the same hereby is, appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to be immediately availa-

ble, to be expended in the discretion of the President of the United States in aid of State or municipal boards of health, or otherwise, to prevent the introduction of cholera or yellow fever into the United States from foreign countries, or into one State or Territory from another, or in the suppression of or preventing the spread of said diseases, or either of them, in infected districts.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I examined the amendment yesterday. I very much fear that it misses the most urgent point where aid is required, and that is the capacity to use any of this money in aid of those who are sick or are in distress and starvation, as the newspapers report to us from day to day so many are. In the hope, therefore, that something better may be done, I move that the Senate non-concur in the amendment, and ask for a conference thereon with the House of Representatives.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont moves that the Senate non-concur in the amendment proposed by the House of Representatives and ask for a conference thereon.

The motion was agreed to.

By unanimous consent, the Presiding Officer was authorized to appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate; and Mr. EDMUNDS, Mr. ALLISON, and Mr. COCKRELL were appointed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. BLAIR. I present a memorial of stone-cutters of the United States, remonstrating against the passage of the Mills tariff bill. The remonstrants are practical stone-cutters, and the original signatures of the men are appended. I find them located in Dallas, Tex.; Denver, Colo.; Memphis Junction, Ky.; Hallowell, Augusta, Clark's Island, South Thomaston, St. George, Rockland, Round Point, Long Cove, and Tenant's Harbor, in the State of Maine; Worcester and Milford, Mass.; South Ryegate, Rutland, and several other places in Vermont; Niantic, R. I.; Roxbury, Bridgeport, New London, and other places in the State of Connecticut; a large number of places in the State of New York, in the city of New York and vicinity, Long Island, Brooklyn; many places in the State of Minnesota; Washington, D. C.; Kansas City, Mo.; the city of Topeka, Kans.; Cincinnati, Ohio; Rock Island, Ill.; St. Louis and St. Joseph, in the State of Missouri; Indianapolis, Ind.; Riverdale, Cal.; and many other places. The memorialists, addressing the Senate of the United States, state:

We, the undersigned, respectfully petition your honorable body not to pass the so-called Mills bill without striking the item of "Stones, unmanufactured or undressed, freestone, granite, sandstone, and all building or monumental stone" from the free-list, as we believe the importation of rough stone into this country free of duty will be an injury to us and those who quarry stone in this country and benefit no one but the importers and foreign quarry-owners and quarrymen, who do not contribute to the support of this Government. We will not enter into a long argument on this question, but petition for the right to be heard in protest against this attempt to injure quarrymen and stone-cutters through placing stone on the free-list while marble is dutiable; the same reasons for striking marble from the free-list applying to all other stone.

This interest is very large in my own State, and it is also represented among the memorialists.

The memorial was transmitted to me officially by Joseph B. Dyer, secretary of the Granite-Cutters' National Union of America, in the city of New York. I found the number of signatures too large to conveniently count, but there must be some four or five hundred, and perhaps more.

I move that the memorial be referred to the Committee on Finance.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. CAMERON presented the petition of Johnston Palmer and 129 other citizens of Indiana County, Pennsylvania; the petition of William J. Work and 67 other citizens of Crawford County, Pennsylvania; and the petition of H. White and 28 other citizens of McKean County, Pennsylvania, praying for the passage of certain amendments to the interstate-commerce law; which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. PASCO. I present a petition of between five and six hundred citizens of Key West, Fla., very largely interested in the manufacture of cigars, calling the attention of Congress to a deficiency in the revenue laws which operates very disadvantageously to the manufacturers of cigars, owing to the slight difference between duties upon stripped and unstripped tobacco. The facts are fully set forth in the petition, and as it is short I ask leave that it be printed in the RECORD, omitting the names.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida presents a petition and asks that it be printed in the RECORD without the names. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The petition will be referred to the Committee on Finance.

The petition is as follows:

To the honorable the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States:

Your petitioners would most respectfully represent that they are citizens of the United States and of the State of Florida, and residents of the city and island of Key West.

That the principal business of the island of Key West is that of the manufacture of cigars, which gives employment to more than one-half of the population, which is over 20,000.

That the number of cigars manufactured on the island of Key West during the past year was 95,000,000, and the greater part of this quantity was made of imported tobacco from the island of Cuba.

That among the various processes of preparing this tobacco in the factories previous to its being made into cigars is that of stemming the tobacco, or, as it is generally termed in the factories, "stripping" the tobacco, taking the center stem from the leaf, and this work is done here chiefly by women and children,

several thousands of whom depend alone on this particular labor for a livelihood.

That by the act of Congress approved March 3, 1883, chapter 121, the duties on tobacco in leaf unmanufactured and not stemmed are 35 cents, and on stemmed tobacco 40 cents per pound.

That the duties on the stemmed tobacco being only 5 cents per pound more than the unstemmed tobacco, the manufacturers are thus enabled to get their tobacco from Cuba already stemmed and at a slight excess in cost over the unstemmed tobacco, and the manufacturers here are availing themselves of this privilege and employing or giving employment to laborers in Cuba.

That the result is that gradually but surely the laborers here who are employed in this special branch of the cigar industry are being discharged and deprived of this mode of obtaining a living, and one-half or more of the laboring population of this island are being driven from their legitimate field of labor by being thus brought into competition with the cheap labor of Cuba.

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that the duties on tobacco in leaf unmanufactured and stemmed be increased, or that the act of Congress above mentioned be otherwise amended so as to prevent them from being brought into competition with the aforementioned cheap labor in the island of Cuba.

And your petitioners will ever pray.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. COCKRELL, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 3578) to perfect the military record of James T. Hughes, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. SABIN introduced a bill (S. 3593) granting a pension to Franklin B. Dorothy; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. CALL introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 111) relating to yellow fever and epidemic diseases; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Epidemic Diseases.

Mr. MITCHELL introduced a bill (S. 3594) granting a pension to Robert Steward; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. HAWLEY introduced a bill (S. 3595) making an appropriation to aid in the erection of a monument to the members of the First and Second Regiments United States Sharpshooters who fell in the battle of Gettysburg; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 3596) for the relief of the estate of the late James B. Sinclair; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

VIANCEY TAGGART—CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Mr. SHERMAN. The bill (S. 3585) for the relief of Viancey Taggart was erroneously referred to the Committee on Pensions instead of the Committee on Military Affairs. I move that the former committee be discharged from its further consideration, and that it be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The motion was agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I move that when the Senate adjourn to-day it be to meet on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to.

ISAAC DAVENPORT AND OTHERS.

Mr. STEWART. I offer a resolution to correct a mistake in a former reference to the Court of Claims, and I ask for its present consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

Resolved, That the bill (S. 1808) entitled "A bill for the relief of Isaac Davenport and others, citizens of Virginia," referred to the Court of Claims by the Senate on June 13, 1883, together with all the accompanying papers, in pursuance of the provisions of an act approved March 3, 1883, be also referred to said court under the provisions of the act entitled "An act to provide for the bringing of suits against the Government of the United States," approved March 3, 1887, to find and report to the Senate the facts bearing upon the merits of the claim and all the facts contemplated by the provisions of said acts.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Does that come from a committee? If not, it ought to be referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. STEWART. It comes from the Committee on Claims. It is the correction of a mistake in a former reference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada asks for the present consideration of the resolution.

Mr. STEWART. I will explain it to the Senator from Vermont. The committee ordered the case to be referred under the two acts, and by mistake the resolution simply made the reference under the act of 1883, and it should be under both the act of 1883 and that of 1887. This simply corrects the mistake.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Reserving the right to object for a moment, I wish to say that the ordinary form of these resolutions has been simply to make the reference to the Court of Claims and cite the statutes. I observe that this resolution goes on and proceeds to declare what the court shall do. That may be precisely what the statute requires it to do. If it be, of course it does no harm. If it be not, then it is outside of the statute and of our authority and propriety.

Therefore I ask that the matter may be laid aside in order that I may compare the resolution with the statute and see how it is.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be temporarily laid aside.

Mr. STEWART. I will state that the last part of it is in the usual form.

Mr. EDMUNDS. It may be.

Mr. SPOONER subsequently said: Before the Senator from Vermont [Mr. EDMUNDS] left the Chamber he requested me to say that after having examined the resolution introduced by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. STEWART] he is satisfied with it, and interposes no objection to its passage. Therefore, if there is no objection, I ask that the resolution be passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection being withdrawn to the resolution proposed by the Senator from Nevada, the question is upon the adoption of the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

IMPORTATION OF CONTAGION OR INFECTION.

Mr. CALL submitted the following resolution; which was read:

Resolved, That the Committee on Epidemic Diseases are hereby instructed to consider and report before the adjournment of this session of Congress, by bill or otherwise, such additional legislation as may be necessary or useful to prevent the importation of contagious or infectious diseases from foreign countries on the coasts or boundaries of the United States, and to prevent and suppress it in the interstate commerce, and from passing from one State to another, and for the subsistence of such persons as may be detained by public authority from places where there is danger of infection or contagion to other States.

Mr. CALL. I ask for the present consideration of the resolution.

Mr. HALE. The chairman of the committee [Mr. HARRIS] is absent at present. The committee referred to in the resolution has other matters touching this same subject which it is now considering. I ask that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Epidemic Diseases.

Mr. CALL. Before any action is taken on the motion of the Senator from Maine, I desire to read the following letter from the mayor of the city of New York addressed to me:

MAYOR'S OFFICE, NEW YORK, September 25, 1888.

MY DEAR SENATOR: The inclosed letter seems to contain suggestions worthy of attention. I suppose that legislation would be required to give them effect, although it is possible that under the law as it stands in reference to the National Board of Health, the President would have power to establish a system of national quarantine if he should think the emergency required it. It seems to me that we ought to take the matter in hand now in order to guard against the possible evils of a general outbreak of yellow fever next year. I wish you would consider the subject carefully, and, if you think well of it, introduce some resolutions which would lead to action before Congress adjourns. The subject is one which interests every part of the United States, and particularly the city of New York. As you know, we are subscribing liberally for the relief of the Florida sufferers, and we can well afford to do this as a matter of self-interest as well as of Christian sympathy; but we are powerless, except by our local quarantine, to prevent the spread of contagion. The remedy ought to be applied in the places where the fever exists and on a system so comprehensive as to assure the country that every precaution has been taken to stamp out this disease which produces such havoc in human life and such destruction of property. Asking your early attention to this important subject, I am,

Yours, sincerely,

ABRAM S. HEWITT, Mayor.

HON. WILKINSON CALL,

United States Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.

The letter to which the mayor of New York refers, and which he incloses to me, is from James M. Van Hook, a citizen of Fort Meade, Polk County, South Florida, and is as follows:

CHARLESTOWN, IND., September 22, 1888.

HONORABLE SIR: I am a native of this State. I entered the Union Army, served through the war, and came home broken in health. About seven or eight years ago I moved to Fort Meade, Polk County, South Florida. I love my adopted State and hope to live there until the end.

On the day that yellow fever was discovered in Jacksonville I was in the city on my way north to consult my old family physician and then return to my Southern home. Although the roads are obstructed down there, and there is great danger of taking the disease, I intend to get to my home. I may have to go first to Key West and then come up the road from Punta Gorda to my home. There are thousands of New Yorkers in Florida, and they are deserving of help. The citizens there are from every State of the Union. The old citizens are mostly from the Southern States. I assure you that these people are a unit in their desire to have the Government take charge of the coast (and interior) regulations regarding health, etc. You will find that there is no regular quarantine law in force between Florida and the southern ports, or was not a few weeks ago, and the customs office was merely a formal office. People could leave any of the southern ports and land on our coast and carry death and disease all over the United States without a question being asked them by any one in authority. Your cities will be desolated next summer by fever, cholera, and other diseases if our 1,000 miles of seacoast is not guarded.

A man of ordinary ability, with a little authority, could have checked the fever at Key West. * * * You doubtless remember the messages sent to the Surgeon-General from these places. The fever was kept alive all winter at Plant City. The Surgeon-General did all he could, but he was not allowed to do any real work. Of course we (of Florida) expected Jacksonville to be desolated after the one case appeared there. I can not write the particulars, for it would take up too much of your valuable time. In our locality there will not likely be a fever-killing frost in the next ten years, and if the proper work is not done the fever will get a good start next spring and sweep over the whole country. The whole people of Florida * * * are praying and hoping for help. Those who were in charge have had two years of failure. The State of Florida can no longer hope to conquer the fever, and the other States demand protection. One-fifth of the money already donated by the noble people of New York City, placed in proper hands, would have saved Key West, and all other United States towns—for the fever can be surely trailed from Key West to every fever-stricken point.

Personally I am not afraid of the fever. I think as I am an invalid I would not recover from an attack of it, but I am not afraid, and expect to face it in a few days.

Now there is only one way to save our country from a horrible season next year. If the work is not done I believe all the cities of the South and many in the North will get used to the terrible cry, "Bring out your dead." The people of Cuba are already entering Florida, and so soon as the "scum" of Europe ascertain the fact that they can enter Florida from Cuba there will be cases of cholera and fever enter this "open back door." (Coasting schooners often pass from Cuba

to the Florida coasts without permits.) All vessels should be compelled to touch at Key West if they are bound for Florida, and a first-class quarantine station should be established there.

The only hope we have is that some great and noble citizen will start this work. "You are the man" who can do this. You are known and respected all over the land. You are recognized as a pure man, a leader. Your city is our great city. Your people give their wealth freely. The governors and officers of the cotton States will listen to you. They will not distrust the President and his soldiers if the latter are necessary. The people will hail the United States officers and managers as heavenly ministers. You can accomplish this work, and I know of no one else who can.

The Government I know is now helping, but they are not permitted to control affairs. The whole thing should be in Government hands. It is the only hope. I know that politics can not get mixed up with it. I am a Republican (usually), my neighbors are men of both armies—nearly all are Democrats—and for two years we have been hoping and praying that the United States would take charge. The protection of the Florida coast is no longer a State question; it is now of more importance than the Indian frontier, and the prosperity of the whole nation is at stake. Will you not speak out and save us?

I hope I am not uselessly wasting your time, and I believe I am doing my duty to my country and my State by writing this. I do honestly believe I am only writing that which every citizen of Florida has in his heart.

I am, very respectfully,

JAMES M. VAN HOOK,

A Citizen of Fort Meade, Polk County, South Florida.

In conformity with the request of the mayor of the city of New York, I present the resolution and this letter. I would prefer, as the resolution merely instructs the committee in their discretion to consider the subject and report at this session of Congress, that it should be adopted. There is nothing in it which can be objected to by any member of the committee, as it does not prescribe any form of action or any special method of treating the subject, but simply requires the committee to consider and report during the present session in conformity with the request of the mayor of New York.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine moves that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Epidemic Diseases.

Mr. CALL. I hope the Senator will withdraw that motion. I merely ask that action be taken directing the committee to report, and I make the request upon the letter of the mayor of New York as being a matter of immediate and urgent necessity.

Mr. HALE. I made the suggestion because the committee is considering all of these subjects, and I think it is better that it should be unembarrassed by any instructions. The chairman of the committee is not present, and unless the Senator from Florida agrees that the resolution shall be referred to the committee I shall ask that the matter lie over until to-morrow.

Mr. CALL. I shall have to submit to that course, but it seems to me that a reference is very immaterial. There is nothing in the resolution to which the committee can object. It simply requires them to report at this session, and certainly in the face of a request of the mayor of the greatest city in population and in commerce in the United States, simply to take action, not saying what action, but that some efficient action should be taken, with the existence of this epidemic, already threatening to spread over a large portion of the country, there can be no objection to the Senate acting immediately upon the subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection being made, the resolution will lie over with the motion to refer it to the Committee on Epidemic Diseases.

RELATIONS WITH GREAT BRITAIN AND CANADA.

Mr. SHERMAN. I am directed by the Committee on Foreign Relations to report back to the Senate the resolution directing that committee to inquire into and report at the next session of Congress the state of the relations of the United States with Great Britain and the Dominion of Canada. We report back the resolution without recommendation, with a view that it may be placed upon the Calendar to be the subject of debate in the Senate. It is the desire of the committee to get all the information and all the light upon the subject before its final reference to the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, reports back a resolution which will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution submitted by Mr. SHERMAN September 17, 1888, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Foreign Relations be directed to inquire into and report at the next session of Congress the state of the relations of the United States with Great Britain and the Dominion of Canada, with such measures as are expedient to promote friendly commercial and political intercourse between these countries and the United States, and for that purpose have leave to sit during the recess of Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio reports the resolution without recommendation, and asks that it be placed on the Calendar. It will be so ordered, unless there be objection.

Mr. BLAIR. I wish to inquire of the Senator from Ohio whether the resolution which he has just reported back and had placed upon the Calendar is likely to be early called up for the consideration of the Senate?

Mr. SHERMAN. I am not authorized to say. The Committee on Foreign Relations conceive the subject to be of very great importance and do not desire to rush to its consideration until they have full information.

Mr. BLAIR. So that if any Senator desires to make remarks on the subject, he can do so immediately?

Mr. SHERMAN. The resolution is on the Calendar and can be called up at any time to make observations upon it. So far as the committee are concerned, I am inclined to think that they would not desire to press a final vote upon any measure on this subject until the next session of Congress, but I am not authorized to say even that.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. CLARK, its Clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the one hundred and tenth amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 10540) making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1889, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills:

- A bill (S. 145) for the relief of Edward Braden and Job W. Angus;
- A bill (S. 320) for the relief of John D. Adams;
- A bill (S. 937) for the relief of David L. Brainard and others;
- A bill (S. 1044) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to state and settle the account of James M. Willbur with the United States, and to pay said Willbur such sum of money as may be found due him thereon;
- A bill (S. 1101) granting a pension to Rachel A. Sinkinson;
- A bill (S. 1500) granting a pension to Margaret M. Miller;
- A bill (S. 1582) for the relief of the estate of Lucien Goyaux;
- A bill (S. 1591) granting an increase of pension to Madison M. Meredith;
- A bill (S. 1668) for the relief of A. M. Woodruff;
- A bill (S. 1958) granting an increase of pension to Eleanor B. Goodfellow;
- A bill (S. 2201) for the relief of Laura E. Maddox, widow and executrix, and Robert Morrison, executor, of Joseph H. Maddox, deceased;
- A bill (S. 2346) granting an increase of pension to Jennie Hart Mulhany;
- A bill (S. 2411) for the relief of C. A. Williams and others;
- A bill (S. 2675) granting an increase of pension to Lieut. James R. Durham;
- A bill (S. 2711) restoring Phebe McLaughlin to the pension-roll;
- A bill (S. 2720) granting a pension to John B. Ross;
- A bill (S. 2836) granting a pension to William E. Taylor;
- A bill (S. 2838) granting an increase of pension to Betsey A. Mower;
- A bill (S. 2887) granting a pension to George H. Johnson;
- A bill (S. 3125) restoring the right of pre-emption to Alfonso Roberts;
- A bill (S. 3276) granting restoration of pension to Sarah A. Woodbridge;
- A bill (S. 3471) to authorize the construction of bridges across the Kentucky River and its tributaries by the Louisville Southern Railroad Company;
- A bill (H. R. 10934) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell township maps or plats remaining on hand in his office;
- A bill (H. R. 11101) to include Sapelo Sound, Sapelo River, and Sapelo Island in the Brunswick collection district in the State of Georgia;
- A bill (H. R. 1923) providing for the establishment of a life-saving station at the harbor of Kewaunee, Wis., and at other places herein named; and
- A bill (H. R. 10068) granting a pension to Lieut. Starkey R. Powell.

SUNDY CIVIL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. ALLISON. I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives on the sundry civil appropriation bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the resolution of the House; which was read, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, September 27, 1888.

Resolved. That the House concur in the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the one hundred and tenth amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 10540) making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1889, and for other purposes.

Mr. ALLISON submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate numbered 110 to the bill (H. R. 10540) "making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1889, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 110, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted, insert the following:

"For the building for the Library of Congress as herein provided for, and for each and every purpose connected therewith, including the cost of all professional and other personal services that the Chief of Engineers of the Army may deem necessary for the work and shall specially order, \$500,000. This appropriation and all appropriations hereafter made, and all sums available from appropriations heretofore made for this purpose, shall be expended under the direction and supervision of the Chief of Engineers of the Army, who shall have the control and management of all of said work and the employment of all persons connected therewith. And all contracts for the construction of said building, or any part thereof, shall be made by the Chief of Engineers of the Army, and so much of the act entitled 'An act authorizing the construction of

a building for the accommodation of the Congressional Library,' approved April 15, 1886, as requires the construction of said building substantially according to the plan submitted to the Joint Select Committee on Additional Accommodations for the Library of Congress by John L. Smythmeyer, and so much of the first section as provides for a commission, together with the eighth section of said act, be, and the same are hereby, repealed, and the duties of said commission under said act are hereby devolved upon the Chief of Engineers of the Army, who shall annually report to Congress, at the commencement of each session, a detailed statement of all the proceedings under the provisions of this act, and hereafter, until otherwise ordered by Congress, no work shall be done in the construction of said Library except such as is herein provided for, and all contracts for work or materials not necessary for the execution of the work contemplated herein are hereby rescinded. And all loss or damage occasioned thereby, or arising under said contracts, together with the value of the plan for a Library building submitted to the Joint Select Committee on Additional Accommodations for the Library of Congress by John L. Smythmeyer in the Italian renaissance style of architecture, may be adjusted and determined by the Secretary of the Interior, to be paid out of the sums heretofore or hereby appropriated: *Provided*, That before any further contracts are let for the construction of said building, general plans for the entire construction thereof shall be prepared by or under the direction of the Chief of Engineers of the Army, which plans shall be subject to the inspection and approval of the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Interior: *And provided further*, That the total cost of said building shall not exceed \$4,000,000 exclusive of appropriations heretofore made."

And the Senate agree to the same.

W. B. ALLISON,
EUGENE HALE,
F. M. COCKRELL,
Managers on the part of the Senate.
WM. H. FORNEY,
JAMES N. BURNES,
THOS. RYAN,
Managers on the part of the House.

The report was concurred in.

PRESIDENTIAL APPROVALS.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. O. L. PRUDEN, one of his secretaries, announced that the President had on the 26th instant approved and signed the following acts and joint resolution:

- An act (S. 186) to amend section 1225 of the Revised Statutes, concerning details of officers of the Army and Navy to educational institutions, etc.;
- An act (S. 2252) to incorporate the Georgetown Barge, Dock, Elevator, and Railway Company;
- An act (S. 3447) amendatory of "An act relating to postal crimes and amendatory of the statutes therein mentioned," approved June 18, 1888, and for other purposes;
- An act (S. 124) granting a pension to Henry F. Kaiser;
- An act (S. 1988) granting a pension to Henry R. Blakiston;
- An act (S. 2576) granting a pension to Richard Hudson;
- An act (S. 2713) granting a pension to Pierre Bottineau;
- An act (S. 2913) granting a pension to Mary Sturgess;
- An act (S. 2938) granting a pension to James McDonald;
- An act (S. 2951) granting a pension to Mrs. Mary Morrison Elliott;
- An act (S. 3130) granting a pension to Patrick Welch;
- An act (S. 3186) granting a pension to Christian Winkel;
- An act (S. 3236) granting an increase of pension to George A. Washburn, late major, Sixteenth Connecticut Volunteers;
- An act (S. 2750) to increase the pension of Samuel A. Tate;
- An act (S. 212) for the relief of Patrick H. Winston, jr.;
- An act (S. 576) for the relief of Semon Bache & Co.;
- An act (S. 1506) for the relief of Addie Bell; and
- Joint resolution (S. R. 102) appropriating \$200,000 to suppress infection in the interstate commerce of the United States.

THE LOUISIANA ELECTION.

Mr. CHANDLER. I ask unanimous consent to call up the resolution in relation to the Louisiana election.

Mr. GIBSON. I inquire of the Senator from New Hampshire whether he proposes to take a vote on the resolution this morning.

Mr. CHANDLER. My purpose in calling up the resolution is to ascertain whether any Senator desires to make remarks thereon. If so, I propose that debate shall proceed.

Mr. GIBSON. I propose to make a few remarks on the resolution whenever the Senator desires to have a vote on it.

Mr. CHANDLER. After the Senator has concluded his remarks I desire that the Senate shall proceed with the consideration of the resolution until a vote is reached.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution submitted by Mr. CHANDLER July 19, 1888, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Privileges and Elections be instructed to inquire—

1. Into the facts of the recent election in the State of Louisiana held on the 17th day of April, 1888, at which there were chosen State officers and also a Legislature, which has since elected two United States Senators; and especially to ascertain and report whether the 136,746 votes returned for the candidate of the dominant party for governor were actually cast, in view of the fact that at no previous election had the votes for such candidate of such party exceeded 88,794; and also why in the parish of Madison there were returned 3,530 votes for one party and none for the other; in East Feliciana Parish, 2,276 for one party and only 5 for the other; in Morehouse Parish, 1,584 for one party and only 14 for the other; in Ouachita Parish, 2,994 for one party and only 5 for the other; in Sabine Parish, 1,441 for one party and only 2 for the other; in Tensas Parish, 4,627 for one party and only 113 for the other; and why there were similar returns from other parishes; and also to ascertain and report whether or not at said State election there was any violence, intimidation, or fraud which pre-

vented a fair election, and particularly whether or not there were any false canvasses or false returns made by the local election officers or included in the final canvass of the votes. And in case said committee shall find that such illegalities as violence, intimidation, or fraud, false canvasses or false returns prevailed in connection with such election, then said committee shall further inquire—

2. Whether any of the acts or omissions of the officials or other persons responsible for or connected with such illegalities were contrary to the Constitution of the United States or the amendments thereof, or were violations of any of the statutes of the United States, especially the provisions of chapter 7, Title LXX, of the Revised Statutes, punishing crimes against the elective franchise and civil rights of citizens, and, if so, whether any prosecutions have been or ought to be commenced in the United States courts for such offenses.

3. Whether such illegalities are likely to be repeated in connection with the election to be held in said State on the 6th of November next for Representatives in Congress; and if so, whether there is occasion for the alteration by Congress of any of the regulations prescribed by said State for holding elections for such Representatives in Congress.

4. And said committee shall also inquire whether there were in connection with the aforesaid State election illegalities, frauds, false canvasses, and false returns so extensive and systematic in their character as to show that there existed on the part of the various State election officers a deliberate plan to apparently carry said election without regard to the votes actually cast, and to choose a governor and other State officers and a State Legislature by such illegal, false, and fraudulent means, and if so, whether said Legislature was actually and duly elected by the people of Louisiana, or was in fact substantially the creation solely of the returning and canvassing officers, and whether said State of Louisiana has a republican form of government, including a Legislature entitled to choose United States Senators, and to provide methods for the appointment of electors for President and Vice-President of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. President, I am under the impression that the people of this country in all parts of it, whether Republican or Democratic in politics, and especially that the business men of the country, are weary of these unconstitutional and revolutionary methods of investigation that tend only to disturb the relations of the States to the Union, and to excite ill-will and distrust between the sections, and the white people and their former negro slaves in the Southern country. They may serve temporary partisan purposes; they can bear no good fruit.

When I see the thin attendance in the Senate on this occasion, when it was proposed by the Senator from New Hampshire to ask for a vote upon his resolution, I am persuaded that the thoughtful members of the Senate in the Republican party can not, and do not, sympathize with the purposes of the resolutions. I can not but remark upon the lack of interest in these proceedings which twenty years ago engaged the public attention, and constituted the instrumentality by which turmoil, and confusion, and tumult and disorders, and race collisions, were promoted in the South, and governments of misrule and confiscation were upheld, and even justified, by many uninformed people of the North. We have, I hope, passed beyond that epoch.

But what are these resolutions that arraign, if not the sovereign State of Louisiana (for that term appears to have become offensive to some persons in these modern times), certainly the "indestructible State," for the States have been characterized as such by the Supreme Court of the United States. They instruct a standing committee of the Senate, the Committee on Privileges and Elections, to ascertain whether there be a republican form of government in the State of Louisiana; whether the members of the General Assembly were duly elected under the constitution and laws of the State, and whether or not they were competent to elect Senators and to make laws; whether the governor was duly elected; and whether, finally, the people of the State should exercise their constitutional rights to choose Presidential electors, and to have their votes counted in the electoral college.

Resolutions so formidable in their scope, so comprehensive, and so sweeping, and fatal to one of the commonwealths of this Union, should neither be introduced, nor considered, by the Senate, unless supported by a state of facts, certified to the Senate by the most solemn and weighty evidence. But under what circumstances have they been brought to our attention? There has not been from the State of Louisiana a single petition presented to this body from any citizen in that State informing the Senate that he had a grievance of any kind in the wide world that the Senate might redress. There has not been a complaint from any body of the people of that State to the Senate asking for any legislation to protect them in their rights, political or civil.

We know, because the Senate of the United States must take cognizance of public facts, that there is but one government in the State of Louisiana, but one person claiming to be governor, but one body claiming to be the Legislature of the State, but one supreme court in the State. We have before us the constitution and laws of the State, observing and maintaining the Constitution and laws of the United States, and all the rights and privileges of the citizens of the United States and of the State, and radically republican in form. We know that State to-day is in satisfactory relations with the other States and with the Government of the United States in all its branches, the Congress, the executive, and the judiciary.

It is represented in the House of Representatives; it is represented here in the Senate. We know that law and order prevail in the State of Louisiana. We have no knowledge of any tumult, of any insurrection, of any disorders in that State but in the individual instances that occur, more or less, in every community, of misdemeanors and crimes aggravated, perhaps, by the fact that the negroes, who were recently, and from time immemorial the slaves of the white people, have been suddenly made free, and elevated without any education or training, except such as the institution of slavery afforded, to participate in

the conduct of the Government; and it can not be disguised that the race problem, sometimes on account of politics, but more frequently without reference to politics, creates friction and difficulties greater than in the States where no such revolution has been wrought, and where the same race problem does not exist under such embarrassing conditions, or in such an intense form. A state of society like this must appeal to every thoughtful man's patience and sense of justice, if not to his generous sympathy.

I do not propose at this time to argue the constitutional questions raised necessarily by these resolutions.

They involve the proposition that under the Constitution of the United States a single Senator may, on his own motion, in the absence of a petition or memorial from a single citizen of the State, when it is known to the Senate that there is but one government in the State, and no insurrection, or tumult, or disorder, challenge the legality of the government of the people of the State and put them on trial to show whether their government is republican in form, a government whose constitution and laws show it to be such, and which is satisfactory to the whole people of the State and is in constitutional and harmonious and satisfactory relations to the Government of the United States.

They involve the proposition that the Senators are not to be chosen by the Legislature of the States as constituted by the people of the States in accordance with their constitution and laws, but that the Senate, in the absence of any protest or complaint from any member of the Legislature, or from any citizen, or of any contest or contestant against the election of the Senators, may put on trial the Legislature itself of the State and usurp its functions "to determine the election, returns, and qualifications of its own members."

They involve the proposition that in advance of a Presidential election this Senate, on the motion of a single Senator, without even a reference to the appropriate committee, shall convert itself into a court or political caucus and institute an inquiry to determine whether one of the States in this Union, without its consent, shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate and of its right to choose electors to participate in the election of the Chief Magistrate of the country.

These and other propositions not less revolting the Senate is requested, by the Senator from New Hampshire, to indorse as resting upon sound constitutional grounds.

I admit that the States can not place a limit upon the powers of the Federal Government; that they can not either nullify a law or secede from the Union, and that there is no way by which a boundary may be fixed to the Federal power except by appealing to the people against the party that shall attempt usurpation, and by the action of the Government itself, its Congress, its Executive, and its courts.

And I submit to Senators that where this has become the settled construction, that State interposition can not set limits to the central authority, but that the Federal Government must, by its Congress, President, and Supreme Court, and the Constitution, determine the measure to its own jurisdiction, the safety of our institutional and municipal liberties demands that the functions and powers of the Senate should be employed rather to uphold the checks and balances of our complex system, and to curb usurpations, than to respond to the behests of party exigencies to overturn and tread upon all precedents and every principle of constitutional law in the midst of a heated Presidential campaign.

If these resolutions provided that this investigation should be conducted in the parishes where the Senator from New Hampshire alleges irregularities and outrages have been committed, finding his foundation for such charges in anonymous letters and newspaper clippings, and if the character and standing of the persons making these charges could be known to the Senators, and if the persons accused could have a fair hearing, I do not know that I should object seriously to the adoption of the resolution. It is a fundamental principle that every person accused should have the opportunity to know precisely what the charges against him may be, and to be confronted by the witnesses, and that the cause should be submitted to a jury of the vicinage; and in no case, in any country enjoying constitutional liberty, will an indictment be sustained on mere hearsay or anonymous communications; it must be supported by affidavits or sufficient evidence. But here is a proposition that indicts a whole State 1,200 miles away, puts the liberties and institutions of a million and a quarter of people on trial, in violation of every principle of right and justice.

If a committee of the Senate were to visit my State they would not find the people there living in a Utopian condition; they would not find them, possibly, realizing the dreams of Jean Jacques Rousseau, or living in such a commonwealth as the honest old counsellor Gonzalo, in the Tempest, would establish; but they would find an industrious, sober-minded, kind-hearted, generous, and brave people, who in the midst of great disasters and misfortunes have re-established their industries, their schools, their churches, and the supremacy of law, giving protection to life and property. They would find a people not only building up their material fortunes, but also building up institutions of learning, universities and colleges of a high order; they would find the relations between the races peaceable and kind; they might also ascertain that occasional outbreaks occur, owing to diversity of race and condition; but they would find a people like the people of other States of this Union in the North and in the South, except that the difficulties

and responsibilities of adapting our institutions to self-government are greater than in States where sudden and violent changes in the social order have not taken place.

Now, these resolutions propose no such inquiry, but they propose that a committee of this Senate shall be constituted a political court in this city, and that summons shall be sent out to every person in the State of Louisiana who may have a complaint or grievance against his neighbor, or who, feeling that if he can convince this committee that he has made sacrifices or suffered any wrong on account of his political opinions, in the event of the election of Mr. Harrison he may be rewarded in proportion to the gravity of the offense that he should allege has been committed against him. This prosecution will be conducted by pettifogging politicians, some of whom are already in this city cutting and drying the programme in advance for the working of the committee. The offer of a visit to the Federal capital, with all expenses paid, the expectation of forming the personal acquaintance of leading Republican Senators, the hope that their services to the Republican party amid the dreadful condition of society in which they live, according to their own accounts, will be recognized, will induce many a man to sacrifice truth and the friendship of his neighbors in order to merit reward at the hands of political leaders. Every neighborhood scandal, every old feud, every grievance, will be retailed to this committee, and these stories in daily bulletins will be disseminated throughout the North to poison the minds of our fellow-countrymen against their countrymen in the Southern States. Thus the seeds of sectional ill-will and animosity will be sown and a harvest in due time may be gathered. You will not hear by this mode of investigation the substantial people of the State, for they are busy in their homes; they have their farms and private business to look after and their daily round of occupations. At this season the farmers are gathering in their crops; they are taxed to make both ends meet at the close of the year; but the unscrupulous politicians in every neighborhood, who fatten on local disorders that they breed, and are looked upon with contempt as Ishmaelites, and who are without any stake in the community, will hasten to regale this committee with their fictions. It will be simply impossible to induce the best element of citizens, who are, as I said, occupied at this time, to leave their homes and come before a committee in Washington which they believe is organized simply for political purposes. Hence an inquiry like this should have and can have no weight with the country; in fact, it will have no more weight than the anonymous and slanderous letters which the Senator from New Hampshire has read to the Senate, or the clippings from newspapers which assert one thing to-day to attract attention and deny it to-morrow.

But the Senator from New Hampshire did not rest, I am frank to say, his demand for this investigation solely upon anonymous letters and newspaper clippings. He refers to tables showing the vote at the election on the 17th of April, 1888, in Louisiana, and he exhibits to the country the fact that in many of the parishes, a long list of which he publishes, the vote actually cast exceeds the number of persons duly qualified by registration to vote. He cries out "here is evidence of fraud." He next shows that there was a total vote in the State of Louisiana of 188,739, while at the election of 1884 there was a total vote of only 132,296, and at the election of 1876 a vote of 160,964. Upon these statements the Senator insists that his claim for an investigation chiefly rests, because he himself can not expect that the Senate should take any action upon mere anonymous communications and extracts which he has read to the Senate. He himself will admit that this would be trifling with the Senate, as well as with the people of one of the Commonwealths of the American Union, and therefore it is that he bases his demand for investigation chiefly upon an official statement of the vote and registration in the State of Louisiana. Now, let us look at those statements.

I will demonstrate that the Senator has been entirely mistaken in his figures; that his premises rest upon an error of his own; and that therefore the very ground-work upon which he is asking for this inquiry falls from under his feet, and this resolution should fall with it. The Senator furnishes us with the official vote on April 17, 1888, but he does not exhibit the official statement of the registration taken in accordance with law ten days before the election. He refers us to the registration of 1884, and other speeches have been made here referring us to the registration of 1880. I append to these remarks an official statement of the registration in 1888 and the official vote at the election in 1888, and it will be seen that the statement of the Senator that the vote exceeded the registration is a mistake.

It does often happen in elections, where persons are careless about qualifying to vote, that they are permitted to vote on affidavits upon being identified, and it is possible that this may have occurred in some places, and, in fact, did occur in Concordia Parish. Now, these tables show that there were registered previous to the election of 1888, 253,557 persons, of whom there were whites 125,407, and colored 128,150. The total vote cast at that election on the 17th of April was 188,739, showing that there were 65,821 persons duly qualified to vote who did not vote. There was no complaint against the registration. I use statements taken from the same sources as the Senator himself draws from, except that my statements, both of the registration and of the vote cast, relate to the election of April 17, 1888, while his statement of registration relates to the previous elections.

This fundamental error must be fatal to the whole argument of the Senator. It is very natural that he should have made such a mistake, because being 1,500 miles away and having probably never put his foot within the State of Louisiana, and his acquaintance being limited in that State, possibly, to the class of pettifogging politicians, it is easily comprehended that he should have been led into just such mistakes by them. Here, then, we have the fact that there were over 65,000 persons qualified by registration to vote who did not vote in the recent election in Louisiana; and the vote cast in the State at the recent election bears the like proportion to the total male population of over twenty-one years of age as exists between that population and the vote in the majority of the States. On the average only about 80 per cent. of persons entitled under the laws to vote usually cast their votes, as will be seen from these figures which I have taken at random from Spofford's Almanac:

PERCENTAGE OF VOTE IN 1884 TO NUMBER OF VOTERS IN 1880.

	Per cent.
Connecticut.....	71
Illinois.....	84
Kentucky.....	73
Maryland.....	80
Michigan.....	85
Missouri.....	81
New Hampshire.....	80
New York.....	83
New Jersey.....	87

In 1884 in Louisiana there were 86,610 persons registered who did not vote; in 1876 there were 46,658 registered voters who did not exercise the franchise. So that I submit there is nothing phenomenal or extraordinary in the vote of the recent election in Louisiana. But the Senator says it is not the total number of votes cast that is surprising, but it is the very large majority that Nicholls received over Warmoth. I freely admit that the majority was large, and that perhaps it would excite suspicion in the minds of persons unacquainted with the state of popular feeling in Louisiana, or with the conditions of the Democratic as well as the Republican party in that State. But these fluctuations of majorities are not confined to the State of Louisiana, and I think that the large majority obtained by Governor Nicholls could be more easily and satisfactorily explained than the phenomenal majorities which have marked the elections in other States of the Union.

Here, for instance, is the State of New York. In 1879 Cornell (Republican) received 418,567 votes, Robinson (Democrat) received 375,799 votes; Cornell's plurality was 42,777 votes; and in 1882, only three years afterward, Cleveland (Democrat) reversed this plurality of 42,777 for the Republican party and was elected by a plurality of 192,854.

Take, again, the State of Massachusetts. In 1879 Long (Republican) was elected by a plurality of 13,602 votes; the very next year his plurality was 53,245, and the year after, General Butler reversed this plurality for the Republican candidate and was himself elected governor by a plurality of 13,949 votes.

Not only are these oscillations of majorities in these two States greater than in the State of Louisiana, but the fluctuations in the total vote, when you consider the political conditions, the steadfast opinions of the people, the thorough organization of the parties, and the facilities for intercommunication, are indeed extraordinary, and more difficult to be accounted for than in a State like Louisiana, where there has been in times past so much race antagonism, so much political commotion, and where for years the working people of the State were subjected to a government composed chiefly of their former slaves, which every year consumed the entire surplus of their earnings and mortgaged, by a public debt, one-fourth of the assessed valuation of their property, while nearly every guaranty for life as well as property was destroyed.

I am sorry to say, but truth compels me to do so, that at that time, while the white people in that State were subjected to such ignorant and degraded tyranny, despoiled of their property and their rights, the demagogues in the Republican party of the North did not extend to them any generous sympathy, nor was any committee sent to inquire into their sufferings and wrongs, which had been proclaimed throughout the whole land. I know that at that time thoughtful and conservative members of the Republican party condemned those spoliating governments just as they condemn these resolutions, the effect of which and the intention of which are to restore such governments to power over the white people and property-owners in a Southern State.

I was speaking of the oscillations of the popular vote in some of the Northern States, and I observe that in the State of Massachusetts there was a change of 68,715 votes from 1879 to 1883, and of 56,079 votes from 1882 to 1883, and of 94,445 votes from 1884 to 1885, whereas in the State of Louisiana there was an increase in the total vote from 1879 to 1888 of only 27,000, and a fluctuation from 1884 to 1888 of 56,000. It appears that there is nothing on the face of the papers more extraordinary in the official statement of the recent election in Louisiana than in the official statements of election in other States. Doubtless Senators from New York and Massachusetts and other States where these oscillations have taken place could very readily explain the causes of them; and I can in a few words relate to the entire satisfaction of the Senate the reasons why such a large vote was cast and such a large majority obtained by Governor Nicholls.

It is always an unpleasant task to discuss persons living in your own State, as was observed by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR]

the other day, when he said he did not think it exactly right for any one to ask him about the standing of particular individuals and particular newspapers in his own State; that he did not think it proper to discuss the personal character and the standing of its citizens.

There had been a wide breach in the Democratic as well as in the Republican party in Louisiana. The two wings of the Democratic party were led by Governor Wiltz, and afterwards by Governor McEnery on the one hand, and by General Ogden and Governor Nicholls on the other; the two wings of the Republican party were led by Governor Warmoth on the one side and Governor Kellogg on the other.

In consequence of the differences between the leaders of the Republican party, and owing to the disrepute which the Republican administrations in the State had fastened upon the party, its organization fell to pieces and it despaired of carrying any State election. Every one felt that the contest to be decided at the recent election in the State was an issue between the two wings of the Democratic party. This was the opinion generally of Republicans as well as Democrats. The canvass between the Democratic wings was inaugurated almost a year in advance of the election. There never was in the State of Louisiana such a warm, protracted campaign, and, if I may be pardoned for saying it, such a forcible appeal to the people of the State. From the middle of August until the middle of January, when the State nominating convention was assembled, the leading men of the State were engaged daily in making speeches, going from parish to parish, and the newspapers of the State were all enlisted on the one side or the other. Indeed, having participated myself in the canvass and being well acquainted with the people of the State, I think I am safe in saying that all there was of political vitality, of political interest in my State was divided between those two wings of the Democratic party. The wing represented by Governor Nicholls gained a great triumph, but no sooner was its supremacy assured by the action of the Democratic convention, than a policy of reconciliation and of healing of differences was adopted.

The wing represented by Governor McEnery was given recognition on the State ticket by the nomination for important places of two gentlemen associated with that wing, and when that great convention dispersed the Democrats who had espoused the cause of McEnery became for the most part the eager champions of Governor Nicholls's election. The Nicholls division of the party has been assailed by the Senator from New Hampshire because it acted with generosity towards the defeated McEnery wing of the party. This is unjust, and I submit to Senators from the North, if it has not happened to them that when one wing of their party was defeated they have sought and generally succeeded, when the convention assembled, in composing all differences by recognizing the factions or divided elements in their own party; they not only do this in their State conventions, but in national conventions. This was notably the case when Garfield and Arthur were nominated.

Returning to the State election—no one supposed that the Republican party would put a candidate in the field, as there was no organization, and no expectation that they would do otherwise than organize for the national contest in 1888. But to the surprise of nearly every one a convention was called and the nomination offered to Governor Warmoth. He hesitated to accept it, but did so at the last moment, believing, I presume, that the differences between the McEnery and Nicholls elements of the Democratic party might be made available. He consented reluctantly to become a candidate, and in a few short weeks before the election made a rapid canvass of the State. I believe he was received everywhere with consideration, because there were many people in the State who had come to believe that some of the most outrageous acts committed during the Warmoth administration were carried over his vetoes and against his influence. During his canvass he declared that if elected he would endeavor to see to it that the intelligent and property-holding classes should control the State, that he would not raise the race issue, and would continue in office the officials whom Governor McEnery had appointed. He also did not hesitate to declare that he was and had been opposed to Federal intervention in affairs of the State, that he disapproved of and discountenanced Governor Kellogg's methods and policy, that Kellogg never was elected Senator of the United States, that he was a "political phenomenon," a man who had held his seat in the Senate without having been elected by any sort of Legislature. Governor Warmoth declared that he had had a breach with President Grant during his administration and that he had thrown up his hat with joy, like all the citizens of the State, when Kellogg's administration was overthrown on the 14th of September, 1874, and that he himself had canvassed the State for the election of Governor John McEnery.

Now, these sentiments were addressed to the white people, who were all thoroughly aroused by the long canvass of which I have spoken. Every one will admit that they did not tend to awaken the hopes of the old Republican leaders, but to alienate Governor Kellogg and his friends, who constituted, perhaps, the majority of the active element in the Republican party. The fact was frequently commented upon that Governor Kellogg, though in the State, took no part in the canvass. Under these circumstances is it extraordinary that Governor Warmoth should have received a small vote and Governor Nicholls a large vote? Nicholls possessed certain attractions for the people of the State, both white and colored, which excited their interest, respect,

and sympathy. He had been one of their heroes in the great civil war, and had lost an arm at Winchester, and a leg, when side by side with Stonewall Jackson, at Chancellorsville. He had always exhibited in his official relations great fairness in the execution of the law and the punishment of crime, and much kindness towards the colored people. These considerations are sufficient to account for the large vote indicative of the confidence that the whole people of Louisiana had in this gentleman.

Now, in certain parishes enumerated by the Senator from New Hampshire, parishes on the Mississippi River, where the negroes outnumbered the whites, say as ten to one, it appears that the election went all one way. The conditions of society in those parishes present the race problem in a more intense and difficult form than in other parishes of the State where the whites constitute a majority, or where the two races are more equally divided, and where the white people have always made their permanent homes. In the delta, or riparian parishes, many of the white people formerly, as they do now to some extent, resided in the highlands or in Mississippi with their families. The negroes were concentrated in great numbers on vast cotton plantations where there were but few white people. Consequently they did not come in contact with the white race in any large degree. It was rural and not domestic slavery; hence, the negroes in those parishes were extremely ignorant and wholly unfit for self-government or the government of others, and even under the reconstruction régime they were brought to rely upon their white leaders in the Republican party and voted mainly in accordance with the wishes of those leaders. When that party was overthrown, some of its leaders became Democrats. Nearly all the land-holding Republicans, and specially the settlers in those parishes who had been officers in the Federal Army, became Democrats, or voted with the Democratic party upon local issues, if not on the national ticket. It has been customary in the State and local elections for the white Republicans of this class, that is, the substantial, property-holding Republican and Democratic leaders, to come together and agree upon a ticket, and the negroes for the most part voted for this ticket, parish officers and State officers. I have been told by leading Republicans from those parishes that they could not afford to see their property pass under a government controlled by negroes; in other words, they united with the Democrats in using every resource and every influence against the establishment of local government under the control of the non-property holding and ignorant classes.

Such of the negroes as have become educated have also, I understand, joined the Republican and Democratic leaders in this policy, who feel that they can not live under a negro government; and I expect this would be the feeling of the Senator from New Hampshire, himself, if he lived in one of those parishes where the negroes, owing to the circumstances I have related, are so entirely ignorant and unfit to levy taxes, to enforce law and order, or perform other governmental functions; and yet in those parishes there are some intelligent negroes elected justices of the peace and to other parochial offices. In some cases they have been elected to the State Legislature. I found in the parish of Madison the very general officer who was appointed by General Canby to receive the surrender of the Confederate army to which I had been attached. He was present at the Democratic meeting which I had the honor to address in that parish, and I understood that he and all the ex-Union officers there were supporting the State ticket and the ticket for the Legislature which was elected, and such, I believe, was the case in the parishes above and below Madison on the Mississippi River from the Arkansas line to the mouth of Red River. I myself have old friends in those parishes, who when the Republican party was in power found it necessary to become Republicans in order to protect their property. Some of them had inherited large estates, and they were gentlemen who would adorn any community by their intelligence and their character. They became, I repeat, Republicans in order to save their property, but they did not succeed in preventing ruinous and confiscating taxation. I heard a leading Republican say once that when some one asked what the debt of the parish in which he resided was, he replied that it depended entirely upon the necessities of two or three white Republicans in that parish, who, whenever they were hard pressed, issued enough scrip to satisfy their wants. These parishes are now out of debt; they have expended thousands and thousands of dollars in building levees on the Mississippi River; some of them have a surplus in their treasuries; the white people and colored people are working together satisfactorily; property is improving in value, and schools are rapidly increasing in number. I understand and I believe, for I desire to speak with perfect frankness to the Senate, that there are certain political tricksters in those parishes who have sought, not so much to promote the interests of the Republican party, as to promote their own selfish interest at the expense of the community, and that they have, many of them, rendered themselves odious both to the Republicans and Democrats, and that in some instances these evil-doers have been warned to desist from their bad work.

They hold about the same relation to society there that the anarchists do to the people of Chicago, or any other agitators and peace-disturbers to the communities in which they reside. Some of these men propose to enlist the ignorant negroes under their banners, and to fight, not for the Republican party, but for themselves, at the expense

of the good order and the security of the lives and property of the substantial citizens, Republicans and Democrats alike, and to destroy every educational and religious interest and institution, as well as the peace of society, in order that they may appear in some quarters as zealous Republicans, or as martyrs for principle. In a few instances I understand that such men have been requested to leave the community.

Mr. CHANDLER. May I ask the Senator to what case he refers?

Mr. GIBSON. I am not referring to any particular case. I am speaking generally, and not of a particular case.

Mr. CHANDLER. I understood the Senator to refer to some particular case. What is his name?

Mr. GIBSON. I do not know what the man's name is. I am speaking now of the general condition in regard to these parishes on the river.

Mr. CHANDLER. There were numerous cases of this kind where men were notified to leave?

Mr. GIBSON. I do not know that there were numerous cases.

Mr. CHANDLER. Has the Senator any in mind?

Mr. GIBSON. I have in mind Mr. Holmes, an old Confederate soldier and a gentleman for whom I have always entertained high regard, and whose hospitality I have enjoyed; but I do not think he went to any excess. I had the parishes of Tensas and East Carroll in my mind; I had the parishes enumerated in the Senator's resolutions in my mind.

But this condition of things is confined to a few parishes of the State of Louisiana. I believe that wherever and whenever such conditions prevail men of property and intelligence will combine together to exert all their influence, without respect of party, to prevent the interests of the community from falling under the control of the ignorant and those wholly unfit for exercising the powers of government, and who become the willing dupes of political adventurers or designing communists. We have an example of this state of things on the Pacific coast, where the Chinese, claiming the oldest civilization in the world and representing a race endowed with extraordinary skill and power, have been excluded from our Pacific States, because they were not only different from those communities in race, but their standard of morals was also different, and because they were utterly ignorant of our institutions, and were content, in order to accumulate a competency, to work for wages much lower than our own people could live and prosper on. They were in fact as much alien to the prevailing sentiments and moral qualities of the population of the Pacific coast as if their only training had been found in the institution of slavery itself. The ruthless massacres of the Chinese in Wyoming Territory and Colorado exhibit a phase of race conflicts and indicate the limitations upon the Federal power to afford adequate remedy, as held by Mr. EVARTS himself when Secretary of State. No sooner had these conditions presented themselves, this menace to free institutions been offered, this array of ignorance appeared, than Senators from that coast raised a cry which has resounded throughout the Union, and which has been responded to with alacrity by Senators from all parts of our common country. They have, in effect, invoked the Senate to re-enact the Dred Scott decision, and to take the ground with respect to the Chinese race upon which that famous decision rested in respect to the colored people in this country. They who hold with the Declaration of Independence, that all men are created free and equal, find themselves under an imperative necessity, political and social, of their people to adapt their doctrine to the exclusion of the Chinese race. Now, when these wants and conditions are brought home to Senators from States on the Pacific coast, they ought to appreciate and I believe they do appreciate the embarrassing and almost insurmountable difficulties that the Southern people have to contend against when dealing with the race problem in their midst, when dealing with the negro born in slavery, and who by reason of his historical condition remains for the most part in subordination, a result which nearly always follows when an inferior is placed in juxtaposition with a superior race in the same territory.

These conditions which exist in the South, as they prevailed throughout a portion of the Union in earlier times, were aggravated in the southern section by the fact that they came upon the white people there, not as they did upon the white people in the Northern States by a gradual process of emancipation and a steady readjustment of relations, but they came upon the Southern people at the end of the most destructive war in respect of men and property that any civilized people ever encountered. The settlement of the question in the Southern States has unfortunately been complicated with the contests of the two great political parties of the country, but I think every one who surveys with a calm eye society in the South will admit that, under the circumstances, the preservation of peace, the recognition of civil and political liberty, the guaranties for life and property, the advancement in education and material resources have been wonderful, if not miraculous. I append some data showing the progress in the South generally, and in Louisiana in particular.

I repeat that the state of things which I have described was confined mainly to certain riparian parishes that were enumerated by the Senator from New Hampshire, but in other parishes, where the Republican party was organized and where the same conditions did not prevail as in the riparian parishes alluded to, the vote may not appear any less remarkable to the Senator from New Hampshire. For instance, in

the city of New Orleans, where there was not the slightest dispute about the fairness of the election in April last, there were polled 38,966 votes, and out of that number Governor Nicholls received 27,824 and Governor Warmoth 11,142—Nicholls's majority being 16,682. At the previous election, in 1884, there were over 24,000 votes polled, and in 1879, 19,000.

If any one will take the white parishes of the State, that is, the parishes in which the white voters exceed the colored voters, including the city of New Orleans, and then the parishes which are represented in the General Assembly by Republicans, they will find they constitute a majority of the whole Legislature. In many of the parishes the Republicans indorsed the Democratic ticket for the Legislature, and the senators and representatives from those parishes may be added to those I have referred to, and it will be found that they in the aggregate constitute a large majority of the members of the General Assembly who participated in the election of the United States Senators. Moreover, in several instances, Republican contestants were admitted to their seats in the house of representatives, over which a gentleman presides who has become a resident of that State since the close of the war, and is a Northern man by birth.

Now, under these circumstances, the Senator from New Hampshire comes forward with his series of resolutions that no constitutional lawyer in this Senate can approve, but which he hopes may be adopted as part of the political programme. He would have one of the committees of this Senate constituted a sort of political mint in which shall be assayed and coined every calumny, every scandal, and, as I said before, every neighborhood feud, every grievance that any man imagines he has suffered, any grievance that any man may be persuaded he has suffered by pettifogging politicians who will be brought here at the expense of the Government. It is proposed that this currency shall find circulation among the good and philanthropic people of the North, who, when the excitement of the campaign shall have passed away and they have made inquiries into the true facts for themselves, shall find it to be base and fraudulent coinage.

Sir, I would rather resign my seat in this Senate than to become the medium by which such vile accusations are to be conveyed to the Senate, the scavenger by whom all the ill-will of the community is to be gathered up and presented to the Senate, or one of its committees. "I had rather be a dog and bay the moon, than such a Roman." I have here newspaper slips from leading newspapers in Rhode Island, and I saw a few days ago a letter from a distinguished citizen of that State, Mr. George S. Waring, declaring that the recent election in Rhode Island was carried by corrupt use of money, and that votes were sold as if in the public market. I have these papers and others at the service of the gentleman from New Hampshire if he desires to extend his inquiry into the legality or fairness of the recent election in the State of Rhode Island. They make out quite a strong case—stronger, I think, than the Senator has made out with his newspaper extracts and anonymous letters against the people and government of Louisiana. Will he accept them?

I am glad to know that there are Senators in this body who have adopted a different policy from that marked out by the Senator from New Hampshire; there are Senators here on the Republican side who by a broad, liberal, I will say magnanimous policy, have won a place in the hearts of the people I represent here to-day, and whose commission I hold by a unanimous vote, both black and white, of the general assembly of that State; there are Senators here who, instead of offering pains and chains and penalties and insults, holding up the people of a Southern commonwealth to the scorn of the public, have come forward with balm for the wounds of the great civil struggle and who have devised beneficent measures of legislation. I need not go beyond the limits of the State of New Hampshire to find such a man, and in years to come, though the Blair bill may be defeated, there will be found in many a hamlet in my State a warm welcome for the name of the statesman who had the sagacity and courage to bring forward that wise legislation intended to educate and enlighten the people of our country.

But the junior Senator from New Hampshire prefers to follow a different course. Without referring his resolutions to the consideration of the committee, but picking up here and there a scandal of the community from anonymous letters and newspaper clippings, often erroneous, he hopes to constitute a political machine to operate during the Presidential campaign, to catch, like the ear of Dionysius the Tyrant, the slightest whispers of political parasites or schemers, and proceed on such testimony to convict his countrymen, living in a distant State, of crimes and misdemeanors. Thus he would attempt to brand with the "Scarlet Letter" one of the fairest and noblest Commonwealths in this Union.

Sir, if this method of procedure can find justification in the minds of the constitutional lawyers in this Senate, or can bring gratification to the heart of any Senator on this floor, or if the author of these resolutions feels that they will gratify his constituents, or that they may be necessary to the success of his political party, he is welcome to such honor as they may bring him. If such charges, based on such flimsy grounds, were made, and if the indictment were laid against the decency and civilization and good character of my fellow-countrymen in New Hampshire, and had no other foundation than the Senator from New

Hampshire himself offers to the Senate, I should feel impelled by every sense of public duty and public honor, as a Senator and a gentleman, to interpose my arm and my voice in their defense; I should feel that I ought to lift my voice, as I do now, against such revolutionary, violent, heartless, reckless, and unscrupulous charges as have been laid against the generous, industrious, and enlightened people from whom I hold a commission on this floor.

Mr. President, I do not desire to prolong this debate, but I was struck, as the Senator from New Hampshire proceeded, with the inconsistency in which he indulged. In the first place, he appealed to the record, to the official table promulgated by the secretary of state of Louisiana to show that the vote of that State exceeded the registration of the State.

Mr. CHANDLER. If the Senator will allow me, I wish to say that I have never done that.

Mr. GIBSON. I found in looking over the former speech of the Senator from New Hampshire on yesterday that he furnished a table which has gone before the country showing that the vote in certain parishes of the State of Louisiana exceeded the qualified voters in the parish.

Mr. CHANDLER. Now the Senator makes the statement accurately.

Mr. GIBSON. In order to do that he takes the election of 1888 and the registration of 1884.

Mr. CHANDLER. May I ask the Senator right there whether there has been any registration since 1884?

Mr. GIBSON. Certainly.

Mr. CHANDLER. I should be obliged to the Senator if he would put it in the RECORD.

Mr. GIBSON. I will furnish the table.

Mr. CHANDLER. I should be obliged to the Senator if he would, because I have been unable to find any registration since 1884.

Mr. GIBSON. What a commentary is that upon the position the Senator from New Hampshire assumes! He would arraign the people of Louisiana when he himself declares that he is in perfect ignorance of the fact that there is required by law, ten days in advance of every general election in that State, a registration of the citizens in the State in order that they may be qualified to vote. That is a public fact which no one would overlook who desired to investigate and to ascertain how elections are conducted in the State of Louisiana. When, in ignorance of this fact, he displays to the people of the country the registration of 1884 coupled with the vote of 1888, showing thereby that the vote exceeded the registration, that Commonwealth stands here accused and convicted of the very fraud which he alleges against her. Yet the frail and uncertain groundwork of the *prima facie* case upon which this allegation rests is dissipated and disappears the very moment the official facts are presented to the Senate.

Not only that, but I show that in a period of twelve years there was a fluctuation in the total vote of only 27,000 in the State of Louisiana during the last election, whereas in the State of Massachusetts there was within one year a fluctuation in the total vote of 95,000. I submit the circumstances which led to the election of General Butler in Massachusetts to the governorship of that State, the influences that were behind him, the peculiar conditions of society in the State of Massachusetts, a State as much honored by myself and by the people of this country as any one in it, perhaps, except the State of Virginia, as the leading State of the Revolution, and in all the great occurrences which have taken place upon the arena of American politics in this country—a State with fixed institutions, with fixed opinions, whose society has never been subverted or revolutionized by force and war.

But when the Senator is confronted by these fluctuations of the votes in New York and in Massachusetts, and when the offer is made to him to take up these newspaper clippings concerning the election in the State of Rhode Island, he declines the offer. However, he occupies himself as a Senator on this floor by clipping from day to day the newspaper accounts of one occurrence after another in the State of Louisiana. Yet at the outset he declares that the press was muzzled in the State of Louisiana, and that therefore it was impossible from the newspapers of that State to ascertain what the condition of society was in it. So the propositions upon which his *prima facie* case rests—first, the official returns of the registration and the election; and secondly, the fluctuation of the vote in the State of Louisiana; and thirdly, the newspaper clippings, which he declares himself are untrustworthy, as we all know they are—have no foundation in fact.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BERRY in the chair). Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. GIBSON. Certainly.

Mr. CHANDLER. If the Senator will allow me, I will state that I have made no such declaration. I said that accounts of these transactions rarely found their way into the local papers, and that in order to ascertain them we must glean them either from the Northern press or the metropolitan press. I did not make the statement—

Mr. GIBSON. The Senator declared in his speech which I had the honor of reading yesterday or the day before that the false countings and killing of voters are seldom found recorded in Democratic newspapers, and never in local newspapers of Louisiana; and yet he has not

quoted from a single paper outside of the State of Louisiana to maintain his allegations.

Mr. CHANDLER. I expressly excepted, if the Senator will allow me, the metropolitan journals. He will find the statement in my speech which he says he did me the honor to read.

Mr. GIBSON. The first proposition upon which the Senator proceeds to arraign the State of Louisiana was based upon the registration and the vote in that State. He finds by his own admission that that falls from under his feet. The third proposition rests entirely upon the newspaper clippings.

The Senator says also that the negroes are being disarmed in the State of Louisiana. His information on the subject is as unreliable as it was with respect to the registration and the vote cast in the State. When I go to my old home in the parish of Terre Bonne, where the colored people still live, occupying their homes and cultivating their farms, without even paying rent to me or any taxes, I send over to them and borrow guns when I desire to go hunting. I have no gun in my own house. I know something of the people of Louisiana. I have traveled through nearly every parish in it. I believe I know as many of my fellow-citizens personally as any living man, and I can venture to state from my personal knowledge that the idea that the white people are disarming the colored people is simply absurd. The Senator would be laughed at if he would go in any neighborhood in the State and make such a declaration.

The Senator alludes to some occurrence in which he said my brother was engaged in Terre Bonne Parish. What does that rest on? It rests upon the irresponsible declaration of some private letters written to the Senator by a single man in the parish, of whom I never heard, and I doubt if the man ever lived there. The parish in which I reside went for the Republican party in the last election and Republican members were elected to the Legislature, and my impression is they voted for me; certainly they did not vote against me for the Senate.

So the Senator's arraignment stands upon inadequate premises. He has been carried away by his zeal for his party. He has been carried away by his desire that certain political workers who claim citizenship in Louisiana shall visit Washington and retail to him and to the political managers of the Republican party stirring tales of their grievances and their wrongs—grievances and wrongs that exist in every large and populous community; grievances and wrongs that ought to be punished in my State, and many of which are not punished in my State; grievances and wrongs that exist perhaps in the Senator's own State and in the State of every Senator who has a seat on this floor. We can not remedy all wrongs by legislation. We can not hope to stretch out our arms from the Senate Chamber to give quiet and peace and protection to every individual in this country. We must hope that the desire of self-government, of amendment on the part of the people themselves where these wrongs occur, will lead them to seek redress of them, because the wrong against one man to-day may become a wrong against another man to-morrow.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Would it disturb the Senator or interrupt him if I should ask a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MANDERSON in the chair). Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. GIBSON. Certainly.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I should like to ask my friend from Louisiana (for I have tried to understand the point of the debate on both sides, although I have not been in the Senate Chamber all the time) what is the objection to an inquiry by the Senate of the United States to ascertain what the truth is? If there be any considerable number of people in the State of Louisiana or Vermont who are deprived of rights which enter into the composition of the Government of the United States and they appeal for redress, what is the ground and reason why the Senate should not inquire?

I remember, if my friend will permit me for a moment, that in 1879 or 1880, when a political party of which I am not usually a member was in the majority here and had sway, an inquiry was instituted by that majority, and without any opposition on this side, into wrongs concerning the suffrage, etc., I think in Rhode Island and Massachusetts, and there was one allegation touching some wrongs in one county in the State of Vermont. As I remember, all the Senators on this side said, "By all means; make every inquiry; let us develop the truth and see how far the right of rights," as platforms have justly called it, "has been evaded; and then we can consider whether within our competence and scope there is any redress." I should like to understand the precise reason why it is not thought fit that we should find out what the truth really is.

Mr. GIBSON. If the Senator from Vermont had done me the honor to listen to my previous remarks he would have ascertained my objections to this particular resolution and this particular mode of redress and inquiry. There has been no memorial here from any man in the State of Louisiana stating that he had suffered any grievance. There has been no complaint addressed to the Senate of the United States. There is no tumult, no "buck-shot war," no insurrection. It is one government, and all is quiet and peaceable. There are no complaints from disappointed candidates, no memorials from the citizens; but a Senator from a distant State, 1,500 miles away, rises in the Senate and

offers the registration and the vote of the State, which he now confesses he did in error, and reads anonymous letters—

Mr. CHANDLER. I dislike to interrupt the Senator, but I have made no such confession of an error, Mr. President.

Mr. GIBSON. The record will show and does show his own confession of his ignorance of the registration. He reads anonymous letters to the President of the Senate, he reads newspaper slips. On these absurd evidences he alleges that there is a conspiracy in the State against self-government, and he asks that one of the standing committees of the Senate, on this inadequate showing, shall be instructed to make an inquiry to ascertain whether there be a republican form of government in the State of Louisiana; whether there be a Legislature; whether there be a governor; whether there be a supreme court, and whether there be a people in the enjoyment of self-government in that State. He is not willing to refer the resolutions and charges and testimony to the Committee on Privileges and Elections for their consideration and report, but wishes to instruct the committee, whether they approve of the investigation or not, to proceed with it.

I submit to the veteran Senator from Vermont whether, on such a showing and in the midst of a Presidential election, this committee should be instructed now to proceed with such an examination and in-

quiry, to be conducted, perhaps, against their own sense of propriety and judgment?

Mr. EDMUNDS. May I ask my honorable friend from Louisiana what the Presidential election has to do with it? I confess I do not understand.

Mr. GIBSON. I fear that the Senator is so fertile in questions that I shall exhaust the patience of the Senate if I attempt to answer them one after the other. If the Senator himself can not perceive some relation between this investigation and the Presidential election, when the resolution itself declares that the inquiry is to be made in order to ascertain in advance whether the people of Louisiana ought to be permitted to vote for Presidential electors, I think I may conclude that the Senator is asking his questions without having deigned even to read the resolution itself. One less experienced in public affairs than the Senator from Vermont would find, if he looked into the history of this body, that these investigations, these inquiries, these inquiries, always accompany a Presidential election. No such resolutions are offered, no such inquiries are instituted by enterprising political Senators except in view of elections for the Presidency in which the fortunes of their party are concerned; and this shall be my brief answer to the Senator from Vermont.

APPENDIX.

Statement of registered voters of the State of Louisiana for the year 1888.

Parishes.	Total registered voters.	Voters of native birth.	Voters of foreign birth.	White voters.	Colored voters.	White voters who write their names.	White voters who make their marks.	Colored voters who write their names.	Colored voters who make their marks.
Acadia.....	2,308	1,926	382	2,006	302	851	1,155	87	215
Ascension.....	5,312	5,023	289	1,864	3,448	1,436	428	643	2,805
Assumption.....	5,643	5,517	126	2,500	3,143	1,668	832	1,086	2,057
Avoyelles.....	4,946	4,836	110	2,300	2,646	1,579	721	501	2,145
Bienville.....	2,713	2,699	14	1,731	982	1,671	60	58	924
Bossier.....	4,625	4,590	35	1,100	3,525	1,075	25	106	3,425
Caddo.....	6,080	5,603	477	2,152	3,928	1,962	190	456	3,472
Calcasieu.....	5,034	4,429	605	4,304	730	2,797	1,507	219	511
Caldwell.....	1,113	1,110	3	591	522	561	30	90	423
Cameron.....	450	422	28	396	54	212	184	5	49
Catahoula.....	2,500	2,460	40	1,345	1,155	905	440	155	1,000
Claiborne.....	5,117	5,104	13	2,512	2,605	2,459	53	201	2,404
Concordia.....	4,104	4,084	20	676	3,428	670	6	406	3,028
De Soto.....	2,899	2,878	21	1,154	1,745	1,094	60	57	1,688
East Baton Rouge.....	7,186	6,844	342	2,762	4,424	2,454	308	797	3,627
East Carroll.....	3,046	3,004	42	321	2,725	321	377	2,348
East Feliciana.....	3,054	2,899	155	1,100	1,954	1,067	33	141	1,813
Franklin.....	1,244	1,235	19	513	731	422	91	76	655
Grant.....	1,283	1,276	7	722	561	468	254	147	414
Iberia.....	5,554	5,318	236	2,344	3,210	1,629	715	520	2,690
Iberville.....	6,246	6,091	155	1,256	4,990	1,082	174	520	4,470
Jackson.....	1,249	1,246	3	780	469	669	111	84	385
Jefferson.....	3,736	3,422	314	1,332	2,404	1,032	300	428	1,976
La Fayette.....	3,364	2,648	716	2,020	1,544	1,006	1,014	334	1,010
Lafourche.....	5,531	5,385	146	3,303	2,228	1,719	1,584	420	1,808
Lincoln.....	2,676	2,665	11	1,757	919	1,476	281	80	830
Livingston.....	1,247	1,207	40	1,075	172	805	270	32	140
Madison.....	3,698	3,662	36	330	3,368	319	11	464	2,904
Morehouse.....	3,162	3,139	23	785	2,377	767	18	53	2,324
Natchitoches.....	5,194	5,186	108	2,344	2,980	1,439	875	457	2,523
Orleans:									
First ward.....	3,278	2,543	735	2,668	580	2,450	248	252	328
Second ward.....	3,910	3,096	814	3,132	778	2,903	229	268	510
Third ward.....	5,708	4,458	1,250	4,061	1,617	3,769	322	742	875
Fourth ward.....	2,970	2,272	698	2,219	751	2,075	144	369	352
Fifth ward.....	3,830	3,001	829	2,969	851	2,591	378	480	381
Sixth ward.....	2,630	1,985	645	2,157	473	1,654	503	266	207
Seventh ward.....	4,085	3,370	715	2,835	1,250	2,569	266	712	538
Eighth ward.....	2,264	1,768	496	1,987	277	1,823	164	122	155
Ninth ward.....	3,511	2,595	916	2,925	586	2,668	257	175	411
Tenth ward.....	4,426	3,359	1,067	3,652	774	3,440	212	360	414
Eleventh ward.....	4,452	3,480	972	3,483	969	3,253	230	462	507
Twelfth ward.....	2,455	1,998	457	1,927	528	1,791	136	230	298
Thirteenth ward.....	1,450	1,205	245	1,028	422	952	76	189	233
Fourteenth ward.....	774	619	155	524	250	480	44	98	152
Fifteenth ward.....	2,625	2,182	443	1,463	1,162	1,344	119	321	841
Sixteenth ward.....	827	708	119	327	500	308	19	180	320
Seventeenth ward.....	779	633	146	486	293	436	50	86	207
Ouachita.....	3,914	3,842	72	1,044	2,870	938	106	781	2,089
Plaquemines.....	2,946	2,341	605	1,162	1,784	927	235	413	1,371
Pointe Coupee.....	4,436	4,231	205	1,327	3,109	1,109	218	402	2,707
Rapides.....	7,309	5,196	2,113	4,893	2,416	4,240	653	236	2,180
Red River.....	1,938	1,920	18	690	1,248	580	110	186	1,062
Richland.....	1,793	1,760	24	644	1,149	871	73	189	980
Sabine.....	1,972	1,952	20	1,538	434	1,173	305	40	394
St. Bernard.....	1,829	1,656	173	871	958	462	409	398	560
St. Charles.....	2,096	2,078	18	242	1,854	199	43	408	1,446
St. Helena.....	1,509	1,491	18	761	748	684	77	157	591
St. James.....	5,235	4,450	785	1,835	3,400	1,541	294	374	3,026
St. John the Baptist.....	2,962	2,947	15	1,011	1,951	884	127	145	1,806
St. Landry.....	10,947	10,835	112	5,354	5,593	3,745	1,609	1,677	3,916
St. Martin.....	3,674	3,630	44	1,476	2,198
St. Mary.....	7,676	7,413	263	2,227	5,449	1,938	289	605	4,754
St. Tammany.....	1,859	1,741	118	1,158	701	558	200	254	447
Tangipahoa.....	2,842	2,737	105	1,727	1,115	1,465	262	243	872
Tensas.....	5,163	5,094	72	728	4,435	721	7	723	3,712
Terre Bonne.....	5,311	5,220	91	2,276	3,035	966	1,310	459	2,576
Union.....	2,965	2,938	27	1,854	1,111	1,594	260	130	981
Vermillion.....	2,490	2,417	73	1,931	559	820	1,111	107	452
Vernon.....	952	876	76	829	123	610	189	53	70

*The original registration book having been destroyed by fire, the number of whites and colored who write their names and make their mark can not be given.

Statement of registered voters of the State of Louisiana for the year 1888—Continued.

Parishes.	Total registered voters.	Voters of native birth.	Voters of foreign birth.	White voters.	Colored voters.	White voters who write their names.	White voters who make their marks.	Colored voters who write their names.	Colored voters who make their marks.
Washington.....	1,215	1,213	2	892	323	619	273	60	233
Webster.....	2,463	2,423	40	1,146	1,317	1,096	50	68	1,249
West Baton Rouge.....	2,377	2,270	107	547	1,830	386	161	341	1,589
West Carroll.....	571	563	8	252	319	202	50	56	263
West Feliciana.....	3,350	3,225	125	550	2,800	510	40	150	2,650
Winn.....	1,375	1,369	6	1,194	181	856	338	35	146
Total.....	233,557	232,949	20,608	125,407	128,150	99,945	23,985	23,010	102,942

STATE OF LOUISIANA, Office of Secretary of State.

I, the undersigned, do hereby certify the above to be an accurate report of the whole number of registered voters in the State of Louisiana, the number of native and foreign born, and the number of white and colored voters, respectively, who write their names and the number who make their marks who have registered up to April 7, A. D. 1888, made in compliance with section 43 of act No. 123 of the General Assembly of the State of Louisiana, approved April 10, 1880.

[SEAL]

OSCAR ARROYO, Secretary of State.

Official vote for governor and lieutenant-governor of the State of Louisiana, cast on the 17th day of April, 1888.

Official vote for governor and lieutenant-governor of the State of Louisiana, cast on the 17th day of April, 1888—Continued.

Parishes.	For governor.		For lieutenant-governor.		Parishes.	For governor.		For lieutenant-governor.	
	Francis T. Nicholls.	Henry C. Warmoth.	James Jeffries.	Andrew Hero, jr.		Francis T. Nicholls.	Henry C. Warmoth.	James Jeffries.	Andrew Hero, jr.
Acadia.....	1,688	149	1,704	142	Terre Bonne.....	1,687	2,033	1,690	2,034
Ascension.....	2,715	1,334	2,715	1,334	Union.....	2,369	91	3,377	89
Assumption.....	1,902	2,159	1,834	2,228	Vermillion.....	1,687	619	1,678	619
Avoyelles.....	2,425	1,310	2,429	1,309	Vernon.....	947	271	942	271
Bienville.....	1,923	37	1,954	35	Washington.....	763	761	761	761
Bossier.....	4,213	95	4,206	91	Webster.....	1,506	325	1,437	314
Caddo.....	4,802	324	4,816	310	West Baton Rouge.....	1,712	454	1,712	454
Calcasieu.....	2,371	708	2,333	687	West Carroll.....	420	81	426	74
Caldwell.....	402	02	676	276	West Feliciana.....	2,038	377	2,058	377
Cameron.....	992	885	991	871	Winn.....	1,196	83	1,198	83
Catahoula.....	2,397	708	2,394	707	Total.....	137,257	51,471	137,468	51,244
Claborn.....	4,219	145	4,224	145					
Concordia.....	1,865	74	1,875	72					
De Soto.....	1,984	2,606	1,984	2,607					
East Baton Rouge.....	2,680	285	2,679	285					
East Carroll.....	276	5	2,291	5					
East Feliciana.....	987	4	988	4					
Franklin.....	582	402	586	402					
Grant.....	1,923	590	1,915	569					
Iberia.....	1,802	2,610	1,809	2,603					
Iberville.....	963	7	965	7					
Jackson.....	833	1,271	855	1,281					
Jefferson.....	1,708	1,234	1,710	1,236					
Lafayette.....	2,702	1,548	2,725	1,553					
Lafourche.....	1,273	191	1,280	199					
Lincoln.....	766	14	768	14					
Livingston.....	3,530	14	3,539	14					
Madison.....	1,584	285	1,586	285					
Morehouse.....	3,373	508	3,372	508					
Natchitoches.....	2,190	663	2,193	658					
Orleans.....	2,321	1,514	2,326	1,502					
First ward.....	1,526	738	1,572	696					
Second ward.....	1,790	846	1,804	825					
Third ward.....	1,566	413	1,553	414					
Fourth ward.....	2,030	1,155	2,033	1,138					
Fifth ward.....	1,487	293	1,491	289					
Sixth ward.....	1,209	594	1,218	586					
Seventh ward.....	828	800	848	785					
Eighth ward.....	500	949	518	933					
Ninth ward.....	1,404	487	1,408	484					
Tenth ward.....	731	351	717	353					
Eleventh ward.....	393	246	400	243					
Twelfth ward.....	1,066	928	1,097	924					
Thirteenth ward.....	276	430	278	430					
Fourteenth ward.....	407	229	408	229					
Fifteenth ward.....	2,994	5	2,995	5					
Sixteenth ward.....	971	1,678	978	1,673					
Seventeenth ward.....	1,945	1,465	1,947	1,463					
Ouachita.....	4,678	449	4,679	453					
Plaquemine.....	1,679	78	1,679	78					
Pointe Coupée.....	1,287	63	1,291	63					
Rapides.....	1,441	2	1,443	2					
Red River.....	904	396	900	394					
Richland.....	172	1,377	172	1,377					
Sabine.....	846	375	846	375					
St. Bernard.....	808	2,181	899	2,182					
St. Charles.....	593	1,216	591	1,214					
St. Helena.....	3,909	3,273	3,907	3,238					
St. James.....	1,624	1,107	1,641	1,093					
St. John the Baptist.....	2,885	1,649	2,882	1,687					
St. Landry.....	912	615	917	609					
St. Martin.....	1,249	629	1,243	630					
St. Mary.....	4,627	113	4,627	113					
St. Tammany.....									
Tangipahoa.....									
Tensas.....									

RECAPITULATION.

Francis T. Nicholls.....	137,257
Henry C. Warmoth.....	51,471
Majority for Francis T. Nicholls.....	85,786
James Jeffries.....	137,468
Andrew Hero, jr.....	51,244
Majority for James Jeffries.....	86,224

J. H. DUGGAN,
AUG. LEVERT,
On the part of the Senate.
EMILE DUPRE,
J. R. LAND,
JOHN M. STALLINGS,
On the part of the House of Representatives.

EDUCATION IN LOUISIANA.

	1873.	1874.	1887.
Number of schools.....	884	1,039	1,985
Number of children enrolled.....	57,443	74,309	111,823

Detailed statement for 1887.

Number of schools:	
White.....	1,318
Colored.....	607
Number of pupils enrolled:	
White.....	64,916
Colored.....	46,912
Average attendance:	
White.....	45,845
Colored.....	34,262
Number of teachers:	
White.....	80,107
Colored.....	1,724
	685
	2,409

Number of private schools:

White.....	349
Colored.....	31
Total number of pupils in public and private schools.....	134,677
Receipts of school fund.....	\$611,255.60

Louisiana has now 11 colleges, with 3,040 students.

The Southern University for colored persons, created by constitution of 1879 (article 231) and supported by annual appropriations of \$10,000, is in a thriving condition.

1888.

Total registration:

White.....	125,407
Colored.....	128,150
Total.....	253,557

White voters who can write their names.....	99,945
Colored voters who can write their names.....	23,210

1880.

Population, ten years and over.....	649,070
Can read.....	297,312
White and colored who can not write.....	318,380
White who can write.....	58,000

AGRICULTURE IN LOUISIANA—COTTON PRODUCTION.

Year.	Acres.	Bales.
1879.....	864,787	508,569
1880.....	971,843	404,373
1880-'87 (estimated).....		550,000

SUGAR.

Hogsheads.	1870.....	Hogsheads.
1859.....	221,840	144,881
1860.....	228,753	218,314
1866.....	41,000	350,000

CROP REPORTS OF COMMISSIONER OF AGRICULTURE FOR YEAR 1887.

Crop.	Quantity.	Acres under cultivation.
Cotton.....	bales..... 406,420	1,002,764
Corn.....	bushels..... 19,927,323	973,142
Rice (clean).....	pounds..... 69,930,831	72,686
Sugar cane.....	hogsheads..... 264,856	197,044
Molasses.....	gallons..... 16,243,490	
Sweet potatoes.....	bushels..... 1,805,012	19,460
Irish potatoes.....	do..... 256,168	6,719
Oats.....	do..... 416,101	41,549

[The New Orleans Times-Democrat.]

THE GREAT SOUTH.

The Times-Democrat presents elsewhere this morning, as it has for five years, a review of the condition of the Southern States to-day and the progress they have made in the past twelve months. When we first told this story but little was known of the wealth and advantages of the South. To-day the whole world recognizes them, and there is scarcely a paper in the North but publishes columns each year about Southern progress and development, while scores of industrial papers have sprung into existence here to chronicle the advance made in each line of mining or manufactures. Moreover, the Southern States no longer "hide their lights under a bushel." They recognize the benefits to accrue to them from making known their wealth, their resources, and their progress. Nearly all of them have statistical bureaus and publish from time to time interesting reports of their condition.

From these and other reports it is an easier matter to-day to give, as we do elsewhere, the progress of the South during the year, and to find how far it has moved forward since 1880.

The doubter who may regard what the papers have had to say about the South as due to a disposition to "boom" things must be convinced by the official figures of the assessments. No one can imagine for a second that these exaggerate the value of property. On the contrary, there is a strong disposition to undervalue it. When, therefore, the assessments show that the wealth of the South is increasing at a rate nearly twice as great as the population, it is evidence of prosperity which none can deny or dispute. The following is the assessment of the several Southern States during the census year and for 1887-'88. The assessments now being made will show a still larger increase.

States.	1887-'88.	1879-'80.
Alabama.....	\$214,925,869	\$117,486,181
Arkansas.....	148,868,206	86,409,364
Florida.....	84,860,534	29,471,618
Georgia.....	341,504,921	235,650,530
Kentucky.....	483,491,690	318,037,875
Louisiana.....	221,500,000	158,587,495
Mississippi.....	129,887,254	106,594,708
North Carolina.....	210,035,453	156,100,202
South Carolina.....	141,495,056	132,037,986
Tennessee.....	239,750,000	211,768,538
Texas.....	650,412,401	304,493,163
Virginia.....	374,043,338	308,455,135
Total.....	3,240,774,722	2,164,792,795

In the census report on valuations, the Census Bureau in 1880 estimated that the true value of property of all kinds in the South was much greater than the assessments—57 per cent. greater in Texas and Virginia, 43 per cent. in Georgia—the total being \$5,725,000,000 as against an assessment of \$2,164,792,795. On this basis the true valuation of the South to-day is \$8,570,829,140, showing an increase during the past eight years of \$2,845,829,140, with an improvement in the assessment of \$1,075,981,927.

The wealth to each inhabitant is:

Assessed wealth per capita, 1880.....	\$148.42
Assessed wealth per capita, 1885.....	171.11
Actual wealth per capita, 1888.....	452.43

This improvement has kept on steadily from year to year, as the following figures from the Times-Democrat's reports will show:

1879.....	\$2,164,792,795	1884.....	\$2,887,834,861
1880.....	2,388,642,420	1885.....	2,996,514,535
1881.....	2,473,620,423	1886.....	3,028,536,879
1882.....	2,565,903,787	1887.....	3,064,800,443
1883.....	2,782,115,803	1888.....	3,240,774,722

It will be noted that last year's improvement was considerably above the average.

We have elsewhere given so full a review and such ample statistics on this subject that we will but present the following figures, making a comparison between the South to-day and what it was in 1880. Nothing better illustrates the progress made during that period.

	1888.	1880.	Increase.
Population.....	18,942,858	14,639,714	29.4
Assessment.....	\$3,240,774,722	\$2,164,792,795	49.8
Railroads, miles.....	35,679	17,808	100.0
Hands employed in factories.....	440,253	215,245	141.0
Capital.....	\$426,597,000	\$179,366,230	143.5
Production.....	\$585,088,103	\$315,924,794	85.4
Pig-iron produced, tons.....	845,920	212,022	397.8
Mineral output.....	\$25,482,600	\$3,347,445	760.6
Farm products.....	\$793,098,293	\$611,679,048	29.7
Farm animals.....	44,830,972	20,754,243	55.8
Fruit, value.....	19,421,380	9,103,113	113.4
Total production of all kinds, agriculture, mining, manufacturing, fisheries, etc.....	\$1,353,312,620	\$949,814,720	42.5
Schools.....	62,038	45,031	37.8
Children attending.....	2,402,117	1,832,620	36.7
School expenditures.....	\$11,742,702	\$6,415,706	83.2

It will be seen that in every respect the South has moved forward more rapidly in wealth than in population; that it produces more and is richer and more prosperous in every way. These statistics draw a better picture than any words can of the advance of the South since 1880.

[The New Orleans Times-Democrat.]

NEW ORLEANS.

These advantages, cheap raw materials, cheap transportation, and the best markets were in themselves enough to build up manufactures here. Another advantage that might be mentioned is the variety of industries concentrated here which must help each other. The presence of the great foundries of New Orleans, of the saw-mills, will of necessity aid other establishments which may need lumber or machinery of a peculiar kind. In New Orleans they can get everything they want and will not be required to send elsewhere for it.

And, finally, it was discovered that New Orleans possessed an abundance of labor, excellent in character, intelligent, capable, endowed with much of that taste to be found in France, tractable, and free from that unfriendly feeling toward capital which creates a friction in New England and other industrial sections, and which has so injured manufacturing there.

The result of these discoveries has been to bring about a rapid advance in manufactures here, the details of which are given elsewhere. The manufactures of New Orleans have more than doubled in the past eight years, as follows:

Year.	Establishments.	Capital.	Hands.	Wages.	Products.
1888.....	2,185	\$21,677,670	23,865	\$8,242,599	\$41,508,000
1880.....	915	8,565,303	8,404	3,717,557	18,808,000
Increase.....	1,270	13,102,367	15,461	4,525,042	22,700,000

Capital no longer hesitates over these investments and more has found its way into manufacturing industries during the past year than during the entire decade between 1870 and 1880.

Mr. TELLER. I do not rise to discuss the resolution before the Senate nor the conduct of the people of Louisiana, either in this election or any other. I have had some experience of these matters in the way of investigation, and I sympathize very much with what was stated by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BLAIR] the other day when he said it was useless, perhaps, to discuss this question because we were powerless to redress the wrongs that by general admission are perpetrated. What I desire now is to correct a statement made by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. GIBSON] as to the opinion of Republican Senators in regard to the rights of the Chinese under the Declaration of Independence. I suppose he meant to say that they hold on their side that the Declaration of Independence was not intended to cover any but white men, and did not intend to cover and did not cover Chinese.

Mr. President, for one, I desire to enter my dissent from that doctrine. The Declaration of Independence, in my judgment, covers all mankind, white and black and red, and I do not find anything inconsistent with that declaration in my attitude toward the Chinese.

I do not understand that the Declaration of Independence declares that every man is the social equal of every other man. I do not understand that the Declaration of Independence declares that every man has the same rights that every other man has all over the world. I understand it to mean simply that when the people are grouped in one community under one government every man is equal before the law. That is all it asserted. It did not assert that the Englishman who comes

to America is the equal before the law of the American citizen, nor did it assert that the Chinaman coming here is equal to the American citizen before the law. If that was so, by what right do we say that the foreigner who comes here shall not participate in the affairs of government until he has passed a certain probationary period and his qualifications have been determined by a proper court? The right, entirely consistent with the Declaration of Independence, to say that any man who comes here from another country, not being a citizen of this, comes here subject to just such laws as we make for him, has never been denied that I know of in the history of the Government; and when I vote to say that a Chinaman shall not come here and vote, or that he shall not come here even when he does not vote, I do not run counter to anything in the Declaration of Independence.

We have the same right to say that the white man of Great Britain or France or any other portion of the world shall not come here that we have to say that the Chinaman shall not come here. We say the Chinaman shall not come here because his presence is injurious to the interests of the American people. Whenever the American people believe that the presence of the white man from Great Britain or any other country in the world will be injurious to our people, it will not only be our right but it will be our duty to say that that man shall not come, or if he comes shall not remain.

I have never put my opposition to the admission of the Chinaman upon any other ground than I would put my opposition to the admission of an Englishman or a Frenchman or a German; not upon the color of his skin; not upon the inferiority of his intelligence, which I claim exists; not because he is incapable of taking on the highest civilization that belongs to the Caucasian race; but because his presence here is injurious to the people who are here and who compose this Government and have a right to legislate for themselves in their interests, however injurious that legislation may be to those who are not a part and parcel of this Government; and I adhere to every word that was uttered in the Declaration of Independence in its highest and noblest sense. It means that if a Chinaman is made a fellow-citizen by your consent, you must treat him as you treat your white brother. It means that though the African is dark, thick-lipped, curly haired, and ignorant, if he is your fellow-citizen you must mete out to him the same political rights as you mete out to the most intelligent and the wealthiest white man in your community. That is what the Declaration of Independence means, and that is what, so far as I can, I intend in my legislative career to insist shall be its construction, and that the Government shall be administered upon that theory so far as it is possible.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. GIBSON] says that the conservative people of this country are weary of these inquiries into the affairs of the Southern States. I do not so understand the temper of the American people. I believe that what they are weary of are the frauds, false countings, and murders of legal voters which are going on in the South in order to make that section solid and enable it to govern the North and the country.

The Senator says that if an inquiry of this kind was suggested in reference to New Hampshire, he would lift his arm and his voice in this Senate to prevent such an investigation. Mr. President, when such evidence is presented to the Senate of the United States of wholesale fraud and of widespread murder resorted to in the State of New Hampshire to prevent the Democrats of that State from voting at any election, the Senator from Louisiana may interpose to prevent an investigation, but there will be no such interposition on the part of either Senator from New Hampshire or any Republican Senator upon this floor.

The Senator likens the Committee on Privileges and Elections, when charged with an investigation of this kind, to the ear of the tyrant Dionysius. The comparison is inapt. Committees of this body are the ears of no tyrant. They are the ears, the eyes, and the limbs of the legislature of a republic, and I trust that the time will never come when the ears of the American Senate will not be open to frauds, outrages, and murders committed anywhere in this country for political reasons. I trust that when the humblest citizen, wronged in property or in personal liberty, comes to the American Senate and asks an investigation a hearing will be accorded to him, the facts ascertained and proclaimed to the American people.

Mr. President, the Senator has carefully refrained from alluding, as have all the Senators who have discussed this general question at this session, to the facts of which complaint is made. They refuse to enter into them. They say there is no constitutional authority to investigate them. They deal in generalities entirely, and they dislike to face and they do not face the specific facts which make this outcry before the American people.

The charge is that these outrages, that these murders of colored people in Louisiana and in other Southern States, are committed for political reasons. They are not murders of mere brutality; they are not isolated in their character, perpetrated in pursuance of no deliberate purpose; they are not, as Democrats are fond of calling them, sporadic in their nature; but they are part of a widespread, deliberate system of politics and political action on the part of the Democratic party, established in order that the control of the Congress and the Presidency of the United States may be wrongfully and criminally transferred from the party to which a free and fair and honest election would give

it to another party, which can only obtain that control by such frauds and by such violence as are now exhibited to the whole nation.

I stated when this resolution was before the Senate on a former occasion that these methods of politics which were resorted to in order to secure a return of 136,746 votes and a majority of 84,753 for Nicholls in Louisiana on the 7th of April were a continuing system; that the same species of intimidation, violence, and murder was being continued in the State of Louisiana as a preparation for the election which is to give the electoral votes of the State of Louisiana to Grover Cleveland.

Recent facts justify the assertion which I then made, and disagreeable as I know it is, painful as I know it is, harshly as I know it grates upon the sensitive and patriotic nerves of the Senator from Louisiana to contemplate the fact that in his State to-day black men, Republicans, are being butchered in order that the Presidential electoral vote of that State may be cast for Grover Cleveland, yet I conceive it to be my privilege and my duty to bring these facts to the attention of the American Senate, to the attention of the people of New Hampshire, if the Senator will have it so, and to the attention of the American people, in order that possibly they may be aroused to the enormity of the wrongs that are being perpetrated upon the humble colored voters in this State of Louisiana upon which the Senator has passed such a eulogy.

I find in the New Orleans Daily Picayune of Monday morning, September 17, 1888, the following account:

LOUISIANA—BREAUX BRIDGE—CRIME COMMITTED ON NEGRO WOMEN—THE WHITE PEOPLE IN MASS MEETING DECLARE SUCH PROCEEDINGS SHALL STOP.

BREAUX BRIDGE, LA., ST. MARTIN'S PARISH, September 16.

An awful crime was perpetrated in this vicinity Friday night. A gang supposed to be composed of five thus far unknown parties assaulted a negro cabin, and shooting through the walls mortally wounded a black woman, who died a few hours afterwards. From this place they went to another cabin, outraged a black woman, and then whipped a black man.

The negroes have made no affidavits yet. The white population is very much excited over this matter, and held last night an indignation meeting. About three hundred white men were present. Hon. Charles Delhomme made a stirring speech, in which he denounced such parties and such actions in the most virulent language. He was warmly applauded, and resolutions were immediately and unanimously passed that these negroes will be fully protected, so as to enable them to make the proper affidavits declaring all those whom they may have recognized, so that they may be duly arrested, delivered to the courts, and dealt with to the utmost rigor of the law.

The white people are decided that order and peace shall prevail, and that any disturber of them shall be summarily dealt with, whether white or black.

Also the following from the Picayune of the 18th:

CALLING A HALT ON NEGRO OUTRAGES—SAM. POLK CHARGED WITH MURDERING A COLORED WOMAN.

ST. MARTINSVILLE, LA., September 17.

An affidavit was to-day made against Sam. Polk, a young man of Breaux Bridge, for the murder of the negro woman who was so brutally killed near Breaux Bridge Friday night. It appears that Polk, who was accompanied by four other men, was well recognized, and he lost his hat, which was brought to the district attorney's to-day. The hat was recognized as belonging to Polk. Polk is said to be the one who outraged the other colored woman, and an affidavit was made against him for that crime also.

Polk has fled, and at this writing has not been arrested, although the officers and citizens of Breaux Bridge went in his pursuit.

There are strong doubts against the other assassins and they will soon be in the hands of justice.

The whipping and bulldozing of negroes is getting to be too frequent, especially by irresponsible parties, who, when banded, are criminally inclined. These outrages will be stopped and at once.

Another account, in the Washington Post, September 17, 1888, is headed:

LOUISIANA OUTRAGES.

NEW ORLEANS, September 16.

A Picayune special from Breaux Bridge, La., says that on Friday night five unknown men attacked a negro cabin, and shooting through the walls, killed a colored woman. At another cabin they outraged a colored woman and whipped a colored man.

A mass meeting of three hundred white men was held Saturday night to express indignation at the outrages. Resolutions were adopted pledging protection to the colored people and punishment to the perpetrators of the crime.

I make the prediction, as I did on a previous occasion, that the indignation will end in resolutions. There will be no indictment and no punishment of the perpetrators of these outrages upon these negroes, the object of which is to affect the approaching Presidential election, when the parish of St. Martin is to be converted from a Republican parish into a Democratic parish. In the parish in 1874 there were 1,631 white votes and 1,771 colored votes. The vote returned in 1888 was for Nicholls, 1,107; for Warmoth, 1,624. This is one of the few parishes in which at the last election the Republicans managed to obtain a majority. The decree, however, has gone forth from the Democrats of Louisiana that St. Martin shall not be in the Presidential election a Republican parish, but shall cast a majority for Grover Cleveland.

The Louisiana Standard of September 22 gives the following account of this Breaux Bridge atrocity:

DEMOCRATIC MURDER—AN EPIDEMIC OF ASSASSINATION—ORGANIZED GANGS OF DEMOCRATIC MURDERERS MAKING THE KILLING OF NEGROES A PASTIME—HOW LOUISIANA NEGROES ARE BEING REDUCED TO MEXICAN PEONAGE—ASSASSINATION ITEMS AS TOLD IN DEMOCRATIC SPECIALS—NO POLITICS IN IT, BUT THE MURDERERS ALL GOOD DEMOCRATS.

ST. MARTINSVILLE, LA., September 17, 1888.

"News reached here this morning of one of the most cowardly crimes that ever was committed in this parish." Friday night, at about 11 o'clock, in the

vicinity of Breaux Bridge, a gang of four or five parties, some of them so far "unknown, whipped a black man, criminally assaulted one black woman, and killed another."

The particulars gathered from the mother of the dead woman are about as follows:

On Friday night the gang called at the door of the woman's house and knocked, saying it was the sheriff. She opened the door and recognized one of the parties, Sam Polk. She shut the door on them. They then fired through the door several shots, one of them taking effect in the woman's abdomen and she died next morning.

The coroner's inquest revealed "the fact that she bore seven months' twins, one of them having the ball through the head. The man Polk was recognized as having engaged in the three crimes. His hat was also found at the door of the cabin. He was not found when search was made for him.

"The white people are indignant and very much excited. Warrants have been issued against Polk and three other parties suspected to have participated in the crimes. The white people will see that the colored people are protected and justice done."

This is well enough in its way, in its recounting the damnable crime. All that about the white people being so terribly indignant is so much bosh. The parish has been a hell for the negroes for months. Democratic outlaws, called Regulators, have been and are in control of the parish. The killing and outraging of negroes has been their pastime. The planters have been and are helpless to afford their laborers any protection. The laborers are justly getting generally alarmed.

Those who can are showing the disposition to get away. The grinding season is coming on. The cane has to be gathered, and the sugar to be made. A large increase of laborers is wanted. The parish is getting to be known for the Democratic hell that it is. There is the growing fear that the needed laborers can not be had, that those now on hand will get out. All this means ruin. These Democratic murders, again, this epidemic of assassination of helpless negroes are reaching the North, may affect the coming election. There is the seeming desire to call a halt, to hold up until the grinding season and the election shall be well over. That is about the measure of the excitement among the whites. It is all fear and gammon. Nobody will be hurt for murdering negroes.

AND YET ANOTHER ITEM.

ST. MARTINSVILLE, September 18, 1888.

"Vilmon Hollier, Declaire Hollier, Detour Hollier, and Numa Boudreaux were arrested last night by Sheriff Gardamel and the citizens of Breaux Bridge, for the murder of the negro woman. Sam Polk is still at large and the officers are in pursuit. Vilmon Hollier is an ex-convict, having been pardoned last year."

This closes the present chapter of Democratic specials; maybe something may be done with that "ex-convict." Something evidently must be done, or that sugar crop goes to the demnition bow-wows—there won't be any laborers in the parish to make it.

That "ex-convict" will do to make an example of. There is nothing like an example, you know. The poor devil, as an "ex-convict," is not to be presumed as having any friends. Clean him out. The negroes will be satisfied that they are to be duly protected.

Bah! Why not go for the Democratic chivalry, the sons of the first families, the organized gangs of "regulators?" These are but the later and the smaller crimes. Why not attack that Democratic damnable verdict "parties unknown," covering the assassins of Freetown?

It is no use, gentlemen. Louisiana is overridden with Democratic assassins. You may not wipe out the facts.

The outside world is coming to understand them. You have your Democratic government, installed by force and fraud. Your authorities are in the hands of those who forcibly and fraudulently put them in power. Your bulldozers and ballot-box stuffers are running the State. They are making the State a Democratic hell by murdering and outraging Republican negroes. Your State is virtually damned, is accursed because of an assassin Democracy. The negroes must look out for themselves. They must get out of the State.

The Washington Post of August 27 has the following:

Race troubles in Louisiana—

This case is one of those which the Senator from Louisiana calls the petty grievances with which the Senate of the United States ought not to be troubled. He would scorn, he says, if any petty grievance of this kind should happen in the State of New Hampshire to unworthily and in an undignified and unpleasant manner bring it before this lofty body, of which he has the honor to be a member—

RACE TROUBLES IN LOUISIANA.

NEW ORLEANS, La., August 26.

A dispatch from St. Martinsville says: "For three or four weeks past wild rumors have been spreading all over the parish that the negroes were arming and that a conflict of races was imminent. These rumors induced whites to organize for protection and safety.

The 1,631 whites of St. Martin are in danger of having the 1,771 colored voters arm themselves and assault and kill and murder these poor, innocent, quiet, well-behaved, and peaceful Democrats of that parish; so for protection and safety they decide as follows:

As a measure of preservation, the whites decided to disarm some of the negroes. The whites left yesterday for the Fifth ward, and completed the work of disarming without any resistance, except in one instance, where the whites were fired upon by two negroes, Albert Harris and his son, who were entrenched in a cabin.

The whites of Louisiana, if they hear that two poor negroes have possession of guns in an humble cabin in which they live, forthwith declare that these two negroes are entrenched in their cabin and that the whites are in danger, and thereupon they organize a posse—if there are two negroes, generally of about one hundred and fifty whites—and they go to the cabin and disarm these terrible negroes!

The negroes fired fifteen or twenty shots, which were returned by the whites. After firing for ten minutes the negroes surrendered. One of them was wounded in the arm. They were escorted out of the parish and warned never to return. The work of disarming was continued in a section of the Fifth ward where trouble was anticipated, but the rumor proved to be unfounded. Two bad characters were ordered to leave the parish within a specified time.

I have not the slightest doubt that they were going to vote the Republican ticket if they had staid there, and according to the modern Louisiana doctrine which the Senator has avowed and attempted to justify upon the floor of this Senate to-day, if a man wants to vote the Republican ticket he is a bad character, is to be notified to leave.

The weapons taken from the negroes were mostly old shotguns. A few rifles were found, but there was nothing showing an aggressive armament, except in the case of Albert Harris—

One of these two negroes—

who had a new Winchester rifle and a good supply of ammunition. All is now quiet.

Undoubtedly all is now quiet, and that kind of quiet will continue until after the 6th of November, when the votes for Grover Cleveland in that parish have been counted and the votes for Benjamin Harrison have not been counted, and then the negroes may have some measure of real rest and peace until the approach of another election.

Here is a telegram from Shreveport, La. This is from the Daily Picayune of September 18; no old bones, or time-worn stories, or rotten timber in any of these extracts from the current Southern newspapers. The Picayune says:

SHREVEPORT—NEGRO MURDERERS SUE FOR A CHANGE OF VENUE—SHREVEPORT'S DELEGATES FOR BLANCHARD.

SHREVEPORT, La., September 17.

The arguments in the case of Henry Brown *et al.* for a change of venue were heard this morning in the district court. A number of witnesses, all summoned by the defendants, testified that a fair trial could not be secured in Shreveport for the accused. The case was continued until to-morrow for further evidence. The accused are held for conspiracy and murder.

They are charged with killing Ed. Scott, a negro, on Saturday night, September 1, while he was at his home in bed. The crime is one of the darkest and most deliberate ever perpetrated in this community.

The primary election for delegates to the Congressional convention, fixed to convene on September 28, was very quiet. Less than 100 votes were cast throughout the city. All the delegates elected favor BLANCHARD's return to Congress from this district. He will have no opposition.

Undoubtedly the canvass of Mr. BLANCHARD will be quiet, as quiet as has been his nomination. No opposition has he to fear—

Mr. GIBSON. I do not like to interrupt the Senator—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield?

Mr. CHANDLER. Nothing will give me more pleasure.

Mr. GIBSON. The remark that Mr. BLANCHARD will have no opposition means to his nomination, not to his election.

Mr. CHANDLER. Not to his election. There had better not be any vigorous opposition to his election, unless the negroes of that district want general slaughter among them before the 6th of November.

I do not know upon what ground the Senator from Louisiana says that there will be organized Republican opposition to Mr. BLANCHARD's election. The last time he was elected there was no opposition, and if affairs are as quiet in his district—"quiet" meaning the quiet that succeeds the killing of prominent and active negro Republicans—there will not be likely to be any opposition to him at the approaching election.

[The Daily Picayune, Tuesday morning, September 18, 1888.]

TWO MORE NEGROES TAKEN OUT AND SHOT TO DEATH.

OPELOUSAS, La., September 17.

Yesterday morning at Ville Platte prairie a crowd of armed men rode to the house of two negroes named Jean Pierre-Salet and Sidairo, and after leading them a short distance riddled them with buckshot, killing both men instantly. This killing is supposed to have been brought about by the incendiary language recently used by these two negroes.

The affair created intense excitement in the neighborhood where it occurred.

Doubtless the incendiary language used by these negroes was something like the incendiary language which the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. SPOONER] showed the other day was used by the negroes in Texas, of which complaint was made, which was, I believe, that they argued in favor of a protective tariff.

Since this resolution was before the Senate on a previous occasion I have found one or two accounts in other papers of the Freetown affair, which I desire to incorporate in my remarks at the risk of disturbing the sensibilities of the Senator from Louisiana. This is from the Weekly Messenger at St. Martinsville, La.:

A RIOT—E. PAYSON SMITH KILLED AND ANOTHER MAN SLIGHTLY WOUNDED—TWENTY-FIVE NEGROES KILLED.

The news came here yesterday morning of a riot which took place in the parish of Iberia during the evening of Thursday. The particulars we got at the time of going to press are about as follows: It was reported that the negroes were arming and drilling in the section where the riot took place, and Captain Cades, in command of a detachment of his company, went there to quiet and disarm the negroes. The negroes, it appears, were congregated in a cabin, and when Captain Cades informed them of his mission the negroes from within the cabin opened fire on him and his men, killing Mr. E. Payson Smith and slightly wounding another man. Captain Cades then ordered his men to return the fire, and twenty-five negroes fell dead.

The body of Mr. Smith was immediately taken to New Iberia.

At the time we go to press everything is reported quiet.

NEW IBERIA—VERDICT OF THE CORONER'S JURY ON THE NEGROES SLAIN IN THE FREETOWN RIOT.

[From the Louisiana Standard, New Orleans, August 25, 1888.—Correspondence.]

NEW IBERIA, La., August 23.

The coroner's jury reached a verdict yesterday evening in the case of the killing of the ten negroes in the Freetown riot on the 15th instant. Two days were spent in collecting evidence, which resulted in the following verdict:

"We, the jury impaneled to hold an inquest on the body of Tom Simon, deceased, come to the conclusion that he met his death by a gunshot wound inflicted by parties unknown to the jury. From the evidence collected the jury is further led to the conclusion that the following also met their deaths by gunshot wounds inflicted at the same time and place by parties likewise unknown to us: Sam Cahill, Louis Simon, Edw. Simon, Eugene Green, Alex. Valere, Edw. Valere, and others. This at Freetown, parish of Iberia, on the 15th day of August, 1888."

Here is the damning outcome. The verdict of the coroner's jury but smoothed

over a wholesale massacre. It is a palpable, damning lie. Do the members of this jury realize the position in which this verdict places them? Do they realize that they must stand self-convicted as perjurers before God and man? Where is the honor of a community? Where the honesty of a jurymen's oath? Where is the honor of Governor Nichols? "Vengeance is mine, saith the Lord."

I also have in the Picayune an account of this "Iberia riot," as it is called, which I desire to insert in the RECORD. The account of the beginning of the affray here given is that the white people of the section began to feel alarmed about the negroes at Freetown, and this is what they did:

The citizens rode into Freetown and found, as rumored, a large number of armed negroes quartered there. They asked its meaning and the negroes were silent. They then demanded a surrender of their arms, with the promise that when they learned to behave themselves—

I judge that means only that when they learned to submit to the policy that has been outlined here to-day by the Senator from Louisiana of having no ticket in the field except the Democratic ticket—they would be returned, and that the negroes should at once disperse. The great majority of them accepted the terms of the party and surrendered their arms, which were found without exception to be loaded with ball or buckshot.

The negroes took possession, it appears, of Rev. Mr. Nora's house. Then follows the brutal massacre which was described in the Times-Democrat, published with my remarks the other day:

THE IBERIA RIOT—TWENTY NEGROES AND ONE WHITE MAN SLAIN—GLOWING DETAILS OF THE BATTLE—THE NEGROES BARRICADED IN THE PREACHER'S HOUSE—NONE LEFT ALIVE TO TELL THE STORY—SOME INNOCENT MEN WHO SUFFERED WITH THE GUILTY—THE NAMES OF THE SLAIN—THE FUNERAL OF MR. SMITH IN NEW IBERIA—POLITICS NOT A FACTOR IN THE FIGHT.

NEW IBERIA, LA., August 17.

To-day all is quiet again. This morning a large number of men from various sections of the country and neighboring towns were here, but nearly all of them returned to their homes during the forenoon.

This morning the remains of Mr. E. P. Smith were removed to the Episcopal church. He was forty-two years of age and a native of Ohio, and a bachelor. The funeral services were conducted at the church by Rev. C. C. Kramer. The edifice was crowded to a jam, and the yard and walks in front of the church were also crowded. After the regular services at the church the funeral cortege was formed, as follows: The Iberia Guards, the Attakapas Rangers (of which the deceased was a member), the hearse, the Phoenix Bucket Fire Company (of which the deceased was also a member), Iberia Steam Fire Company, No. 1; American Steam Fire Company, No. 2; followed by many friends and acquaintances on foot and in carriages.

A large number of ladies were in attendance, and their floral offerings were profuse and tasty. Palm leaves figured conspicuously among the evergreens. At the grave Rev. Kramer finished the services, after which followed a salute of three volleys by a detachment of the Iberia Guards. Thus were the last tributes of respect paid to the departed—a noble spirit, a fast friend, a congenial companion.

The trouble of yesterday grew out of a spirit of revenge on the part of the negroes. The better element of this and neighboring parishes had found it impossible to longer tolerate a certain element of idle and immoral characters. This latter class were ordered away from the various sections, and many of them found refuge at Freetown, a small village composed entirely of negro families. There they told their stories to their friends and nursed their growing anger.

On Monday last the report reached this place that the negroes were arming and congregating at Freetown. Their number was estimated at from 500 to 600 strong, mounted. Tuesday they had received re-enforcements sufficient to fully double their numbers, and feeling their strength they assumed a threatening attitude, boldly declaring the refugees should not leave the parish and should not be molested.

On Wednesday their numbers were further increased, and the people of the surrounding country began to feel some alarm lest these negroes, overestimating their strength, should attempt some acts of violence.

On Thursday matters had not improved up to noon. By this time the residents and property-owners of this section began to collect at a point a short distance from Freetown, their object being to disperse these negroes without violence and to send those who did not belong there to their homes and business.

Rev. H. Nora, a colored minister, left Freetown in the morning to attend a conference of ministers at this place, and during his absence his residence was taken possession of by a number of the armed negroes. This house refused to surrender, returning word that they were not to be taken. The whites then sent a second messenger to the house, saying they would give them twenty minutes in which to lay down their weapons. The negroes again refused.

In this house, situated but a short distance from the main road or street, were quartered some twelve or fifteen negroes, among the number their leaders.

A squad of mounted white citizens were some 150 yards from the house, waiting the expiration of the twenty minutes, and before the given time had expired a door of the house was thrown open and a volley fired at them. One horse was wounded.

This was a surprise to all, and immediately the firing became general. The door of the house was again closed, but a constant fire was kept up from windows and doors partly open for quite an interval. Later the fire was carried on by spurts by both sides, lasting in all for nearly an hour and a half.

At this time Mr. Smith broke from his lines and made for the house. His comrades implored him to return, but, deaf to their entreaties, he went on. The house was reached, the door was forced, and he fell. At his side was a comrade who had followed him on his fatal errand; but when Mr. Smith fell his comrade retreated backwards, keeping up a constant fire from a repeating rifle, and escaped unhurt.

At this stage of the fight the negroes became panic-stricken and attempted to flee from the house, and the deadly work was soon brought to a close.

After the fight closed the bodies of eight negroes were found in the house and five others outside.

Others say three or four more were killed. It is thought by some that a few made their escape, while others who were at the scene deny this.

One of the negroes who shot Mr. Smith was named Smith and was recognized among the dead by Mr. Smith's comrade to-day.

Coroner J. Wolf called a jury as follows: Mr. William Lamb, Dr. James A. Lee, Messrs. Zenon, Decuir, Doud, Laughlin, and William R. Burke, and proceeded with them to Freetown to view the remains of the negroes.

They returned this evening and have deferred taking testimony until a later date.

From the above statement of facts it will be clearly seen that politics have played no part; that the negroes brought the trouble on themselves; that they fired the first shot; that they shed the first blood, and that they bore the consequences of their acts.

The negroes who surrendered were not harmed in any way.

FREETOWN—WHERE THE BATTLE WAS FOUGHT—THE FIGHT AND ITS VICTIMS.

LAFAYETTE, LA., August 17.

The riot briefly reported from this point at a late hour last night as occurring at Cade's Station really occurred about 6 miles southwest of that point, at Freetown, which is located in the corner of Iberia Parish and only a short distance from St. Martin's, Lafayette, and Vermillion Parishes. This section is more properly located 4 miles southwest of Burk station on the Morgan Road, and about 10 miles from New Iberia.

Freetown is a little town of negroes, but more of a neighborhood, as it covers about 4 square miles, with fifteen families living in small hut-like houses from 100 to 400 yards apart, with small fields attached, from which they are supposed to make a living, and the houses and fields usually belong to the family using them.

About the center of the settlement is a store kept by a negro, a Baptist church, and a school-house. But a few white families live in the range of this neighborhood. There are but few houses there which could be called comfortable negro houses.

It is understood that for some years back considerable foraging and depredations in stealing of cattle, corn, and cotton on the outlying white neighborhood has been carried on, and supposed to have been done by some of those at Freetown. This is said to have been known to be true of Andy Smith and one or two of Tom Simon's sons. Several of these negroes are reported to have been whipped for it, but it was not possible to detect the ringleader, Andy Smith.

It is said that a few days since the regulators of that neighborhood sent him word that they were going to whip him. He immediately drew around him sixteen to eighteen negroes of the neighborhood, all of whom were armed with Winchester rifles, old muskets, and double-barreled shot-guns, numbers of the latter of recent purchase in New Iberia. This was but a few days since. He then sent word to the white people to come on, that he and his friends were ready for them, and, it is said, threatened the lives of four or five white men near by.

Andy Smith, the leader of the blacks in this trouble, has shot two or three white men in the past four years, and is known to be of desperate courage and meanness.

The four or five whites receiving this defiant message believed their lives were in danger, and sent a few messengers to New Iberia and Abbeville, across the line and into La Fayette, to the effect that they would be killed and appealed for help.

In response to this call about 150 to 200 men from these three sections reached Freetown after the dinner hour of yesterday. They found these armed negroes, about eighteen in number, barricaded in a new four-room frame house, built by their pastor, Rev. Celeste Noop, who was at the time in New Iberia, holding a protracted meeting among his people. These negroes had sent Noop's wife away and were its sole occupants at the time.

The house was surrounded by the whites, and a half hour's delay occurred in a parley on the part of the whites, who assured Smith and his crowd that it was peace, if it was desired, and not violence, and if the negroes would surrender their arms the whites would take them away for the present, but at a subsequent time, when peace was fully established, they should be returned to their owners, and guaranteed no violence to any one of the party.

In the interest of this purpose, the whites secured the services of old man Tom Simmons, father-in-law of Smith, and father of Louis and Edward Simmons, two of the occupants of the house, and also old man Sam Cohit, each of whom besought the barricaded negroes to comply with the request to surrender their arms and prevent any one from being hurt. Surly silence was the only response. The pacifying efforts were ineffectual. The whites were about 20 feet from the house. Payson Smith and Alfred Lasalle, of the whites, approached the house, and as Lasalle opened one of the doors, poor young Smith stuck his head in and was immediately shot down dead by Andy Smith.

This was the first signal for a general firing from inside by the blacks and outside by the whites. The house is new and uncalled and therefore has very thin walls. The doors and windows, being closed, the firing was at and through this thin wall. The blacks standing close up the wall fired outside, and before it reached the whites the force of the ball was spent in passing through the wall. The whites at a long range penetrated the walls easier and only had a few feet to reach those on the inside, and hence proved more effectual in killing those for whom they shot. There were, it is estimated, four hundred to five hundred shots fired, and when the battle was over the walls from 4 inches to 5 feet above the floor were riddled with bullet-holes. Several of the negroes during the fight escaped and were shot while running, but most of them fell when they opened battle in the house.

It is understood when the battle was ended there were over twenty guns found in the house.

In addition to the killing of Payson Smith, the white forces suffered a slight wound in the wrist of Mr. Manard, a young creole from New Iberia Station.

In reference to the results on the side of the negroes, it is not absolutely certain, but from two sources it is made up as follows: A prominent gentleman who went to the grounds this morning says that he went into the negro church, when he found there were eight dead negroes who were left there to await the coroner's inquest. These were Sam Cohit, Earnest Griest, Andy Smith, Paul Charles, Louis Simmons, and three others whom the gentleman did not know. He was informed that old man Tom Simon had been killed and carried to his own house. He was also informed that an unknown negro was wounded and died last night, which would make ten killed. He was informed that four others were missing and unaccounted for—whether absent or dead was not known.

There was one wounded, Alex. Lee, a colored school teacher, who called Dr. B. T. Mosely to attend him. This would make a total of fifteen. Dr. Mosely says Lee is seriously wounded in the jaw and throat, and has a flesh wound in the breast. The other information is denied.

From a negro from Freetown, who was to-day at Cade's station: He says that there were originally thirteen dead negroes in the church, but that five were carried away; and that Tom Simmons, the unknown negro who died last night, and the school teacher would make sixteen, and the four missing would make a total of twenty.

In addition to the names of the dead first given the negro informant gives those of Edward Simon, son of old man Tom Simon and brother-in-law of Andy Smith; Edward Vallier, Jr., Alex. Vallier, and T. Pochelle.

Violence is always an important fact in reaching intelligent conclusions, but this case is somewhat independent. Beyond the fact that Andy Smith for his general bad character was threatened with a whipping in retaliation armed himself and friends and defied the white people, and then fired the first shot, in the face of the fact that there were ten whites to one, thus manifesting his dare-devil rascality in the last moment of life, as death must have seemed inevitable to him after his killing young Smith.

This information is obtained by a buggy ride of nearly 40 miles to-day through mud and hot sun and a scarcity of intelligence to furnish it.

LAFAYETTE—THE EXCITEMENT IN A NEIGHBORING PARISH.

LAFAYETTE, LA., August 17.

Some excitement prevails here to-day consequent of the agitation in Abbeville and the unfortunate affair at Cade Station, in the lower portion of this parish. There is great uneasiness among the negroes, who fear a repetition of violent acts in this quarter. Many of the whites are supplying themselves with

arms and ammunition in case of need, while it is rumored that there is a move to organize a guard for the protection of the town.

This trouble seemingly originated in St. Mary and Vermillion Parishes, and to some extent has spread over this parish, but your correspondent has been unable so far to gather definite information in regard to it. Several parties here, so says Dame Rumor, who have been guilty of miscegenation have been waited upon and ordered to leave. It is safe to say, however, that no bloodshed need be feared at this place, so the sober judgment of our citizens may be relied on to tide over the present uneasy state of affairs.

The farmers must necessarily suffer under this deplorable state of excitement, as the negroes will not leave their homes for fear of being waylaid. Everything is quiet to-night, and the outlook betokens an early subsidence of the rampant perturbation.

Mr. President, I wish to call the special attention of the Senate and of the country to this feature of Democratic Southern policy in the Southern States, which is called the disarming of the negroes. I take it that the right of every citizen to have a gun or a pistol and to keep that gun or pistol in his own possession, in his own house, is the indisputable right of every citizen of the United States. Without a law to the contrary—and I doubt whether any law to the contrary can constitutionally be enacted—every citizen, black or white, North or South, has the right to own a gun and to keep it. It is his property. It is his property for self-defense. It is his property for the defense of his home, his wife, and his children, and it can not be taken from him without the violation of a natural right, and as I believe without the violation of a constitutional right.

Article II of the amendments to the Constitution declares:

A well regulated militia being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed.

That article grew out of the original theory of the founders of this Government that a well regulated militia was the sure defense of a State. It was the militiamen organized under that principle who fought the battles of the revolution and won our independence of the mother country, and from that day to this it has been understood to be a natural and a constitutional right on the part of every citizen to keep and to bear arms.

The policy which the Southern white Democrats have adopted is that in order to prevent the negro from exercising his right of suffrage under the fifteenth amendment of the Constitution he shall be deprived of the privilege of keeping arms in his possession. It must be apparent to every thoughtful citizen that this plan, if carried out, will prove to be utterly destructive of the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments of the Constitution, and will bring the black people of the South into absolute subjection to the white people of the South.

Take the State of Louisiana. The proposition of the white Democrats of Louisiana is that every white citizen of that State may have a gun and a revolver, and may keep the same wherever he may be, and especially may keep them within his own home, and that he may use those arms according to his discretion if he does not create a breach of the peace.

The further proposition is that the colored people of Louisiana shall none of them be allowed to keep or bear arms and that the gun or the pistol of every colored man shall be taken from him. Manifestly the millennium of Southern Democrats will have come when this resolution of the Democrats of Louisiana is carried into effect, because we shall then have the whole white population armed each man with a gun, and we shall have the colored people, no one of them with any instrument either of offense or of defense, and all this in defiance of the natural and the constitutional right of the citizen.

Let me tell the Senator from Louisiana that this plan which has been inaugurated by the white Democrats of Louisiana, will not be a success. They may disarm here and there a few of the negroes of Louisiana, they may surround in their little homes or in the cabins of their colored clergymen a few little bands of negroes and take their arms from them, or shoot them down to bloody death because they are Republicans; but they will not succeed in disarming the whole body of the colored population of Louisiana.

The negroes of this country are growing in intelligence; they are gaining in courage on this question, and the colored men of Louisiana will maintain their right to keep and bear arms, in my judgment, in time and in the long run against the whole body of white leaguers, Ku Klux ruffians, and all the other vagabonds, gamblers, thieves, thugs, and villains who, according to the Democratic papers of the city of New Orleans, have been organized in the interest of the Democratic party, and especially in the interest of the Senator from Louisiana who has addressed the Senate. The colored men will keep their arms and they will use their arms when they see fit to do so in defense of those rights of American citizens which belong to-day, at the South as well as the North, to every American citizen whatever may be the color of his skin, or whatever may be his politics, whether Democratic or Republican.

Mr. President, I do not intend to go over the ground which I covered the other day nor to follow the Senator from Louisiana at length in the remarks which he has made. He has omitted to refer in detail to any of the particular outrages which were recited by me as affording at least sufficient ground for an investigation. The Senator has undertaken to prove that there is nothing extraordinary or remarkable in the increase of the vote of the Democratic party in Louisiana from 62,540, the vote for Cleveland, from some 80,000, the largest vote that was ever cast, up

to 136,746, by asserting that it is not strange that there are fluctuations of votes at different elections, and he has cited fluctuations which have occurred in Northern States.

Mr. President, I grant that mere fluctuations of votes up and down in various elections are not of themselves necessarily proofs of fraud, but I say that if you will find a case like this in Louisiana where for a series of years the largest vote which a political party has ever been able to cast has been 80,000, and where suddenly the vote has leaped from 80,000 up to 136,000, there is afforded a presumption of fraud which would of itself justify an investigation.

If the Senator will point out any parallel case to this monumental fraud in the State of Louisiana which was perpetrated by Governor McEnery and his satellites on the 17th day of April and subsequent to that time during the counting of the vote, I will insist that there should be an investigation of such an election, particularly if it resulted in the creation of a Legislature which has elected two United States Senators to claim seats in this body.

But I did not rest upon the extraordinary character of the vote on the face of the returns. I went on with *prima facie* proofs containing astonishing and remarkable revelations concerning the transactions that occurred in Louisiana on the 17th of April and prior thereto. I called attention to the murder of William Adams, a man who had been a Democrat, a friend of Governor McEnery, but who had seen fit to change his politics and to undertake to distribute in Monroe, La., the home of Governor McEnery, ballots for Warmoth, and who was killed by the infamous Captain Theobalds and his gang of cut-throats who to-day control the parish in which they live. His throat was cut and he was thrown into Bayou De Siard.

The Senator from Louisiana says he scorns in the American Senate to enter upon the consideration of an incident like this. I also called the attention of the Senator to a transaction in which his own brother was engaged, and which was exhibited to the Senate of the United States by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. INGALLS] in a speech which he made here some three months ago, and which was repeated again in full in the newspapers of Louisiana. Not a word does the Senator utter in denial or in defense of that outrage upon the rights of the citizen.

The Senator from Louisiana has stated quite accurately, I think, the political policy of the Democratic party in the State of Louisiana. He says that in certain parishes, which I understand to be the colored parishes, where the colored people being Republicans and desiring to vote the Republican ticket are in an overwhelming majority, the policy of the Democratic party is to induce the Republicans to agree that there shall be only one ticket in the field and that shall be the Democratic ticket. He says that the Republicans of those parishes are becoming willing to assent to such a condition of political action or of political servitude, and that when such an arrangement is made, if anybody undertakes to dissent from it and to organize the Republican party, or to organize an independent party, or to run against the candidates nominated by the combination, it is customary to notify him to leave the parish.

Mr. President, I will take the proposition of the Senator and go before the American people upon the question whether or not there is under such circumstances a republican government. I understand a republican government to be a government elected by the free voters, with an honest count of the votes. I understand a republican government to be one which involves two parties; that republican governments are to be conducted ordinarily with a majority party and a minority party; that both parties are to be free; and that through the workings of parties, with vacillations from one side to the other or political power, the States and the nation go on successfully practicing the republican experiment.

But a government is not a republic unless two parties can safely be organized among the people, unless the members of each of those parties have equal rights in law and in fact. If there is to be but one party, with but one ticket in the field, the Republic is destroyed. That such is to be the rule I understand to be the position of the Democrats of Louisiana, as stated and justified by the Senator from Louisiana upon this floor.

On that issue I believe that the Republicans of this country can safely go to the American people. It is an issue which ought to be proclaimed in all its breadth and in all its fullness to the people of this Republic, the issue whether there shall be a free ballot, whether there shall be candidates on both sides, whether there shall be two parties in this Republic and in every portion of this Republic where citizens choose to organize parties, or whether, as the Senator says, there shall be but one party, and any citizen who undertakes to organize another party and to induce it to put candidates into the field shall be notified that he is a disturber of the public peace and be ordered to quit his home, as the Senator says, and as the facts show, Capt. H. B. Holmes was ordered to do in the case to which allusion has been made.

Mr. President, I do not desire to detain the Senate any longer. I have heard criticism of the fact that there has been statement and discussion of the facts before the investigation has been made. I submit that unless the Senator from Louisiana had been willing that the resolution should pass it would not have been becoming for me to have urged its passage without presenting the *prima facie* evidence which

seemed to me to justify an investigation. I have presented that evidence. I have shown the facts of record, the facts which have been reported to me; the conspiracy on the part of Governor McEnery and his associates to have a majority returned for Nicholls, whatever the vote might be that was actually cast, and I submit now, in closing, that the Senator from Louisiana has himself practically admitted in his speech that there exists in the State of Louisiana no republic, and if no republic, then no Legislature of a republic which could elect him and Mr. White to take seats in this body.

APPENDIX.

ARTICLES FROM THE LOUISIANA STANDARD, T. B. STAMPS, PROPRIETOR, NEW ORLEANS, AUGUST 25, 1888.

If the colored man in this State has a spark of spirit in his body, and desires to be practically free, as is guaranteed by the national Constitution, he must leave here and go at once. Go North, East, or West, where you will be treated at least like a human being born according to God's laws.

We hope to publish next week the fact that the negro has started the immigration from this cut-throat slice of the solid South; that he will demonstrate that he means to be free by leaving a State where he is held now as much as a slave as ever before the emancipation proclamation of God's great Christian servant, Abraham Lincoln.

On our front page will be found a letter from Mr. L. A. Martinet, the leading colored Democrat of the South and editor of the Progress, in which he scathingly and manfully denounces the Democratic methods and the cold-blooded butchery of negroes and diabolical outrages on Republicans by the Democrats.

MARTINET ON HAND IN CONDEMNATION OF NEGRO BUTCHERY—HE CAN NOT CONDONE DEMOCRATIC METHODS AND DECLINES FURTHER FEALTY WITH THE PARTY OF OPPRESSION.

NEW ORLEANS, LA., August 23, 1888.

To the Progress Publishing Company:

GENTLEMEN: When Saturday I read in the morning papers of the massacre of the negroes at Freetown, Iberia Parish, I was shocked and horrified. It was a ruthless and brutal butchery of human beings, without cause, reason, or sense. Moreover, there exists in the parishes surrounding that section a reign of terror and lawlessness that is a shame to civilization. Colored people are unmercifully beaten and whipped for no cause or reason; they can not be out at night after 9 o'clock with safety; their property is forcibly taken from them in broad daylight; and old and respectable residents and families are driven away from their homes, the latter because the husbands happen to be white.

In view of the fact that every act of violence against negroes in the South is charged in the North to the Democratic party, and of all that there is at stake for the Democratic party in the pending national contest, it does seem as if the perpetrators of these unheard-of outrages, who are said to be Democrats, have gone mad.

I called on the governor Monday and yesterday again, with a view of securing some official action for the protection of these injured and outraged people, or for putting a stop to this lawlessness. I explained to him how critical the situation is, but I regret exceedingly to say that he does not think that a case has yet arisen where he has the authority to interfere, and he seems apprehensive that if he does interfere now it might make matters worse.

Well, if the negroes are to be butchered, flogged, and driven from their homes under a Democratic administration, without cause or provocation, and the authorities are not able to speak one word in their behalf for humanity's sake, or in censure or condemnation of the atrocious deeds, then there is no reason that I know of why they should change their politics, and thus try to remove what we believed a bar to relations of amity between their white fellow-citizens and themselves, especially when it is known that even those who have voted the Democratic ticket are not exempt from brutal treatment. Even personal friends of ours of irreproachable character have been molested and driven away. I mention this to illustrate better the deplorable state of affairs—not that we would think our friends more sacred than others. If we favored a Democratic government it was specially for the purpose of assuring protection to our people. This failing, we see no way in which they are benefited by it.

I confess I am not only disappointed, but pained and grieved beyond expression. My faith in Governor Nicholls was such that I never could once believe that such outrages could be committed under his administration without at least immediate rebuke and condemnation. My faith in him is not altogether shaken, and I yet have the hope that he will take some action.

It is all a sad return for our unselfish and disinterested efforts to establish permanent relations of peace and harmony between the races, an end for which I have labored long, endured much vexation, and made great personal sacrifices.

A task that forced itself upon the Progress at the outset was to defend the election of the present State administration against the exaggerated charges of fraud, of rancorous political opponents. That we have not been entirely unsuccessful is shown by the readiness with which our articles have been quoted in the United States Senate and the extensiveness with which they have been reproduced by the Democratic press.

Thoroughly acquainted with the incapacity of the negro voters in their present untutored state to govern, and knowing how easy a prey they are to designing and unprincipled politicians and demagogues, we have labored hard to convince them that it was best for their interests that the people who own the property and possessed the intelligence, as I thought, should rule. Through it all we have been honest and conscientious. We have borne uncomplainingly the ostracism of our people and the odium that, among them, attaches to the colored man who professes himself a Democrat, and we have never asked nor expected personal reward in any shape or manner.

Our sole aim and endeavor has been to promote, in our feeble way, the good and welfare of the whole people. Conscious of having striven to perform what we considered a public duty, of having, in the interest of what we believed to be the cause of good government, labored to enable these people to control the mass of illiterate voters in their midst without a resort to violence or unlawful means, we could rest perfectly satisfied with the little appreciation our efforts have received from those who were to be first benefited by them. But I will not, I can not, condone the shedding of innocent blood.

Knowing the worthlessness of professional negro politicians, and how hurtful they are to their own race, I have been, with your approval, unsparing in denouncing them, going to the length of palliating, if not always justifying, the illegal measures taken to rid the community of them, when no bodily harm or injury was done. But I can not, I will not silently countenance the ruthless butchery and cruel whipping of defenseless and innocent people, the despoiling them of their property, and the running away of others from their homes because they chose to marry or unite according to their individual tastes.

The right of people to marry to suit themselves is the most sacred that I know. It is a divine right, and no one has rightfully the authority to interfere with the contracting parties. I could not say less on this point without, as it were, submitting to the desecration of the cherished memory of my dead parents, and condemning their holy union and marriage, of which I am the product.

No matter what the governor's personal feelings may be concerning these outrages—he has a strong sense of right and justice, and I know he deprecates and

condemns them in his heart—yet it seems to me that his silence will create on the outside world the false impression that this lawless condition of affairs is not so extensive, widespread, and critical as it really is, which would be wrong; or, worse, it may be taken by the "regulators" as warrant to go on in their nefarious course.

It must be remembered, too, that the Picayune, which may be regarded as the organ of the administration, has unqualifiedly pronounced itself upon the question of miscegenation, encouraging the inhuman crusade against it which is spreading all over the State, and from which spring so many acts of violence.

The Progress has no circulation outside of the State. It is not a factor in the Presidential contest—and there is something more sacred than politics in this matter. A question of humanity is involved. The party that would use the perpetration of such outrages merely for campaign purposes, as a stepping-stone to power, ought not to succeed; and the party that is too weak and pusillanimous to denounce them ought not to be entrusted with power. Also, our efforts to establish and maintain peace and harmony between the races have, it seems to me, not only proved futile, but may be, under the circumstances, considered officious. Therefore, unless the policy of the paper can be so directed as to deal with this lawlessness as it should be dealt with, I beg you to accept my resignation as editor.

Very respectfully,

L. A. MARTINET.

AN EARNEST PROTEST AGAINST THE WHOLESALE SLAUGHTER OF INNOCENT AND INOFFENSIVE COLORED MEN—MEMORIAL MASS MEETING IN GEDDES HALL—ABLE ADDRESS OF REV. E. LYON—MATTERS IN DETAIL.

Wednesday night Geddes Hall was filled by a large assemblage of prominent divines and citizens who assembled to enter their protest against the indiscriminate slaughter of innocent negroes in adjoining parishes. A large number of ladies were present.

The meeting was called to order by Hon. T. B. Stamps, who announced the subject of the meeting and read the following list of officers:

Rev. J. W. Hudson, president; Hon. George D. Geddes, honorary president; vice-presidents, Revs. F. T. Chinn, John Marks, A. E. P. Albert, I. H. Norwood, Graham Bell, C. H. Thompson, D. D.; J. W. Hudson, J. T. Newman, M. D.; Rev. R. Thompson, Messrs. H. C. Nichols, E. Brower, Robert W. B. Gould, Revs. A. S. Jackson, J. L. Burrell, Maj. C. F. Ladd, Hon. D. F. Diaz, Col. James Lewis, Rev. T. P. Jackson, Col. R. B. Baquet, Rev. Hon. George Devezin, Hon. Thomas W. Wickham, Rev. Charles Williams, Rev. M. Dale, Mr. Frank C. Taylor, Rev. Guy Watson, Hon. L. D. Thompson, Rev. C. H. Claiborne, Mr. Paul Alexandria, George Landry, esq., Mr. John B. Williams, Rev. B. Brown, Mr. C. C. Wilson, Mr. J. W. Hilton, Hon. C. F. Brown, G. W. Wilson, esq., Rev. L. W. Oldfield, Rev. W. S. Wilson, Mr. Hope Dennis, J. H. Coker, M. D., Drs. Chris. Graves, Robert J. Estes, Rev. Dick Richard, Mr. W. A. Halston, Mr. J. D. Brooks, Rev. H. Taylor, Mr. H. Dixon, Mr. H. C. Green, Mr. Ramie Hawkins, Rev. R. Frazier, Mr. Thomas Wesley, Mr. B. B. Dixon, Jr., Rev. C. Monroe, Mr. H. Powells, Rev. Dave Young, Hon. Henry Demas, E. Duconge, esq., Frank Farrer, Capt. N. D. Bush, Capt. D. D. Wethers, Mr. B. B. Boguille, Mr. L. J. Joubert, Mr. Walter Cohen, Rev. J. A. Wilson, Mr. Joseph H. Fuller, Mr. Paul Bruce, Capt. Peter Joseph, Capt. Charles Lewis, D. M. Moor, W. M. Moor, Hons. W. S. Posey, Frank Farrell, Messrs. A. L. Chapman, Rev. Henry Davis, Mr. Arthur W. Woods, Mr. Edward Gaudet, Rev. M. C. Camfield, Mr. John Marshall, Mr. Alexander Plique, Capt. William Cobb, Capt. J. W. Edwards, Capt. Taylor McKeethen, Capt. Daud Wilson, C. B. Wilson, James F. Thomas; secretary, Rev. Ernest Lyons; assistants, Paul Green, M. J. Simms, R. C. Cammack.

The meeting was opened by divine services, prayers being offered by Rev. Henderson, pastor of the Central Congregational Church. The following committee was appointed to prepare an address: Revs. Ernest Lyon, A. E. P. Albert, M. C. B. Mason, J. H. Coker, M. D., T. B. Stamps, W. Paul Green, James D. Kennedy, Charles B. Wilson.

The committee retired, and in a few moments submitted the following report:

"To the people of the United States:

"We, citizens of New Orleans, as well as of neighboring parishes, from which we have been driven away without warrant or law, assembled in mass meeting at New Orleans, La., on Wednesday, August 22, at Geddes Hall, declare and assert: That a reign of terror exists in many parts of the State; that the laws are suspended and the officers of the government, from the governor down, afford no protection to the lives and property of the people against armed bodies of whites, who shed innocent blood and commit deeds of savagery unsurpassed in the dark ages of mankind.

"For the past twelve years we have been most effectively disfranchised and robbed of our political rights. While denied the privilege in many places of voting for the party and the candidates of our choice, acts of violence have been committed to compel us to vote against the dictates of our conscience for the Democratic party, and Republican ballots cast by us have been counted for the Democratic candidates. The press, the pulpit, the commercial organizations, and executive authority of the State have given both open and silent approval of all these crimes. In addition to these methods, there seems to be a deep laid scheme to reduce the negroes of the State to a condition of abject serfdom and peonage.

"It is being executed by armed bodies of men, styling themselves regulators, all of whom are white, except when a negro is occasionally forced to join them to give color to the pretense that they represent the virtue of their communities in the suppression impartially of vicious and immoral persons. With that pretense as a cloak these lawless bands make night hideous with their unblinking outrages and murders of inoffensive colored citizens. They go out on nightly raids, order peaceable citizens away never to return, whip some, fire into houses of others—endangering the defenseless lives of women and children—and no attempt is even made to indict them. No virtuous element in the State is found among the whites to rise up in their might and sternly repress these outrageous crimes.

"These acts are done in deliberate defiance of the Constitution and laws of the United States, which are so thoroughly nullified that the negroes who bore arms in defense of the Union have no protection or shelter from them within the borders of Louisiana. During the past twelve months our people have suffered from the lawless regulators as never before since the carnival of bloodshed conducted by the Democratic party in 1868, and which prompted the late and lamented General Philip Sheridan, in an official report, to style the whites as banditti. Fully aware of their utter helplessness, unarmed and unable to offer resistance to an overpowering force which varies from a 'band of whites' to a 'sheriff's posse' or the 'militia,' but which in reality is simply the Democratic party assembled with military precision and armed with rifles of the latest improved patents, toilers forbidden to follow occupations of their choice, compelled to desist from the discussing of labor questions, and been whipped and butchered when in a defenseless condition.

"In the instances where negroes have attempted to defend themselves, as at Pattersonville and Thibodaux, they have been traduced in a spirit of savage malignity, the governor of the State, with scarce an observance of the forms of law has hastened his mercenaries or militia to the scene with cannon and rifles ostensibly to preserve the peace, but actually to re-enforce the already too well fortified negro murderers falsely assuming to be lawful possses.

A single volume would scarcely afford sufficient space to enumerate the outrages our people have suffered, and are daily suffering at the hand of their op-

pressors. They are flagrantly deprived of every right guaranteed them by the Constitution; in many parts of the State they are free only in name; they can not assemble in peace to indicate and discuss an equitable rate of wages for their labor; they do not feel safe as property-holders and tax-payers; and are permitted to enjoy but very few public conveniences.

"The latest wholesale murder, rivaling the most horrifying brutalities of the Comanches, took place only a few nights ago near Cade Station, in the parish of Iberia, in the negro village of Freetown. This place is owned exclusively by colored people, who were conceded to be industrious and respectable. They were charged with hiding and protecting in their midst some negroes from other parts of the parish whom the regulators wanted to whip. When this news was spread abroad a sheriff, fraudulently installed, with his men, without any warrant or shadow of law, at the hour of midnight invaded that quiet village, attacked a house wherein a number of negroes expecting the assault had gathered for self-defense, and deliberately slaughtered the inmates. No arrests will follow. The civil authorities are in sympathy with and applaud the crime.

"The governor has shown no disposition to afford our people any protection, because of this and other kindred wrongs, and our sad experience leads us to expect no redress from that source.

"The papers daily record lynchings, whippings, and murders of people on various pretenses, such as are not considered sufficient cause for lynch law for whites under the like circumstances, and tidings pour in upon us like a flood, of brutalities the record of which is suppressed from the public print because of the supposed political effect they would have upon the Presidential and Congressional campaigns in the Northern States.

"We have exhausted all means in our power to have our wrongs redressed by those whose sworn duty it is to impartially execute the laws, but all in vain, until now, because of our murdered fellow-citizens, and apprehensive for our own safety, we appeal to the awakened conscience, the sense of justice and sympathy of the civilized world, and of the American people in particular, to assist us with such moral and material support, as to secure the removal of our people, penniless as many of them are under the feudal system under which they live, to the public lands and other places of the Northwest where they can enjoy some security for their persons and property.

"To this end we have organized a bureau of immigration. We have so done under the following resolution:

"Be it resolved, That a bureau of immigration be composed of J. H. Coker, M. D., president; Rev. Ernest Lyon, A. B., secretary; W. P. Green, esq., M. J. Simms, assistant secretaries; Rev. C. B. Mason, A. B., treasurer; Rev. A. E. P. Albert, D. D., George D. Geddes, esq., Rev. A. S. Jackson, Hon. T. B. Stamps, D. D. Wether, esq., Rev. J. L. Burrell, C. B. Wilson, esq. To our people we advise calmness and a strict regard for law and order. If your homes are invaded expect no mercy, for none will be shown, and if doomed to die, then die defending your life and home to the best of your ability. If convinced that you will not be permitted to live where you are in peace and perfect security quietly go away. If you are without other means to travel take to the public roads or through the swamps and walk away.

"Steam-boats and railroads are inventions of recent years; your forefathers dared the bloodhounds, the patrollers, and innumerable obstacles, lived in the woods on roots and berries in making their way to Canadian borders.

"Invoking the guiding favor of Almighty God and the sympathy of mankind, we are your brethren in affliction and the common bond of humanity,

"Rev. ERNEST LYON,
"Rev. A. E. P. ALBERT,
"Rev. J. H. COCKER, M. D.,
"Rev. T. B. STAMPS,
"Rev. M. C. B. MASON,
"Rev. W. PAUL GREEN,
"Rev. J. D. KENNEDY,
"Rev. C. B. WILSON,
"Committee."

On motion of Rev. A. S. Jackson, which was duly seconded by Rev. M. C. B. Mason, R. W. B. Gould, and others in appropriate remarks, the address was unanimously adopted by a rising vote.

The following resolutions, offered by Mr. Marshall J. Simms, were adopted: "Resolved, That the immigration bureau be, and they are hereby, requested to open immediate communication with the immigration and kindred organizations in California, Kansas, and the Northwestern States and Territories, and to adopt such other plans as will afford the information and relief for our oppressed people.

"Resolved, That every possible method be utilized to inform our people and neighboring States of the terrorism which reigns in the disturbed sections of this State, especially in Iberia, St. Martin, Lafourche, St. Mary, Assumption, Terrebonne, and Vermillion, so that they may be duly warned against endangering their lives and liberty by going to these places."

Stirring addresses were made by Revs. Ernest Lyon, A. S. Jackson, A. E. P. Albert, E. S. Swan, J. D. Kennedy, Miss S. A. E. Locket, Rev. M. C. B. Mason, and others. Meeting then adjourned.

REV. E. LYON'S ADDRESS—THE YOUNG DIVINE HANDLES THE OUTRAGE QUESTION WITH GREAT SKILL.

The following is the able address of Rev. E. Lyon delivered at Geddes Hall: When will deliverance come? is the question which is being asked by the most concerned of our people.

The diabolical system of wholesale and unprovoked murder of our people in the country parishes continues on the increase. The peaceful and law-abiding colored citizens of the State thought that after "the danger was over" that affairs would assume their usual tranquillity; that after the murder and giving up of negroes, whose only crime seems to be, from facts obtained, the attempts on their part to exercise their liberty within the borders of a free Republic, that innocent and defenseless negroes would be allowed to pursue their daily avocation in peace, in order that they may provide for the necessities of their families. But alas! scarcely a wind blows but what it brings the intelligence of murder and bloodshed—murder and bloodshed confined invariably within the ranks of a certain class of the people, namely, the poor and unsuspecting members of the colored race. In all of these engagements the whites have always succeeded in escaping scot-free. This does not look reasonable. There is foul play somewhere, and the whole world begins to believe it.

For a decade of years the innocent and unsuspecting negroes have been made the victims of a cruel fate. The present year dawned upon us, and found the State rent from center to circumference by perplexing political issues. Issues which by a strange admixture of political circumstance, assumed the semblance of labor troubles. Whatever might have been the real causes of these troubles a bloody massacre was the result. A sham attack was shrewdly instituted by the whites on paper only, with the negroes as aggressors. This was only the pretense for the indiscriminate slaughter of men, women, and children which followed. A mother in Israel, bowed down with many summers, who remained faithfully at home during the war to watch her master's children till the battle was over, was mercilessly shot down with impunity within the very heart of a Christian country.

The intelligent members of the race watched with silence and waited with patience to hear the secular press and pulpits of the State, either in mild or in measured terms, denounce the inhuman ravages upon life and property. But

to their disappointment that period has not yet come. Again, we are startled by the sad intelligence of weeping and mourning, of murder and bloodshed at Freetown, a village within the very shade of the capitol of the State. Eleven families in mourning. Eleven wives made widows by a band of white hoodlums claiming to be regulators. This village is largely inhabited by colored people who are industrious and law-abiding. The murder marks one of the bloodiest and most thrilling chapters in the history of crimes.

The offense for which these innocent and helpless people were butchered was the protection they offered to some of the members of the race who were flying from the murderous chase of midnight regulators. Confined within their own premises they determined to give protection to their fellows in distress. There was nothing wrong in this. It would be just what the white people would be too glad to do under like circumstances. But of course such manhood on the part of the negroes is exceedingly offensive to the whites, and they must die. These negroes must be understood were not lawless brawlers or clamorous insurrectionists. They were industrious, peaceful, and law-abiding citizens armed to defend their rights and property at the sacrifice of their own lives. They were murdered. Nothing less could be expected. The odds were against them. But before they welcomed death and shook hands with immortality they evinced to the cowardly whites courage and heroism worthy the race whose image they so nobly bore.

All honor to the brave men, therefore, who so nobly defended themselves at Freetown. May the hands that were swift in shedding their blood receive speedy retribution, and may the soil which drank their blood, as a fitting evidence of nature's displeasure, be barren forever. We ask, are not the laws enacted by the Legislature, composed of competent men, elected by the people, able to protect the State without the interference of regulators? Who are these regulators, and what are they? Are they acting under the official sanction of the governor of the State?

If they are not, why does he allow without his official protest this uncivilized system of affairs which places the whole people in juxtaposition to the Hottentots of the African reservation. The facts as given to the public by the daily journals and telegraph operator who are white men must be taken for what they are worth. What right has the sheriff posse to compel negroes to give up their arms in the defense of their person and property? Would the white people of the State in like position submit to such a glaring piece of injustice perpetrated on themselves?

If the negroes are to be disarmed, should not the regulators be disarmed also? And if their actions are inharmonious to the constitution of the State, they should be apprehended and punishment inflicted. It is time that the better class of our white friends speak out and clear in the defense of right and justice. There is no protection for the negro. If he attempts to protect himself the riot act is read. His arms are demanded. The militia is called out. A sheriff posse is organized and assisted by regulators, who murder the poor and unfortunate negroes with impunity. An investigation into the cause of the Freetown tragedy should be made; a committee should be appointed by the governor, composed of members of both races, charged with this solemn duty. We would advise the most calm, cool, and prudent of our representative men, both in church and in state, to meet and adopt measures whereby to relieve our people in these suffering districts.

They should wait immediately on his excellency the governor and ask him to appoint a committee of investigation, and if this righteous and godly demand is refused the people who are thus abused should be advised to leave those miserable hells upon earth.

In the days of slavery, when they were surrounded by enemies on every hand, with bloodhounds to hunt their tracks, they ventured to flee for refuge, amid perils indescribable. Guided by the Northern star of liberty, they reached the Canadian shores and Northern asylums.

And now, since freedom has come and every man is supposed to be a man, why not seek homes among those people who will accord to them the common rights of humanity?

If they have to leave with no patrimony but a single potato in their pockets, let them take their wives and children by the hand and lead them out of these Sodoms and Gomorrah. Better die a free man than live a slave.

MEMORIAL MEETING.

Geddes Hall was filled on Wednesday night with representatives of our people, including wives and daughters. The meeting was called for the purpose of taking suitable action on the late murders committed on the unfortunate colored people in Lafourche and other parishes.

The meeting was governed by that calm feeling and deliberation which was warranted by the circumstances and which is so necessary to occasions of like serious import. The memorial address, which we print in another column, shows in unmistakable terms the past and present situation of affairs in Louisiana with reference to the colored people.

This was no political meeting, no body of people gotten together for the purpose of hashing out buncombe for political aspirants, no conclave of "bloody-shirt" shakers gotten up to fire the Northern heart in the interest of campaign capital, but a meeting composed of the ministry and representative men and women, who had no other cause at heart than to seek a remedy and its application in the shape of escape from further murders. The address of Rev. E. Lyon, and the orations of Rev. A. S. Jackson, Rev. A. E. P. Albert, D. D., Rev. M. C. B. Mason, Hon. T. B. Stamps, R. W. B. Gould, James D. Kennedy, and others were splendid efforts, and gave very pointedly the horrible details connected with the late butcheries. The calm reasoning with which they held the ear of the audience will certainly be fruitful.

We are glad to record the fact that in obedience to resolution offered a bureau of immigration was organized, which will take immediate steps in the matter of providing information, etc., regarding homes elsewhere.

A great deal can be said of the possible good effect of this commencement in behalf of the colored people, but lack of space forbids a further dissertation on the Geddes Hall meeting; suffice it to say the ball has been started on a roll and it must be kept rolling until we can place the colored people out of further harm's way. Emigrate at once. Don't wait for another butchery.

The colored man is doing himself and his family a great wrong by remaining in this murder-ridden State any longer. We say to you, emigrate to some other State and risk no longer being slaughtered for being a negro. You are worse enslaved in Louisiana than you ever were before. Leave, and leave at once.

"KEEP ON WITH IT."

We copy a head-line from the Times-Democrat. Certain Northern journals are pleased with the conviction of Dennis Kirby for running away with the keys of a New Orleans ballot-box. The Times-Democrat is happy over the good work. It advises that we "keep on with it."

We echo the sentiment. The Times-Democrat, however, is content with small cases. We would advise attention to the far more important. There is the murder of William Adams, in Monroe, his throat cut from ear to ear, for peddling Republican tickets. No arrests, no investigation. Would the Times-Democrat confine itself to the more trivial matters of stealing ballots?

Well, so be it. Take the case of Madison Parish. A return of 3,500 votes for Nicholls—Warmoth without the single vote. Vote, as actually cast: Nicholls, 588; Warmoth, 2,817—Warmoth with a majority of 2,229; a dead steal, in effect, of 5,734 votes in the single parish. Will the Times-Democrat take the case in hand? Dare it challenge the proofs?

What of the present Democratic hell, again, in the Third district? A white man, killed by whom? Certainly not by the negroes. A dozen negroes shot down like dogs. No politics in it. Where's the fool that don't know better? "Why should the prosecution of these criminals be interrupted or delayed?" We quote the Times-Democrat again. Echo answers, why?

PACK UP AND MOVE.

That is our advice to the negroes in the Louisiana bulldozed parishes. We mean it exactly as we say it. Pack up and move.

There is no other remedy. New Orleans is filling up with refugees. They are flocking in from the several different parishes and localities. They are not of the ignorant, or helpless class. They are generally intelligent, are the owners of their own little homes. They have been driven from home and family at peril of their lives.

They have been so driven because of their intelligence; because of their independence. They are not of the old-time class, to be held as servile dogs. That is why they are driven out. Every negro leader, every negro property-holder, every negro who can read and write, is branded as dangerous, must be got rid of. That is the edict, openly promulgated, and well understood. Take the situation as it is. You may not return as free men. Free men you must live and die. You have no protection under the laws. You have no earthly chance in seeking to protect yourself. There is the one resource. Take it, and at once. Pack up and move.

We want to be heard and heeded in every bulldozed parish and locality. We say to the negroes, You have the one and only remedy in your hands. You are the only producers. You raise the cotton and the sugar. You are the supporters, in fact, of the men who persecute you. Without your labor they must themselves go to work or starve. Give them the chance. Let them try the working or the starving. Let them have the field. Pack up and move.

We don't advise any general exodus. That would entail possible privation and suffering. Let the remedy be gradually applied. Let the young men and women set the ball in motion. The movement begun makes the certain better chances for those who stay. There is no single, able-bodied negro too ignorant to know that his two hands will certainly make him an honest living.

He knows they will earn it anywhere on the civilized earth. So, too, with the single, able-bodied woman. She is sure of an honest living anywhere. She has but to work for it. Let the young man and woman get out. We say it, and we mean it. Pack up and move.

Stand not upon the order of going, but go. Don't wait upon any growing crops, or promises of pay. Steal out through the cane-breaks if you must. Any way to get out. Don't flock to New Orleans, or to any town. Set your faces toward a free land, a land where an honest life will insure the honest dues of free men and free women. Go to California, to Arizona, or to any like place where there is room. You can work your way there if you will. The will alone is wanted. Pack up and move.

In any other State, North, East, or West, its governor would seek and demand in person a reason for the atrocious butcheries which have occurred in this State in the last two or three weeks. But we suppose the governor of Louisiana knew how the "law was suspended" in his interest and has forgotten that the "danger has passed," or has forgotten his cue and don't know when to say, "Let up now."

There was a time when some people were led to believe that the Republican party got up these negro-killing matches for political effect. What say these people now? Look at the butchery being continued in this wretchedly-governed State and say whether or not the fact is true that the negro is being slaughtered for no other reason than that he is a negro by the Southern banditti, the never-licked and unwhipped Confederate spirit.

LOUISIANA BANDITTI.

The history of the colored people in Louisiana, as in other States of the solid South, has many pages in mourning commemorating the violent deaths they have suffered at the hands of murderous whelps under one pretext or another. For years the colored citizen of the State of Louisiana has contended with barbarous inflictions, the like of which we read in history of ancient eras, when cruel slaughter was rewarded by crown and scepter.

The negro has suffered death or banishment for exercising his rights of citizenship given him by a nation on whose soil poured the blood of millions of loyal soldiers and statesmen that this American Union might be saved, and that all its citizens might be free, as they were created by the Almighty God. These murders of colored people are the outcome of a lurking feeling of resentment and of refusal to accept of the issues of the late rebellion. A spirit akin to the animus engendered in behalf of the Confederacy, which, though subdued on the field of battle, is cowardly resorting to a warfare of extermination under the cover of civil government.

The pen is again taken up to record another chapter of slaughter and butchery on the unfortunate colored people of Louisiana, the latest deeds occurring at Lockport, New Iberia, Freetown, and adjacent localities where the dastardly idea is rampant that the negro is obnoxious, and they must leave, failing to do which he is to die by the assassin's bullet, the midnight marauder's bludgeon. What a horrible state of affairs to record against a government which brags and boasts of that chivalry under which crime is suppressed.

On Saturday, August 11, at night time, a band of white banditti, all mounted, went out the Bayou road from Raceland to Robert Williams's house, surrounded it, and concealing themselves in the cane, called for Williams to come out. Upon coming out, and seeing the state of affairs, attempted to escape, when he was shot from ambush, and died the next morning. After this piece of butchery, and the same night, they drove up to another colored man's home, Augustave Antoine, took him off some distance, hung him up to a tree, and riddled his body with bullets, and before doing this they shot and killed his brother Eugene.

Another case in view is that of a mulatto, who became obnoxious for some reason or another only known to the murderers, who was flogged in regular slave style and given notice to leave the hallowed precincts of New Iberia. He, terror-stricken, left for Freetown, to where some of his friends resided, for protection. On learning that he was in Freetown, a leader of the banditti, named Cade, organized an alleged military company for the purpose of slaughtering the colored man's friends, who had collected together in their own defense, and in short order butchered up at least a score of colored people.

We could mention many other instances of like character, but enough is here said, backed by authority, to warrant attention to this deplorable state of affairs. We say to the colored people that they must leave this State.

The negroes of St. Martin, Iberia, St. Mary, Terre Bonne, Vermillion, Lafourche, Assumption Parishes, can never expect anything else than a continuance of this inhuman warfare, and if they have to walk they owe it to themselves and families to leave these parts, for the planter is powerless to protect you as a workman and the governor of the State is apparently indifferent to this condition. We say to you colored people to emigrate to California, Arizona, anywhere else where God's law is respected and man's inhumanity to man in the light of Louisiana methods is unknown and never expected.

Do not wait longer; you have suffered sufficiently long and if you remain you will certainly imperil your own life. Emigrate and leave this infernal hell-hole on earth.

[Extracts from the Louisiana Standard, New Orleans, September 1, 1888.]

THE GOOD WORK GOES BRAVELY ON.

Killing and outraging negroes is the order of the day. We ask of the Northern journals that they scan well the certain dispatches as seen in our New Orleans dailies. We mean those purporting to recount the troubles with dangerous and unruly negroes. We mean particularly those as just now appearing from certain sections in the parishes of Terrebonne, Iberia, and St. Martin. Let them read and ponder. The very dispatches of themselves are enough to damn the communities from whence they come.

Here are the armed organizations of whites going about as assumed regulators. Their mission is seen as wholly confined to the negroes. They are themselves outside the pale of all law. They represent no authority whatever save that of organized brute force. They constitute, in fact, nothing more nor less than outlaws; are in honesty to be viewed in no other light.

Here are the armed gangs of outlaws, then, riding roughshod over the country at large hunting negroes to the death. The negroes are largely on their own ground; they appear as living in their own little hard-earned homes.

This was particularly the case in Freetown. The little town was invaded by these armed outlaws. There was the pretense of the sheltering of certain refugees in hiding from the outlaws' threats. A dozen, at least, of negroes were brutally murdered. They were shot down as so many dogs in their kennels. It was the cowardly work of a gang of cowardly murderers. A coroner's jury, as cowardly as the murderers, but serves as the murderers' shield. It signs a verdict to the effect that the negroes were killed by parties unknown.

This late hellish work is mainly confined to parishes in the Third Congressional district.

It appears as in effect the beginning of the Democratic Congressional campaign. The three particular parishes are strongly Republican. The latest official registration with returns of the late election may be in order.

Parish.	Registration.		Election returns.	
	White.	Negro.	Nicholls.	Warmoth.
Terre Bonne.....	2,276	3,035	1,687	2,033
Iberia.....	2,344	3,210	1,262	1,923
St. Martin.....	1,476	2,198	1,107	1,624
Total.....	6,096	8,443	4,056	5,580

The blacks are seen as having the majority vote of 2,347. There is the return of 1,524 majority for the Republican ticket. The voters absent and failing to vote are, for the three parishes, respectively, 1,591, 2,369, and 943, a total of 4,903.

There is here with the free and fair election the large white Republican vote. The 4,903 absentees were unquestionably two-thirds Republican. The three parishes are honestly Republican by fully 3,000 majority.

The bulldozing began previous to election. It was both rampant and fierce on election day. It was by no means confined to the blacks. There were the white Republican leaders coming in for their share. Hon. W. B. Merchant, ex-Republican postmaster in New Orleans, is mentioned for instance by Hon. Senator CHANDLER. Mr. Merchant, as notorious, was outrageously bulldozed; was held a prisoner by an armed body of bulldozers; has since left the State in disgust; is now resident in El Paso, Tex. The election as such was an outrage and a fraud.

The bulldozing broke out afresh immediately following the election in the parish of Terrebonne. Senator INGALLS recounted some of the cases in his famous speech in reply to Senator EUSTIS. An armed band of "regulators" sought to reap their vengeance for being defeated. It appeared, as in evidence, in lead of a brother of Senator GIBSON. The negroes were shot and outraged in every conceivable way. Dozens were driven from their little hard-earned homes in fear of their lives. There are the dozens, so made refugees, in New Orleans to-day.

Terre Bonne, Iberia, and St. Martin are virtually in the hands of the outlaws. They have converted these parishes into a veritable hell.

They are riding roughshod over the country at large. Their path is marked with blood; is strewn with the bodies of a full score of murdered negroes.

These organizations of murderous outlaws are organizations of Louisiana Democrats. They are in effect shielded by the Democratic authorities. Their murders are glossed over and palliated by the Louisiana Democratic press. They are practically a part of the Democratic political methods, murder and outrage for opinion's sake. And still the good work goes bravely on.

MARTINET'S LETTER.

We recommend to the colored voters of the country to peruse the letter of Mr. L. A. Martinet, editor of the Progress, published last week in this paper. We address ourselves more particularly to the colored voters of the North, because it matters not how the negroes vote in the South, the result is the same—the South is always solid, through fraud and murder, for Democracy—whereas in the North, in several States, they hold the balance of power. The letter presents a mild picture of the fiendish outrages and the condition worse than actual slavery to which our people are subjected in this State, and the colored man who, after reading it, will vote the Democratic ticket is an enemy to his race.

We recommend especially to the colored press, Republican and Democratic, to reproduce this truthful statement from a Democratic source, not with a view of helping one party and injuring the other, but for the sake of humanity and for the purpose of placing the helpless and sorrowful condition of our people in the South before the American people in its true light. It is the more necessary that the colored press should do this as we can not rely upon the Democratic press to publish the truth about the diabolical outrages perpetrated upon our people. All their accounts are colored so as not to incur the regulators' displeasure, and they will publish no impartial statement from any one, colored or white.

There is not a colored man in the State that stood higher in Democratic estimation than Mr. Martinet, yet the Democratic press would not publish his letter, though couched in moderate language; nor would they publish the able and considerate address to the American people on the same subject adopted at the mass-meeting of our people held here last week, and which also appeared in our last Saturday's paper. They even made no mention in their local columns that such a meeting was held, notwithstanding that there were reporters present; and yet it was one of the most notable meetings ever held in this city. All our prominent men and ministers were there and the attendance was exceedingly large. Hence for the dissemination of the truth about those outrages on our people we must rely especially on the negro press.

Now, regarding the political bearing the circulation of such facts will have in the North, it is a matter of secondary consideration with us. As a Republican, we are sincerely and staunchly in favor of Harrison and Morton's election, but we will not use the perpetration of such infernal crimes solely to advance the interests of the party. Our primary object is to make our helpless and pitiable condition known with the view that the humane sentiment of the nation will

devise means to alleviate the wrongs to which we are subjected by the Bourbonism of the South.

But we will be frank in saying that the re-election of Grover Cleveland will be taken by the murderers and destroyers of our people as sanctioning their deeds, and will encourage them to go on in their career of blood and extermination, and they will go on with renewed vigor; whereas the success of the Republican party will show that the healthy public sentiment of the country condemns those outrages, and will throw a damper and act as a check on the perpetrators.

This is no surmising. It is clearly shown by the contrast which the administration of Grover Cleveland and that of President Arthur affords. Compare the two administrations and see for yourselves. Under the quiet and peaceable administration of President Arthur, the rough edges of the war having been smoothed and its wounds almost healed by the long and beneficent Republican rule, angry passions were gradually cooling down and a better condition of affairs was quietly taking place in the South. While here and there at the time of an election some trouble might arise, it was always local and its effect temporary. Republicanism was undoubtedly fast gaining ground; prominent white men were continually proclaiming a change of faith and declaring their adherence to the Republican party, and we confidently looked to a day not far distant when it would be safe for a colored man to be a Democrat and when both parties would be composed of whites and blacks alike.

But the election of Cleveland put a stop to all this. It threw us back into the seventies. It did not cause a reaction in sentiment, but it effectually put a check on its manifestation, and Bourbonism once more became rampant and overbearing. His re-election will give it unlimited sway and will throw us back in the sixties; while the election of Harrison will restore the hopeful condition of things that existed under President Arthur and prepare the country for an era of peace, harmony, and prosperity.

Therefore, we say again, colored men, read Mr. Martinet's letter. His statements can not be contradicted. The Democrats have everywhere proclaimed his integrity and veracity, and they can not to-day impeach his testimony. Read his letter and vote the Republican ticket.

OUR MURDERED DEAD—A REQUIEM FOR OUR MURDERED DEAD.

Let all join in commemorating the victims of the Freetown massacre. Let the roll of the murdered dead be held a lasting roll of honor. Let their names not be forgotten: John Simon, Thomas Simon, Peter Simon, Lewis Simon, Eugene Green, Edward Valere, Alexander Valere, Antoine Michel, Samuel Kokke, Ransom Livingston, Jr. They died, as did the veritable martyrs of old. They died for daring to assert their rights as free men.

They were murdered for giving shelter and protection to the outraged and hunted of their race. They gave up their lives in proof of their manhood. They are so many martyrs to Democratic hate. Let them be so held and revered. "Vengeance is mine, saith the Lord; I will repay."

We assert unhesitatingly that the last Louisiana election was simply an outrageous wholesale steal; that men were murdered for distributing Republican tickets; that Republican voters were generally either bulldozed or defrauded of their ballots; that the officials generally were installed through fraud; that the State is run practically by bulldozers and ballot-box stuffers.

We further assert that there exists to-day in certain sections of the State a reign of terror; that the country is overrun by gangs of outlaws known as regulators; that negroes are being hunted as so many animals; that they are being shot down by dozens, murdered in cold blood for daring to presume upon their rights as men; that scores again are being driven from their hard-earned homes, for all of which we challenge the proofs.

We favor emigration in lieu of immigration. We favor, as far as may be, the general emigration of the negroes.

We don't object to the Northern immigrants. They are of those willing to concede the negro his rights. We won't do any lying to induce them to come. We want the negroes to get out. They have no protection under the laws. The late outrageous verdict of a coroner's jury over a dozen murdered negroes at Freetown is abundant proof. We tell them they have no rights the Louisiana bulldozer is bound to respect. They may be murdered and outraged at will. They are certain to be murdered and outraged until reduced to a state of peonage. The only alternative is to pack up and move.

Let the move begin with the young men and women. Let them get out. Let them stand not upon the order, but go.

THE ASSASSINS LIE.

No politics in it; that's the story in connection with the Freetown massacre. Where's the fool who don't know it to be a lie out of whole cloth. The assassins are Democrats. The victims are Republicans. That tells the story. It is the "Old Third." The district is honestly Republican by 8,000 majority. It was carried two years ago by Democratic boodle, and amounted to say \$60,000 in cash. The boodle candidate is now out of the race. There are no \$60,000 this time in the Democratic bag. The want of it must be made good somehow. There's no other way for it but in killing Republican negroes. That is the one sure way of keeping Republican voters from the polls. The Democratic game has begun. A round dozen or so of negroes have been murdered. It is the beginning of the Third district campaign. That's the meaning of the Freetown massacre.

A CIRCULAR FROM THE BUREAU OF IMMIGRATION.

Fellow-citizens and brethren:

After receiving intelligence through the columns of the daily journals of the terrible outrages and cold-blooded murders of our fellow-citizens at Freetown and other portions of the State, from time to time, without any attempt on the part of the executive authorities to bring the murderers to justice, we felt that patience on our part has ceased to become a virtue, and that the present dangerous crisis to which matters have been allowed to reach in the country demanded immediate action on the part of those located in more favoring districts to adopt measures whereby to relieve those of our fellow-citizens suffering under a reign of terror and brutality in the disturbed portions of the State.

Being bound by the ties of duty, as well as of those of race affinities, memorial meeting was held to contribute honor to those who died in defense of their lives and property, thus winning for themselves an honorable place among the number of martyrs who poured out their life-blood as a precious libation upon the shrine of liberty.

In accordance with this meeting an immigration bureau was organized, with authority to communicate with kindred organizations in California and New Mexico, in order to remove our suffering brethren to regions equally favored in fertile resources, and among a people who are willing to accord to us the common rights of humanity.

It was therefore agreed at a meeting of the board that before such a step is taken a pioneer be sent to the above-mentioned places, whose duty it shall be to survey the country and make arrangements with the planters of that region so that our people, instead of moving on a wild goose chase, will have something definite and sure before them.

It was also agreed by a series of resolutions, both at this board meeting and at the memorial meeting, that an appeal be made to every church organization, secret society, and benevolent association, and every friend of the race to contribute little or much towards defraying the expenses of such an individual upon so important a mission. The board promises to use care and discretion in the choice of such a man.

In accordance, therefore, with those resolutions, we issue this circular, calling upon you in the name of God and the name of common humanity to come to the help of the Lord against the mighty. We need not say to you that the uncivilized methods of regulators are creeping all over the State, like a cancer creeps all over the human body, and that this now peaceful region may soon be disturbed by the hideous yells and the murderous fires of lawless regulators, and you likewise may be found on your way to some safe region where you and your family can dwell together in peace.

Send contributions to J. H. Coker, M. D., president, or Rev. Ernest Lyon, secretary. Office Geddes Hall, No. 220 Erato street.

All contributions will be acknowledged in the S. W. C. A., the Standard and Pelican.

We are your brethren in distress.

J. H. COKER, President.
ERNEST LYON, Secretary.
M. J. SIMMS,
PAUL GREEN,
Assistant Secretaries.

Remember Iberia. Let negro laborers give the parish of Iberia a wide berth. Let the Democratic bulldozers go to work. Leave them to gather the cane and make the sugar. You can have no protection for your lives. Avoid Iberia as you would avoid a pestilence. Go somewhere else for work. Let those already there get out. Let every one who can, pack up and move.

At Opelousas last week another negro was riddled with bullets by white assassins for the reason that it was thought he had purchased buckshot. The mayor of the city gave them the right of way and a *carte blanche*. And so the cruel work goes on. Colored people, you must emigrate. The respectable white people of this State deplore the condition of affairs, but they are powerless to stop this murdering. It is in order for Mr. Nicholls to petition Congress for more power to carry out the laws of this State.

Boycott Terre Bonne. Let the colored laborers boycott the parish of Terre Bonne. That's the word that with the Irish means the next thing to anathema. It fills the bill. Terre Bonne is overrun with Democratic bulldozers. They are hunting and killing Republican negroes. Don't give them a chance at you. Keep away. Get your work elsewhere. Let the bulldozers make their own sugar. Let those who are there get out. Every man who can, take to the cane-breaks, if need be, and get away.

Shun St. Martin. Don't go there for work. Leave the cane and the sugar to the bulldozers. Let them go to work, or starve. They propose to reduce you to the status of the Mexican peons. Let them have the field to themselves. Go to California, to Arizona, anywhere outside of bulldozed Louisiana.

[Extracts from the Louisiana Standard, New Orleans, September 22, 1888.]

WHAT ARE THEY GOING TO DO?

What are they going to do about it? That is the question for our Louisiana negroes to decide. They are citizens and men in the eyes of the law. There is even the special clause in both national and State constitutions pledging them their rights. The law, in so far as they are concerned, is but a cheat and a lie. The national and State constitutions, as applicable to them, amount to naught. There is for the negro absolutely no protection for life or property in Louisiana. He is shot down with as little compunction as is the veriest mangy cur. No one ever hears of his murderer being punished for the crime. He is even hunted down as is the wild beast and shot at sight for no earthly offense but daring to presume upon his lawful rights. He is open to every outrage and contumely; his wife, sisters, and children to every insult and abuse. He has in point of fact not even the protection accorded him in the days when held a slave. He had then his lawful masters at least interested in seeing him free from the abuse of others.

The situation withal is growing worse and worse. The negroes are being gradually cowed into abject submission.

A goodly proportion of Louisiana to-day is for the Louisiana negroes a veritable hell. In the parishes of Terre Bonne, St. Martin, Iberia, and portions of Lafayette, in particular, there exists a reign of terror. All of law is here practically suspended. Gangs of outlaws, known as regulators, are the law unto themselves. Negroes have been wantonly massacred by the wholesale in broad light of day, as evidenced in the shooting down in cold blood of no less than ten in the massacre at Freetown.

Negroes are being hunted as so many wild beasts, are being as mercilessly murdered. Negroes everywhere are being driven from their little, hard-earned homes, are everywhere being wantonly outraged and abused. The infection of lawlessness is spreading, is heard of daily in some new locality.

Governor Nicholls has so far done nothing. He can not plead ignorance of the facts. They are being daily reported in the press. They are matters of common notoriety. His attention, again, has been specially invited, and that, too, by prominent citizens and friends. He was talked to and plead with by Hon. L. A. Martinet.

We have it on good authority, too, that no less a man than Hon. Mr. Breaux, elected with Governor Nicholls as State superintendent of education, has specially interested himself in the matter. We have it that he talked with Governor Nicholls, and plainly enough told him of the terrible massacres, of the outrageous and general lawlessness, of the serious injury it was doing, of the disgrace it was certain to entail, and besought the governor to interfere in behalf of law and order.

Governor Nicholls sits with folded hands while the murders, the whippings, and the outrages against Louisiana negro citizens are being daily carried on. He overlooks both the Constitution of the United States and the constitution of Louisiana.

He appears as giving no heed to enforcement of the laws, as ignoring all obligation as a man, as forgetting his registered oath.

These massacres, these daily murders and outrages, are crying aloud to Heaven. They are being registered beside the oath pledging the law's protection to life and property. Governor Nicholls the while joins in the devotions of the faithful, chanting the anthems ascending before the same High Throne. Is that registered oath to count as nothing? Is there no responsibility for these continued murders? Are these church professions and communions to be measured as sacrilege? Is Francis T. Nicholls to command respect as governor of Louisiana? Is he governor only in name?

PROFOUND IMPRESSION.

By reference to the columns of the Northern and Western press it has been seen that the Geddes Hall address made a profound impression wherever read. Editors who heretofore have received intelligence of Southern crimes with a feeling of incredulity accept the vigorous protest of a large and respectable mass meeting as conclusive evidence of their perpetration.

From the country parishes it is learned that in at least two places the whites, after reading the address, came together and resolved to assure colored laborers that bulldozing should be stopped and they would guaranty protection of life and property. But so great is the mistrust of the people that little reliance is placed upon those pledges.

It has been felt for many months that the colored people of the State should organize in some manner for common defense, precisely as the Irish do, who suffer in many respects under similar conditions of oppression.

The organization of a bureau of emigration is approved in the country parishes as a practical measure of redress; and many inquiries have been made as to means at hand to convey out of the State the hundreds of laborers who are willing to go. A question has arisen in the minds of some whether to go at once or wait until after the crops are gathered; but the good sense of the people tells them that to await the gathering of the crops is largely to defeat the primary object of an exodus of labor, namely, the embarrassment of those planters who aid and direct the marauders against their lives and homes.

It having been demonstrated that the whites are without tender consciences on the Thibodaux and Freetown massacres and other numerous outrages, the idea now is to touch them sorely in their pocket-books and bank accounts by depriving them of sufficient labor to gather their crops. Let this purpose be openly avowed and energetically carried out.

Timid counselors have said that the plan will fail, because other laborers will rush to take the places of those who go. Our advisers show that such is not the experience of several planters who are already in distress. They offer high wages, but liberty of citizenship is not being sold by the negroes in the labor or any other market. Besides, if a new lot of negroes desire to undergo experiences of the kind visited upon the departed laborers, a very little will probably satisfy them, while those who enjoy their freedom in Northern States will extend them their sympathy.

A letter has been received from a United States Senator, in which inquiry is made in regard to the operations of the bureau of emigration. When it opens up communication with leading Republicans and capitalists, the way for effective work will be made clear. Let the bureau be sustained by words of cheer and liberal contributions.

[Extract from the Telegraph, Monroe, La., August 18, 1888.]

It would be a mistake to confound the principle of white primaries with that of representation in Democratic conventions.

We do not hesitate to concede that under normal social and political conditions, the Democratic vote is the fairest basis.

But have we normal social and political conditions in the Fifth Congressional district?

On the contrary, are these conditions not emphatically and pre-eminently abnormal?

We have white parishes and we have black parishes, each class widely and notoriously different with respect to these conditions.

The purposes of this discussion do not require that we analyze, reiterate, and enumerate these differences. They are well known and well understood throughout the district.

These two classes of parishes are not dissimilar in one important feature—they all return safe Democratic majorities.

For political purposes they all are Democratic parishes.

[Extract from the Post, Washington, September 20, 1888.]

It is an undoubted fact that in a number of the Southern States the negroes have been practically disfranchised. The honest men of the South admit this. * * * It is an undeniable fact that in the disfranchisement of the blacks in the South the effect is not confined to local government, but extends to national affairs, and thus becomes a matter of serious interest to the people of all the States. The people of Oregon are as directly interested in the election of Congressmen and Presidential electors in Mississippi as in similar elections in their own States.

If the political complexion of the Federal Government is changed by suppression of the ballot, to just the extent of that change the Federal Government is wrested from its constitutional basis.

We have stated these facts because they are facts, the facts of a very ugly situation viewed from any possible standpoint. If it be true, as we think it is, that black rule is intolerable to the whites of this country, if it be true also that in eliminating that which is locally intolerable the National Government is necessarily vitiated by fraud, what is to be the outcome? It strikes us that this is one of the most serious problems ever presented to the statesmen of the Republic. It ought to be discussed without malice and with a recognition not of a part but of all the facts we have cited. It is a two-sided question, apparently as far from a solution to-day as it was a dozen years ago.

[Mr. GIBSON again addressed the Senate. For his speech complete see page 8981.]

Mr. REAGAN. Mr. President, the Senate is called upon to enter on an investigation of transactions in the State of Louisiana. As I shall vote against the resolution I desire to state a few reasons which will control my vote; and in stating those reasons, without any previous investigation of the subject, but simply acting upon the spur of the occasion, I propose to answer as well as I can the very pertinent inquiry just submitted by the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. EDMUNDS] as to the reason for such action as this.

If it was proposed to investigate the conduct of an election in which members of the House of Representatives were elected, Congress has the necessary jurisdiction. If it was proposed to investigate the conduct of the electors of any State in an election in which electors for President and Vice-President were concerned, Congress has the necessary jurisdiction. If it was proposed to investigate the question as to whether a Senator has been elected by fraud, by violence, by bribery, or other unlawful means, that would be a subject within the jurisdiction of the Senate. Does any Senator know of any other fact that gives jurisdiction to the Senate under the Constitution and laws as interpreted by the decisions of the Supreme Court?

That question I ask Senators. I do not ask for an answer now, but I ask them to take it to themselves, are there any other conditions of fact that authorize the interposition of the jurisdiction of the Senate of the United States for an investigation?

Let us see what the resolution proposes:

Resolved, That the Committee on Privileges and Elections be instructed to inquire (1) into the facts of the recent election in the State of Louisiana, held on the 17th day of April, 1888, at which there were chosen State officers and also a Legislature, which has since elected two United States Senators; and especially to ascertain and report whether the 135,745 votes returned for the candidate of the dominant party for governor were actually cast, in view of the fact that at no previous election had the votes for such candidate of such party exceeded 88,794.

Then, omitting a part of the resolution which speaks of details, about

which I am not informed, and about which I do not propose to speak, it proceeds:

And why there were similar returns from other parishes; and also to ascertain and report whether or not at said State election there was any violence, intimidation, or fraud which prevented a fair election, and particularly whether or not there were any false canvasses or false returns made by the local election officers or included in the final canvass of the votes.

Here is a State election for State officers, involving no election of a member of Congress, no election of Presidential electors, and it is proposed for the Senate to investigate that question as to whether it was a fair and honest election. It is true the resolution recites that a Legislature was elected which has since elected two Senators.

The election of that Legislature was the election of State officers, and I submit to the honorable Senator from Vermont, and he will understand what I mean by the submission of the point, that we will hardly go behind the election of members of the Legislature to determine whether United States Senators were lawfully elected by them. If Senators by their acts have done anything that would disqualify them for seats in the Senate, they are amenable for it. If the Legislature acted unlawfully, then it may affect the legality of an election by them; but there is no charge of anything like that. There is no charge that any Senator has in any respect violated the law. There is no charge that the Legislature has in any respect violated any law. Whence, then, the jurisdiction for this resolution?

Mr. EDMUNDS. Will the Senator from Texas allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. REAGAN. Certainly.

Mr. EDMUNDS. My friend from Texas refers, and correctly, to the election of members of Congress as illustrating, as it well does, his argument. I should like to ask him whether it is not within the competence of the House of Representatives to go behind the returns of the State officers who manage the elections of members of Congress and find out what the real truth is in respect of the election and the people who voted for a particular member of Congress?

Mr. REAGAN. My answer to that question is the action of the distinguished Senator himself in the great question which involved the election of a President of the United States in 1876, when he said to the United States and the world, "You can not go behind the count."

Mr. EDMUNDS. Then my friend means to say that the House of Representatives for now one hundred years has been wrong in going behind the returns and investigating the truth of the votes of the fundamental mass of mankind in each State, which makes Legislatures as well as members of Congress.

Mr. REAGAN. I shall not go into that subject, a subject that is not involved in this question. The Legislature of Louisiana occupies the same relation to the proposed investigation which the electoral college occupied to the Presidential count in 1876.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Let us see, if my friend will pardon me—

Mr. REAGAN. I have only a short time to speak. I desire to speak to the question before the Senate, and I shall not allow myself to be drawn off into the discussion of collateral and unnecessary issues.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I did not intend to interrupt the Senator without his consent for a single moment, of course.

Mr. REAGAN. Now, we will look further into what the resolution proposes:

And in case said committee shall find that such illegalities as violence, intimidation, or fraud, false canvasses, or false returns prevailed in connection with such election, then said committee shall further inquire—

First the predicate is laid for the inquiry by proposing that the committee shall do what the Senate has no power to do by itself or its committee, to investigate a State election. Then it is to inquire—

whether any of the acts or omissions of the officials or other persons responsible for or connected with such illegalities were contrary to the Constitution of the United States or the amendments thereof, or were violations of any of the statutes of the United States, especially the provisions of chapter 7, Title LXX, of the Revised Statutes, punishing crimes against the elective franchise and civil rights of citizens; and, if so, whether any prosecutions have been or ought to be commenced in the United States courts for such offenses.

The United States courts as well as the State courts of Louisiana have been open where all violations of law might be prosecuted in one or another as the jurisdiction appertained to the one or the other.

This chapter 7, Title LXX of the Revised Statutes, has been, some portions of it, the subject of examination by the Supreme Court of the United States. Some of its provisions have been declared to be unconstitutional, all of them where an attempt has been made by the Federal courts to take jurisdiction for personal offenses within the several States. If the law is violated in an election for a member of Congress or for Presidential elector, or in the election of a Senator by the Legislature, whatever provisions are made with reference to that may be enforced in the Federal courts, but no matters relating to an election of State officers come within its provisions, and no jurisdiction is conferred for their trial in the Federal courts.

I take it no formal solemn inquiry by a committee of the United States Senate is necessary to ascertain that fact. All Senators, I take it, know that fact without a solemn inquiry involving a slander against a State. I will read two or three paragraphs from the syllabus in the

case of the United States vs. Cruikshank, decided at the April term, 1874, by the Supreme Court of the United States:

A charge that the defendants conspired to injure certain persons of African descent, being citizens of the United States, thereby to prevent them from exercising their rights as citizens, such as the right to peaceably assemble, to bear arms, etc., unless accompanied with an averment that the injury was committed by reason of the race, color, or previous condition of servitude of the person conspired against, is not sustainable in the courts of the United States.

I submit that in all the papers that I have heard the Senator from New Hampshire read, it has not been alleged, and whatever may have been the case as to that I submit that these resolutions do not allege that any of these offenses, inferentially alleged to have taken place, were committed to affect a person on account of his race, color, or previous condition, so that ground falls on the face of the resolution. Its averments fail to bring it within the jurisdiction of the Senate. If its averments, though false, brought it within the jurisdiction, possibly the Senate might take jurisdiction; but when its own averments fail to bring it within the jurisdiction of the Senate, surely we are not going to enter upon a solemn inquiry as to a matter over which we have no jurisdiction.

At that point, while I do not intend to deal with the facts in this case at all, I could not but be struck with the reading of the newspaper clippings by the Senator from New Hampshire this morning. The statements in these papers in each case showed that the blacks were the aggressors, and although the Senator stated that the troubles grew out of politics, none of the papers he read showed that the parties injured were Republicans or that those alleged to have inflicted the injuries were Democrats; and yet we are indebted to that Senator, the country is indebted to that Senator, for interpolating upon these statements his evidence that the people injured were black people and Republicans, and that the aggressors were white people and Democrats. Yet you cannot find one word to that effect in a single one of the papers that he read this morning, as far as I recollect. This is upon the testimony of a Senator who, as the Senator from Louisiana has said, lives 1,500 miles from that State and knows nothing of the facts himself; but that testimony, to influence an election, to arouse passions, to stir bitter feelings, is perhaps just as good as if it had been sworn to by some competent witness.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. CHANDLER. Will the Senator allow me to read an account of a murder in Texas that was political?

Mr. REAGAN. If I have made a mistake, I shall be glad to be corrected. Is that one of the papers the Senator read this morning?

Mr. CHANDLER. No, sir; this is a new one from Texas.

Mr. REAGAN. Then I do not yield to that. I am talking about what the Senator read. The Senator will have time after I get through.

Mr. CHANDLER. I withdraw my request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas declines to yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. I will read a case after the Senator gets through where it does show why the murder was committed.

Mr. REAGAN. The Senator has made his speech and I am talking now about what he has presented after his second speech as the grounds for this procedure. I do not know what the Senator has; I do not care what he has. I am dealing with the case on which after two speeches and the resolution he has rested his case before the Senate. I propose to read further excerpts from the opinion I have just been quoting. Referring to the civil-rights act, the Supreme Court say:

That act was intended to give to the colored race the rights of citizenship, and to protect them, as a race or class, from unfriendly State legislation and from lawless combinations. An injury to a colored person, therefore, is not cognizable by the United States courts under that act unless inflicted by reason of his race, color, or previous condition of servitude. An ordinary crime against a colored person without having that characteristic is cognizable only in the State courts.

I am reading this to sustain the position I have laid down, and I read further a part of the sixth clause of the syllabus:

The fifteenth amendment does not confer upon Congress the power to regulate the right to vote generally, but only to provide against discrimination on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.

A conspiracy to prevent a colored person from voting is no more a United States offense than a conspiracy to prevent a white person from voting, unless entered into by reason of the voter's race, color, or previous condition of servitude.

If the Senator has something that he proposes to read hereafter to show that there is something in the paper which he has about politics and races, I call his attention and that of the Senate to the fact that he has failed to put it in the resolution, and a demurrer to the testimony would set it aside because he has no basis for its introduction.

Mr. BLAIR. It would not set aside the fact.

Mr. REAGAN. If the Senator will allow me, I am proceeding upon the supposition that Senators understand that the allegations and the proof must agree to and correspond with each other. Perhaps the Senator from New Hampshire—I will not conclude what I might have said.

Mr. BLAIR. Or I would reply.

Mr. REAGAN. I am not talking about that. There is no allegation to admit the proof, as will be seen by reading the resolution, and it is therefore immaterial. I am talking of the resolution which the Senate is asked to pass and not of loose proofs, not of what may come up by a drag-net collection of newspaper slips and anonymous letters over the country.

The object I had in view, Mr. President, was not to enter into a discussion of this question generally, but simply to respond to what I believe to be the very pertinent question which was suggested by the Senator from Vermont, and which had caused me to look into this resolution to see whether we had the power to pass it. There are some other points in it to which perhaps I had better call attention before taking my seat. This is the third clause:

Whether such illegalities are likely to be repeated in connection with the election to be held in said State on the 6th of November next of Representatives in Congress; and, if so, whether there is occasion for the alteration by Congress or any of the regulations prescribed by said State for holding elections for such Representatives in Congress.

This Senate, one of the gravest political bodies on earth, supposed to be distinguished for the maturity of the judgment of its members and for its conservatism and justice, is to enter upon an inquiry to enable it to guess whether the law will be violated in an election to be held next November. If absurdity could go further and do worse I do not know how it would be brought about, that we are to enter upon a solemn investigation for the purpose of enabling the Senate to guess whether the law is to be violated in an election to be held in Louisiana next November.

And if so, whether there is occasion for the alteration by Congress of any of the regulations prescribed by said State for holding elections for such Representatives in Congress.

If we have not sufficient provision to protect the rights of the voters and the rights of the candidates for office, and the peace and good order of society, I suppose we can extend that, and the Senator from New Hampshire, in his zeal in this respect, can surely suggest any additional remedies which may be necessary without a solemn and formal inquiry for the purpose, not of ascertaining the fact as to whether laws are desired, but for the purpose of inflaming the public mind, promoting sectional agitation, and inflicting injustice.

The fourth provision of the resolution is as follows:

And said committee shall also inquire whether there were in connection with the aforesaid State election illegalities, frauds, false canvasses, and false returns, so extensive and systematic in their character as to show that there existed on the part of the various State election officers a deliberate plan to apparently carry said election without regard to the votes actually cast, and to choose a governor and other State officers and a State Legislature by such illegal, false, and fraudulent means; and, if so, whether said Legislature was actually and duly elected by the people of Louisiana, or was in fact substantially the creature solely of the returning and canvassing officers, and whether said State of Louisiana has a republican form of government, including a Legislature entitled to choose United States Senators and to provide methods for the appointment of electors of President and Vice-President of the United States.

This resolution raises a question that it seems to me ought to be thought of and ought to be discussed more than it has been of late years. Our whole system of government is predicated upon the idea of the capacity of the people for self-government. If the people of this country have not the capacity for self-government, then the Republic is a failure and there must be a monarchy, an oligarchy, or an aristocracy to rule it. That is the proposition. I submit that for one hundred years of peace and war the people of this country have proven themselves capable of self-government, and I submit that they are to-day capable of self-government.

Then the powers of government by the constitutions, State and Federal, are distributed between the States and the Federal Government. All the powers necessary are delegated to the Federal Government to enable it to perform all its foreign and Federal relations, and no State can interfere with them. To the States is reserved the vast residuum of power which relates to local controversies, to questions of marriage and divorce, descent and distribution of estates, the enforcement of local contracts, the punishment of local violations of the law—I shall not attempt to enumerate them, nor is it necessary, but all that vast residuum of power remains to the States and is wholly without the jurisdiction of the Federal Government.

Then our system contemplated that our people were capable of self-government to the extent of forming a Federal Government which should control our foreign and our Federal relations; that they were capable of self-government to the extent of forming State governments having the capacity to deal successfully with all those local questions that arise within the States.

This line of distinction has been steadily adhered to by the Supreme Court of the United States, and if the Republic is to exist it must continue to be adhered to. Instances in which it has been broken over by the action of Congress have been arrested and set aside by the Supreme Court of the United States.

The Senator from New Hampshire evidently contemplates that all violations of right are the subjects of Federal jurisdiction. He evidently makes no clear distinction between the powers of the Federal Government and the powers of the State governments in relation to such matters, and there is where this perpetual intermeddling comes

from and comes in—the effort of the people of some of the States to intermeddle in, to interfere with, the local affairs of others for political purposes and to accomplish political ends.

If the States are capable of self-government it is fair to assume that the people of each State will dispose properly of the local questions that arise within it. It is fair to assume that there is no justice in any other State or in Congress attempting to interfere with the legal or constitutional duty of the State to dispose of merely local questions.

Mr. President, I only intended to state very briefly the reason why I should vote against this resolution. Whenever any resolution comes up calling for an investigation within the jurisdiction of Congress, when any Senator thinks that the law has been violated in any respect over which Congress may have authority to act, I shall certainly interpose no objection to the proper investigation, but as far as I can understand I mean to oppose all propositions for investigation which simply means political agitation in violation of the Constitution and of the rights of the States and of the people.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Mr. President, the observations of my friend from Texas [Mr. REAGAN] lead me to occupy four or five minutes in stating very briefly my views about this resolution.

The intermeddling of the Congress of the United States with the local affairs of a State is, of course, very improper. It was thought to be very improper in times, now happily gone by, when that intermeddling took the form of petitions of citizens of some States in the United States addressed to Congress, in favor of proposing to the States amendments to the Constitution which should abolish slavery. The same arguments that my honorable and distinguished friend from Texas now addresses to us were with much greater violence, but with not greater logic, addressed to the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States against any exertion of the right of petition to change the structure of the Government in its constitutional forms so as to get rid of what many people then believed and many people and, I hope, all now believe was a curse to everybody on this continent, the institution of slavery.

So I am not so greatly agitated at this present moment in respect of the fear of our intermeddling with the affairs of the State of Louisiana or the State of Vermont, whose affairs in the same way, when the Democrats were in a majority in this body were by a resolution of the Senate instructed to be inquired into, and with the urgent appeals on the part of the Senators from that State (they may have been wrong) that that investigation should be made to the uttermost, in order that the Congress of the United States in respect of the elections of the constituents who embrace the other House and this (for they all come from the States and the people, only in different forms) might be found to be pure and true, or unhappily discovered to be false and corrupt. There was no man who ever called himself a Republican and there was not any man then, only eight or nine years ago, who called himself a Democrat in this body, who did not vote for that very thing.

Times have changed. It is inconvenient for some reason, I hope a good one, though I confess I am astonished at it; the light of truth, the light that comes from investigation and inquiry, should not be turned upon that portion of the people of the United States of whom it is said that the control is in the hands of a minority who have usurped power contrary to the forms of State written constitutions; contrary to the spirit of liberty and justice and equal rights that we all believe in, or profess to believe in (and I hope we all do believe in), and it is inconvenient that we should know what the truth is. I can not understand it, sir.

If this resolution of the Senator from New Hampshire, about some parts of which I express no opinion as to their propriety, but if the general tenor of it turns out to be a slander, as the phrase has been, upon the State of Louisiana, the Senator who introduced it, if he suspected it to be a slander, will deserve the reproach of the Senate. If he introduced it in the honest belief that there are wrongs in that State which go to the fundamental composition of the whole of this Government, because Louisiana is a part of it, and affecting the States of the North and the East and the West and the Pacific coast as much as they do Louisiana, for we are all one—if it should turn out even that he was mistaken, I hope that nobody would be more glad and happy than he to find out that the truth was that the State of Louisiana possesses a government that not only in form but in substance is a government of equal rights and fair play, and that every citizen is defended as every citizen of every political party in the State of Vermont is and always has been, of whatever politics, and by the efforts of men of all politics in that dearest of rights, his independence as a citizen, the right to cast his vote unchallenged by anybody, and the right to know that it is honestly counted in the sum that goes up to make the autonomy of the State government.

Who shuns an investigation of that kind? What Democrat in the State of Vermont would not hide his face in shame if any representative of his stood up and objected to an inquiry whether in the State of Vermont the practical power of its automatic arrangement had gathered into the hands of a few, by whatever name you may call them, and that the great majority of the people were denied and suppressed in their rights to be heard as voters, and in their rights to participate as voters in the operations of that State.

As little as I admire the general principles of the Democratic party (they have a right to them; we disagree about public affairs), speaking for the Democrats of the State of Vermont as my constituents, I am bound to say, in justice to them, that I know of no man in that State of the Democratic party who would not denounce me if the case were applied to the State of Vermont if I opposed an inquiry of this kind there.

But my friend from Texas says we have not any power. Well, let us see. If we have not, of course such an inquiry would be futile; very likely the witnesses could not be convicted of perjury; very likely they could not be compelled to attend, and all that; but let us see whether we have any power. The Constitution says, as it regards Senators and Members of Congress, and in the same phrase:

Each House shall be the judge of the elections, returns, and qualifications of its own members.

How much does that import? How much does it contain? Are we to say, as the Senator from Texas referring to the Electoral Commission did, that neither House has any power to go behind the certificate that comes to it from a State? The governor of the State in each case certifies, in the one case to the Clerk or Speaker as to a Representative in the House of Representatives, and to the President of the Senate as to a Senator, that so and so, in the case of the House, has been elected a member of that body, and that so and so, in the case of a Senator, has been elected a member of this body. If one House possesses the power to make an inquiry which goes behind the seal of the governor it would seem to be very clear by the Constitution that the other House would have it, for the language is the same, and is applied to each and to both in a group, with the same import and the same force.

I think I am safe in saying that in the House of Representatives for one hundred and one years, since it was organized, and since this body was organized, whenever the occasion has arisen by a suggestion, an inquiry, a protest, or whatever, the House has thought it competent, by the consent of all men of all parties, the fathers and the sons of the Republic, from beginning to end, to go to the bottom of that affair and ascertain the real truth of that election. So the certificate of the governor, the reports of the State canvassing boards, the reports of the district canvassing boards, the tally-sheets at the ballot-boxes in each voting precinct are all open to the scrutiny of the truth in order to ascertain what took place. Is there any safety for the liberty of men as voters and citizens if such a body with such powers can not go to the real truth of the affair?

Mr. BUTLER. May I ask the Senator one question just there, not with regard to the resolution, but on the subject he is discussing?

Mr. EDMUNDS. Certainly.

Mr. BUTLER. Does the Senator hold that either House of Congress would have the right to make that investigation of its own motion, in the absence of some protest or the memorial or complaint of somebody in the State?

Mr. EDMUNDS. I most decidedly do, Mr. President. When the day comes that either House of Congress, when the day comes that either house of a State Legislature, or any other representative body in this world in a place that is worthy of the name of a government, can only move for the public security and for the development of truth for the public security when some man who may be in a dungeon or may be dead comes to the front and demands it, then there will be a failure of the government of men by men and for men upon the face of the earth.

We have had a grand-jury system which is, as I think, with great respect to everybody, a fair illustration of the present matter in regard to the particular topic that the Constitution has put in the possession of each of these Houses with regard to its own members. I believe one of the many good things that our English fathers' form of government gave to us—we having discarded most of the evil things—was the grand jury. Who ever heard in any State (unless it may be very recently somewhere) that a grand jury could not inquire into some crime or wrong injurious to the State to which it belonged because some citizen or some witness or some district attorney or some judge had failed to call their attention to it? They might desire to indict the district attorney himself; they might find it to be their highest duty to indict the judge himself; and are they to wait until he shall charge them to inquire into his conduct?

Mr. BUTLER. Then do I understand the Senator to say that the powers of each House of Congress are inquisitorial, as are the powers of a grand jury?

Mr. EDMUNDS. In my humble judgment, with great respect to the many people I see who are wiser than I, in respect of the subjects that the Constitution has confided to them, their power is universal and supreme in regard to inquiry, and there is no safety for liberty and private rights unless you admit the existence of that authority to its fullest extent.

Suppose in the State of Vermont, a State, and that means ever so much, one-fourth of its inhabitants being what are called Democrats, and I only use that term to illustrate my case, because the Democrats of Vermont are just as law-abiding as anybody else and would be just as eager to defend the right of a Republican voter as a Republican would, and so I only take it to illustrate—suppose one-fourth of the citi-

zens of the State of Vermont being Democrats had by one contrivance or another, either by fraud or violence or other forms of usurpation, got possession of all the counting and canvassing officers in that State at the ballot-boxes, all the returning boards, and the possession of the governorship and the Legislature; and suppose the Republicans came in September last and wished to vote for their candidate for governor, and they were either driven away, or, being allowed to deposit their ballots, their ballots were entirely miscounted and counted for the candidate of the one-quarter of the people of the State, and the returns come in fair on their face under the seals of the county officers, gilt-edged, engrossed on parchment, with every form and semblance of the majesty of right-doing, and the three-quarters of the people of the State of Vermont, the possession of the government of that State and all its administrative affairs having fallen into the hands of one-quarter of its people, appeal to Congress for an inquiry into the composition of the government of that State, is it republican in form? So far as its constitution goes it appears to be, and always was. Does that answer the Constitution of the United States? Was that all that our fathers meant when they said that the United States should guaranty to each State a republican form of government? Did they only mean that in its written archives deposited in its state-house there should be the parchment that contained the fair words of liberty, of justice, of equal rights? Was that all? No, Mr. President; far from it. The word "form" in the Constitution of our fathers meant not only form, but structure and substance and exercise.

Whenever, therefore, there is occasion upon just ground to believe (whether it turns out to be right or wrong, and may it always turn out to be wrong) that in any State, Vermont or elsewhere, the minority has got possession of the Government and excludes the majority from participation and control, it is the business of Congress to interfere, whether silence or protest comes from the State thus affected, because it is not only the welfare of the people of that State, but it is the welfare of the people of every State, the welfare of the people of every part of the nation that is involved, and can not be separated from a right and just republican government in form and substance in every State over the continent. The Senators from Vermont make laws for the people of Louisiana. They are Senators of all the people once elected, and therefore there can be no evil spot anywhere in this Union that does not affect the welfare and the safety of every other part of it.

So I say, Mr. President, hoping with all my heart that an inquiry into the state of affairs in Louisiana will vindicate that people and that whole people, not a small part of it, but all of them as a mass from the beliefs and the suspicions, to put it in the mildest phrase, that now exist so broadly, I can not see any ground upon which any Senator should object to an inquiry of this kind.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, I omitted when speaking before to ask permission of the Senate to insert at the close of my remarks certain accounts of the proceedings in Louisiana to which I have referred. I ask unanimous consent that I may put in the marked passages from the Louisiana Standard of August 25, of September 1, and of September 22, and also an extract from the Monroe Telegraph of August 18, 1888, and an article from the Washington Post of September 20, 1888.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New Hampshire? The Chair hears none.

Mr. CHANDLER. The Senator from Texas [Mr. REAGAN] complains there was no averment in the case of the killing of colored people in Louisiana, which I submitted to the Senate, that they were murdered on account of their politics. If the Senator had listened to my remarks he would have understood distinctly that I took the ground that these murders were part of a deliberate system; that whether admitted to be political or not they were in fact such; that these disarmings and assassinations of the Louisiana colored people were for the purpose of creating a state of terror as a preparation for the election in November. The same state of things exists in the State of Texas, and I now submit to the Senator from Texas the account which I send to the desk of a recent murder, since the late debate, in the State of Texas, which clearly appears to have been the killing of a Republican because he was a Republican.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The article referred to will be read by the Secretary.

The Secretary read as follows:

[New York Daily Tribune, Saturday, September 1, 1888.]

TEXAS—MURDERED FOR BEING A REPUBLICAN—A KUKLUX OUTRAGE PERPETRATED IN TEXAS—HANGED, SHOT, AND MUTILATED.

LONGVIEW, TEX., August 31.

About 2 o'clock this afternoon Deputy Sheriff Walter Reynolds returned from his search for the body of Harrison Spencer, the colored politician who was forcibly taken from his home a few nights ago by a masked band of Kuklux. Spencer had deserted the Union-Labor party and announced his intention of supporting the Republican ticket. Reynolds reported that he had found Spencer's body about 3½ miles from his place, on the west bank of Harris Creek. No sooner had the news spread than over one hundred citizens, white and black, started to the scene.

The dead man was found hanging from a limb about 15 feet from the ground with a rope around his neck. His hands were tied behind him, and the cords were drawn so tightly that they cut deeply into his flesh. He was evidently shot before the rope was placed around his neck. There is a bullet-hole just behind the left ear and one in his left side, and he had been brutally mutilated. A

movement is on foot to investigate thoroughly this crime. The following circular was issued this afternoon, and two hundred and twenty-five citizens responded to the call contained therein:

"To all law-abiding citizens:

"A crime of the most foul nature has just been perpetrated in our midst. Therefore let us come together at 4 o'clock this evening at the court-house and take proper steps, that our citizens and officers may act in unity, that the perpetrators of this crime may be discovered and the law of our land vindicated.

"J. T. SMITH, County Judge.

"A. A. KILLINGSWORTH, Sheriff.

"E. B. RAGLAND, County Attorney."

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, it is easy to get 130,000 Democratic majority in the State of Texas when such political murders as this are constantly taking place in that State.

The Senator from Texas complains that calling attention to outrages of this sort is an intermeddling with the affairs of a sovereign State. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. EDMUNDS] has well shown how the States of this Union are interwoven together in all their political interests, and how a crime against the suffrage in one State concerns every other State. The Legislature of New Hampshire—the people of New Hampshire have sent me here to call attention to just such outrages as this and to intermeddle to just that extent with the affairs of every State where men are killed solely on account of their politics.

I now ask the Secretary to read the account of additional similar occurrences in the sovereign State of Texas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The paper will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

[New York Tribune, September 2, 1888.]

DRIVEN OUT BY THE DEMOCRATS—NEGRO REPUBLICANS IN FORT BEND COUNTY, TEXAS, EXILED UNDER PAIN OF DEATH.

RICHMOND, TEX., September 8.

The white Democrats have triumphed, and the negro Republicans ordered to leave Fort Bend County have gone. About twenty black men were forced out of the county at the muzzle of Winchester rifles. The most prominent exiles are C. M. Ferguson, district clerk; H. G. Lucas and Peter Warren, school teachers. The war grew out of the attempt made on Monday night to assassinate H. H. Frost, a white Democrat. While he was on the way from his store to his house he was waylaid and shot. His wounds were considered fatal, and a pack of bloodhounds was put on the trail to the negro quarter of the town and to the house of John Ervin.

Ervin and his son and a school-teacher, Donovan, were arrested. No attempt was made to lynch them, as it was not certain that they were the guilty men. H. F. Randle, deputy county assessor, was arrested and is still in jail on the charge of being implicated in the shooting of Frost. Randle is a white man. The county assessor, Henry Ferguson, is a negro. On Wednesday morning the following circular was distributed about the stores of Richmond:

"Every white man in town is urgently requested to meet at the court-house at 1 o'clock p. m."

In response to this notice fully 400 men assembled in the court-house. Clem Bassett was elected president. After speeches, the following resolutions were adopted:

"Resolved, That in view of the crimes lately committed in our midst, we consider it necessary to the public good that the following persons be warned to leave the county within ten hours from notification: C. M. Ferguson, H. G. Lucas, Peter Warren, J. D. Davis, Tom Taylor, Jack Taylor, and C. M. Williams; that this convention wait as a committee of the whole on such of these persons as can now be found and through our president notify them of these resolutions, and that the others be notified by a copy of these resolutions; that the above-named parties be forever warned from returning to this county.

"Resolved, That we believe that the leaders of the Republican party of Fort Bend County are morally responsible for the assassination of J. M. Shamblin and the attempted assassination of H. H. Frost, and we demand of them to bring the guilty parties to justice, and we notify them and we solemnly warn them that the patience of an outraged people has been exhausted, and that if another Democrat in this county is personally harmed we will hold said leaders responsible in their persons for such acts."

A body of four hundred armed Democrats then warned the colored men to move and escorted them out of the county. The negroes were compelled to abandon homes, crops, and family. There was nothing against them but suspicion.

Mr. CHANDLER. The Senator from Texas undertook to make the Senate believe that in all these outrages the negroes are the aggressors. I do not deny but what the Democratic papers, and the Democratic reporters who furnish the reports to the metropolitan press of the South, assert that the negroes are the aggressors; but I undertake to say myself that in no case where an investigation may be made will it turn out that the negroes have been the aggressors. It is not in the nature of things. It is not in accordance with the facts as developed in previous affairs of this kind.

Mr. REAGAN. Will the Senator allow me a word?

Mr. CHANDLER. Certainly.

Mr. REAGAN. The facts about this are that Mr. Shamblin was supposed to be assassinated by a negro who had threatened his life because he was a Democrat. That was the beginning of it. He was called to the door and shot down in his own house.

Mr. CHANDLER. A negro killed a white man in his house, shot him down for being a Democrat?

Mr. REAGAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. CHANDLER. That is ridiculous.

Mr. REAGAN. Let me make my statement. It may be very unwelcome to the Senator—

Mr. CHANDLER. It is not unwelcome if it is true, but it is a ridiculous statement.

Mr. REAGAN. It may be very unwelcome to the Senator to hear that a Democrat was shot down by a Republican.

Mr. CHANDLER. That a negro went to a Democrat in his house and shot him down!

Mr. REAGAN. The man who shot him left a paper on his gate notifying him that he was killed for being a Democrat. Nothing was done about that. That was followed by the shooting of the other person named there. That was then followed, not by killing negroes in return for it, but by telling them that some of them must get away from there.

Mr. BLAIR. I should like to ask the Senator a question if he will permit me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. REAGAN. I have not the floor.

Mr. BLAIR. Under the general relations between the white and the colored people the fact that the white is the dominant race and that this inquiry among others is on foot, is there any reason to suspect that Democrats placed that same notification upon the door-post in order to create a suspicion at the North that the colored people were engaged in warfare and murder upon the dominant race of the South?

Mr. REAGAN. I must make a Yankee's answer to my friend by inquiring if he thinks it probable that a Democrat agreed to be shot down in order to make capital for the Democratic party?

Mr. BLAIR. I do not know about that. I do not know what the devotion of a Democrat to his party might lead him to do. I have a suspicion that perhaps he would for the sake of carrying the election and securing to his party the plunder of the next four years allow such a thing as this to be done, but I do not think it would be probable of the mass of the Democratic party. I do not understand, however, as the Senator does, or as he has previously said, that anything of the kind he suggests in his last remark is true. I understand him to say that there was a notification pinned upon the gate-post of the house of the white man murdered that he was murdered because he was a Democrat.

Mr. REAGAN. So the statement is made.

Mr. BLAIR. I do not understand that the colored man called the white man into the colored man's cabin and killed him and notified him that he killed him because he was a Democrat. That I do not understand.

Mr. REAGAN. It was a white man who was shot down in his own house, not in a colored man's house.

Mr. BLAIR. Exactly; a notification pinned upon the gate-post of the murdered white man that he was killed because he was a Democrat.

Mr. REAGAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. BLAIR. The question I asked was, there being a cloud over the actual source of that man's death, whether it is not possible that as a means of false explanation to the North, the Democrats invented that notification and pinned that falsehood upon the gate of this murdered man in order that the North might be misled? Does the Senator, in other words, think that a Republican negro entered upon a crusade against the dominant race of the South and killed one of its leaders because he was a Democrat and then posted a notice accordingly?

Mr. REAGAN. The Senator does not understand what took place there. The dominant party there are the negroes. I have heard the suggestion that men who agree with the Senator in politics—I do not mean in character but in politics—in that country stimulated outrages for the purpose of furnishing political capital to Republicans, but I have never heard the suggestion before now that Democrats killed one and came near killing another man in order to make political capital for the Republicans or anybody else.

The Senator's question, in view of what has appeared, is simply absurd. I know that the Senator and his associates in opinion have no sympathy with white men. They may be shot down for their politics and their families deprived of protection and support. That is all right. But if a colored man happens to be shot down, that is terribly wrong. They never propose to investigate where white men are killed. If there were to be a general investigation into fraud and crime, every day I could pick up newspapers and I could bring a peck of them here showing murders and crimes of the deepest dye all over the North. Why not investigate those things?

Mr. CHANDLER. Is there any pretense that they are political murders?

Mr. REAGAN. The gentleman chooses to call everything a political murder.

Mr. BLAIR. I wish merely, as I had a share—a third interest, I think—in this colloquy, to ask the Senator if it would not be well and just on the whole to the public sentiment of these 65,000,000 of people, South and North, for him to introduce a resolution of investigation to find out about this political murder of a Democrat by a negro in the State of Texas?

Mr. REAGAN. If I had no more respect for the Constitution of the United States than my friend from New Hampshire has, I should do it; but as I respect the Constitution I decline.

Mr. BLAIR. I understand the Senator's construction of the Constitution of the United States would leave such things as political murders uninquied into.

Mr. REAGAN. It does not leave them uninquied into, but it leaves the proper authorities to inquire into them.

Mr. BLAIR. That is, nothing can be done under the Constitution of the country to suppress them.

Mr. REAGAN. The Senator does not understand that there are such things as State constitutions and State laws and State courts to deal with local affairs of that kind?

Mr. BLAIR. No, I do not.

Mr. SPOONER. I want to say simply to the Senator from New Hampshire that I think he does not understand the question from the tenor of his last suggestion. I think that if he did he would assume that whenever a white Democrat is killed in the South by a negro the authorities are very prompt and efficient, and also some not in authority, in providing a remedy. It is only in those cases where a negro is killed by a Democrat that no rewards are offered and no attempt is made to apprehend or punish the guilty party.

Mr. REAGAN. That statement is gratuitous on the part of the Senator, and unjust and undeserved by the Southern people. So far as I know, certainly in the State of Texas, the punishment of crime, whether committed against blacks or whites, is as faithfully carried out as it could be in the State the Senator represents here, and such a statement ought not to be made by a Senator on this floor.

Mr. SPOONER. I have only this authority for making the statement as applied to the State of Texas, that in one case three colored men were hanged without any opportunity for trial, without any hearing, hunted as if they were dogs, and no reward was offered locally or by the governor of the State for the apprehension of the men who perpetrated that outrage; no grand jury ever inquired into it in the vicinity; no district attorney undertook to secure the apprehension of the men who did it. I have known of a case where a Democrat was shot down in the same county and a reward, and a large reward, was promptly offered by the governor of the State, and I think, also, locally, for the apprehension of the man who did it. I have that much warrant for the assumption that there is a different rule applied to those who kill Republican negroes from that which is applied to those who kill white Democrats.

Mr. REAGAN. That statement ought to be accompanied by this statement: That the judge of that district was a Republican, the district attorney was a Republican, and the county attorney was a Republican.

I have further to say, if the Senator is anxious to find a parallel, that he can go all over the Northern States and he will find places where men are lynched and no punishment is meted out to the lynchers, no proclamation issued, no reward offered for their apprehension, and apparently no more effort made than there was there to punish those men. We see accounts of them frequently, but it does not disturb the Senators that white men are lynched in Northern States and these lynchers are not punished and no rewards offered for their apprehension.

Mr. SPOONER. I simply want to say in response to that statement that I do not deny, and no man can deny, that in the Northern States there are occasionally lynchings; no man can deny that there are murders; but I have known no instance in my life where a lynching took place in a Northern State without a reward being offered and steps taken to ferret out the offenders and bring them to punishment. That is the difference between the two sections.

Mr. BLAIR. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire to the left of the Chair [Mr. CHANDLER] is entitled to the floor. Does he yield to his colleague?

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. BLAIR. I wish merely to say that if the Senator from Texas will put me in possession of the names and allegations of fact similar to those which he has so frequently stated to the Senate, I will myself take the responsibility, as I can do under my views of the Constitution, of introducing a resolution for the investigation of this case wherein, as I understand him, the proof will develop the fact—and I submit that it is the first one within the whole range of American history—that a colored Republican has murdered a Democratic leader in the State of Texas or any other State from political motives.

As the Senator represents the State where this outrage has been committed, respecting his constitutional scruples, as I must, if he will give me the data so that I can establish the facts, I will offer a resolution of investigation not only conscientiously, but with great alacrity, and I assure him with a perseverance that will probably result in a development of the actual facts.

Mr. REAGAN. I want to state one more fact, if the Senator from New Hampshire will permit me to do so.

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield.

Mr. REAGAN. It has not been long since at Longview, Tex., a colored man declared his intention to vote the Democratic ticket, and he was waited upon about midnight by some other colored men, taken off to the Sabine Swamp, and has never been heard of since. Another colored man was taken off—so the newspapers say—and murdered by other colored men for saying he was going to vote the Democratic ticket.

Mr. CHANDLER. Will the Senator give the names of those people?

Mr. REAGAN. I can not, because I do not remember them. The first occurrence was at Longview and was published in the newspapers. I do not remember even the locality of the other, but the newspapers stated it.

Mr. COKE. I can give the Senator the names.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from Texas [Mr. COKE]?

Mr. CHANDLER. I will yield in a moment if the Senator will wait, because I do not desire to prolong this discussion so far as I am concerned.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire declines to yield further.

Mr. CHANDLER. I congratulate the Senate and the Senators from Texas on the information which those Senators seem to have sought for and obtained since this resolution was last discussed. When it was before the Senate on a previous day the Senator from Texas nearest me [Mr. REAGAN] knew nothing whatever about the Washington County outrage, and had never heard of the assassination of eight negroes under the most atrocious circumstances at Spanish Camp, in Wharton County. But since that time the Senators do not seem to have needed the influence of the educational bill of my colleague [Mr. BLAIR] to arouse them into an inquiry into some of these transactions that are going on daily and hourly in Texas.

Mr. REAGAN. Mr. President—

Mr. CHANDLER. I decline to yield. I am glad that they have begun to investigate the political condition of Texas, where one-quarter of the voters are colored men. One thing is certain, that nothing has taken place in Texas which has led the Democrats of Texas to conclude that it will not be expedient or safe for them to put a State ticket in the field at the coming election. But it has been the result and the intended result—in my judgment—of the outrages that have been committed in that State to induce the Republicans of that State to nominate no State ticket. I will ask the Secretary to read—

Mr. REAGAN. I want—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. CHANDLER. Yes, sir.

Mr. REAGAN. I want to correct a statement which the Senator has made. The Senator puts me in the attitude of saying that I never heard of the affair at Spanish Camp. I never said any such thing. I did see a newspaper account of it very different from what the Senator presented. Now he presents the fact that the Republicans of Texas have not nominated a State ticket, because they are afraid to do so. I read the proceedings of their convention at Fort Worth within a few days, and the members of that convention distinctly repudiate the idea that they are afraid to put a ticket in the field, but as a matter of policy, to secure a combination of the elements of all the parties together, they prefer not to put a separate ticket in the field.

Mr. CHANDLER. I wonder that the Republicans of Texas under the circumstances had the courage even to hold a convention.

Mr. REAGAN. The leading Republican there, and the one who was their candidate for lieutenant-governor at the last election, distinctly repudiated that doctrine.

Mr. CHANDLER. I ask for the reading of the paper I send to the desk.

The Secretary read as follows:

REPUBLICAN TERRORISM IN TEXAS.

[The New York Star, Wednesday, September 12, 1888.]

GALVESTON, September 11.

The Republicans of Galveston County in mass-meeting last night adopted resolutions condemning the occurrences in Fort Bend and Washington and appealing to the governor of the State to right matters. Another resolution was adopted, as follows: "That the mob violence of Fort Bend County and the assassination of Joseph Hoffman, of Washington County, admonishes us that similar scenes may be expected to follow the vigorous efforts of our party in counties in which the Republican vote predominates; therefore it is the sense of this convention that the interest of the Republican party will be best served by not nominating a State ticket."

Mr. CHANDLER. I now yield the floor.

Mr. COKE. Mr. President, the statement just made by the Senator from New Hampshire, that the Republicans failed to put out a State ticket because of fear of personal consequences, I denounce here as absolutely and unqualifiedly false, without a particle of foundation. It is a statement made for political effect. The purpose for which it is made is a dishonest and an unfair one. It is a statement not believed by the Senator who makes it himself.

Mr. CHANDLER. I call the Senator to order, and ask that the words which he has uttered be read, and that the Chair may rule whether or not they are parliamentary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas will proceed in order.

Mr. COKE. If I have said anything derogatory to the dignity of the Senate, I withdraw it and apologize to the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will proceed in order.

Mr. CHANDLER. I desire to make a suggestion. I am not very familiar with the rules which govern parliamentary debate, and I do not

know how far a Senator is at liberty to go on and say that a statement made by another Senator is unqualifiedly false, or that it is made for dishonest and unworthy purposes. If that be the practice of the Senate, if that be the rule of parliamentary law, I do not object to it. I am just as ready to engage in that kind of debate probably as any Senator on the other side; but it seems to me that the Senate can not afford to indulge in that kind of debate. The more language of that kind that comes from Senators on that side the better it is for Senators on this side.

Mr. DAWES. I understand the rule to be that when a Senator is called to order for unparliamentary language, it is his duty to sit down until the Chair has ruled upon the language taken down at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Such is the order of the Senate, and the Senator from Texas will take his seat.

Mr. COKE. I submit, of course, to the orders of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would hold that the language used by the Senator from Texas was unparliamentary, but he understood that Senator to say that he withdrew the remark and tendered an apology to the Senate for its use.

Mr. COKE. That is what I did say.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas will proceed in order.

Mr. COKE. The Senator from New Hampshire seems anxious that somebody on this side of the Chamber should kick him. I refuse to perform the operation. [Laughter in the galleries.]

Mr. CHANDLER. I call the Senator to order, and ask that his words be taken down.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas will please resume his seat. The Senator from New Hampshire will please state his question of order.

Mr. CHANDLER. I submit that the language used was unparliamentary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would hold that the language is not warranted by parliamentary law.

Mr. COKE. Then I withdraw the language and apologize to the Senate for having used it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will proceed in order.

Mr. COKE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will suspend one moment. The Chair will ask that the Senate preserve order, and he cautions the occupants of the galleries that marks of approval or disapprobation are forbidden by the rules of the Senate, and if they are persisted in the galleries will be cleared. The Senator from Texas will proceed.

Mr. COKE. The statement of the Senator to which I have just referred, that the Republican party failed to put out a ticket in Texas because they feared the consequences personally to the Republicans, is not true and not correct. I hold in my hand a clipping from the Austin Statesman giving an account of the proceedings in the Republican county convention at Austin, which I ask the Secretary to read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The paper will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

TRAVIS COUNTY REPUBLICANS.

[Special to the Gazette.]

AUSTIN, TEX., September 15.

The Travis County Republican convention to-day appointed the following delegates to the State convention at Fort Worth on the 20th instant: J. C. Degress, J. B. Rector, C. A. Newning, D. Friedman, J. M. Holland, R. Platte, J. M. Snyder, J. A. Black, W. E. Easton, J. P. Taylor, J. B. Allen, Tom Helm, W. P. Bacon, W. B. Brush, J. Kerschler, M. Alexander, A. B. Palm, William Nichols, H. Russell, William Alexander, H. J. Oldham, A. Werton, F. Hall, H. Dickerson, and W. C. Rinishes.

The following resolutions were introduced in the Travis County Republican convention to-day:

"Whereas it is a well-known fact that since the Democratic party has been in power in this State the Republicans in a great many counties in the State have been terrorized and proscribed socially and otherwise; hundreds have been murdered, others have been required to leave their homes and again seek homes in other States; thousands of voters have been intimidated, and through fear have remained away from the polls, and thereby failed to exercise the right of suffrage as guaranteed to them under the Constitution and laws of this State; and

"Whereas this feeling of proscription exists to a greater or less extent in almost every county in this State; and

"Whereas there has been a Republican convention called to meet at Fort Worth on the 20th day of this month to select a candidate for governor and other State officers against the Democratic nominees for State officers; and

"Whereas we believe that there are at least 50,000 or 60,000 Republican voters in this State that have not voted the Republican ticket on account of the foregoing reason; and

"Whereas we believe there are thousands of intelligent Democrats or in other organized parties that stand willing or ready to join us in a continued effort to overthrow the old moss-backs, Bourbon, rebel, collar-bound element of the Democratic organization; Therefore,

"Be it resolved, That the delegates from this county to the Republican convention at Fort Worth be, and are hereby, instructed to co-operate with other parties and organizations that will best subserve the purposes heretofore mentioned."

The resolutions were voted down by 63 to 16. The point about it is the convention was composed of three-quarters negroes. The resolutions were introduced by a white man named Platte, a city alderman. The sixteen who voted for the resolutions were white men, and the negroes having more honesty than their white friends voted them down. A prominent negro got up and said the resolutions were a lie on the people of Texas. Thus the Republican negroes of Travis County give the lie to HOAR, INGALLS, and other bloody-shirt wearers.

It transpires that the bloody-shirt resolutions introduced in the Travis County Republican convention to-day, but defeated by 63 to 16, were written by a promi-

ment white Republican politician of Austin now in the North, and intended for use against Cleveland and Thurman in the Northern States to fire the Northern heart. He failed.

Mr. COKE. Now, Mr. President, I will state that Judge Rector, who figures in this Republican convention, is the chairman of the Republican State executive committee, and he voted against this resolution and denounced it in a speech on the floor of that convention. I ask that the proceedings of the Cooke County Republican convention also be read. Cooke County is 350 miles from Travis County, where these proceedings were held.

The Secretary read as follows:

COOKE COUNTY REPUBLICANS.

[Special to the Gazette.]

GAINESVILLE, TEX., September 18.

The Republican convention of Cooke County met here this afternoon and was called to order by the county chairman. Delegates to the Fort Worth convention were elected, and resolutions indorsing the Chicago platform and favoring the nomination of a straight Republican ticket for all State offices were adopted.

W. B. Johnson, attorney, in a speech, referred to the alleged outrages reported from time to time and said for the most part they were all bosh. He had been in Texas several years and he had never been mistreated on account of his politics.

The chairman said it was reported all through the North that the Republicans of Texas were afraid to put out a ticket. He had been in the State fifteen years. He believed Texas was just as good a State for Republicans as for Democrats. Some of his best friends are Democrats. He had never been abused for being a Republican.

Mr. Harris echoed the sentiments of the chair. He labored under no embarrassment by being a Republican. He believed there are as fair elections in Texas as anywhere. He was in favor of a straight Republican State ticket.

On motion, the convention resolved itself into a Harrison and Morton club, and about fifty members were enrolled. The convention then adjourned till next Thursday.

Mr. COKE. I hold in my hand the platform of the Republican party of Texas, just adopted two or three days ago in convention at Fort Worth. Unless some gentleman on the other side desires it read in full I will not ask that it be done.

Mr. BLAIR. I should be glad to hear it.

Mr. COKE. Very well, I will read it. The portion you would like to hear particularly I intended to read. I send it to the desk to be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

THE PLATFORM—OUTRAGES DENOUNCED.

We, your committee on platform and resolutions, beg leave to report as follows:

We cordially ratify the nomination of that eminent statesman and tried soldier, Benjamin Harrison, for President, and that able financier and philanthropic citizen, Levi P. Morton, for Vice-President, and do hereby pledge them our hearty support.

We hereby declare that we are in thorough accord with the platform promulgated by the late national convention at Chicago, and with the principles of the national Republican party as enunciated, explained, and interpreted in the recent letter of Benjamin Harrison accepting the nomination of the Republican party for President.

We demand such national legislation as will give adequate protection to wool, hides, and all Texas products and industries.

As citizens of this great State, the mutual welfare of which is to us paramount to every partisan consideration, we deplore the existence of these outrages which have been recently committed in Fort Bend and Washington Counties.

We believe that the growth, development, and prosperity of this great State should not be retarded nor imperiled by the lawless acts of certain parties in these counties. We denounce these outrages and demand that their perpetrators be punished according to the law of the land, without regard to party affiliation.

Mr. BLAIR. I ask the Senator if he does not approve of that language in the Republican platform?

Mr. COKE. That plank, of course I do.

Mr. BLAIR. I supposed so.

Mr. COKE. That was the one I intended reading for the Senator's benefit.

Mr. BLAIR. Then in regard to what they say of wool and other things that relate to the general prosperity of Texas? [Laughter.]

Mr. COKE. I have nothing to say about that just now. [Laughter.]

Mr. BLAIR. I supposed so.

Mr. COKE. Let the reading continue.

The Secretary continued the reading, as follows:

In view of the fact that the Republicans of Texas have already placed a full electoral ticket in the field, and the further fact that there is no reasonable probability of electing a State Republican ticket, we hereby express our conviction that it would be unwise and inexpedient under these and other existing circumstances for the Republicans of Texas to place in the field any candidate or candidates for State offices.

Respectfully submitted.

EUGENE MARSHALL, Chairman.

A motion to receive the report and discharge the committee was made. This was objected to, and an amendment that the report be received and adopted was put to the house. The result was that the amendment was adopted by a vote of 256 to 130.

A motion thanking the chair and officers and the citizens of Fort Worth was adopted.

Richard Nelson introduced a resolution indorsing the Globe-Democrat as the faithful friend of the colored people of the Southwest. This was also adopted.

On motion of Richard Allen, of Harris, a campaign committee was provided for. De Gress was made the chairman, with power to make up the committee by appointing on it one Republican from each Congressional district.

The convention then adjourned *sine die*.

Mr. COKE. I have had that read for the purpose of nailing the falsehood that has been repeated in the press and in the Senate that the Republican party were afraid to put out a ticket in Texas.

Mr. BLAIR. Will the Senator answer me the question in what way that platform proves that the Republican party were not afraid to put out a ticket?

Mr. COKE. The recital of the platform, the last clause of it:

In view of the fact that the Republicans of Texas have already placed a full electoral ticket in the field, and the further fact that there is no reasonable probability of electing a State Republican ticket, we hereby express our conviction that it would be unwise and inexpedient under these and other existing circumstances for the Republicans of Texas to place in the field any candidate or candidates for State offices.

Mr. BLAIR. Now, I ask the Senator's attention to that clause in view of the fact that there is no reasonable probability of the Republicans electing a State officer; is not that a peculiar form of expression, and how does the Senator account for the fact there stated?

Mr. COKE. If the Senator will allow me to proceed, he will find—

Mr. BLAIR. If the Senator understands my question by a sort of mental process which does not require me to state it, if he takes it naturally, and he sees the point, I certainly shall be very glad to have him answer it.

Mr. COKE. The Republican party of Texas is in a hopeless minority. At this time there are some two or three other political parties in Texas. All of them together may present a respectable appearance and poll a respectable vote. For the purpose of joining fortunes with these the Republican party of Texas simply does not put a ticket in the field, and it is understood that the Republicans are to vote with these other parties I have referred to.

Mr. BLAIR. Will the Senator name those parties?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. COKE. I will yield now.

Mr. BLAIR. I simply wish to ask, does the Senator mean by "these other parties" the Prohibitionists?

Mr. COKE. They are the Prohibitionists and the Union Labor party, the Non-partisan party, and well, several others, the names of which I do not remember now.

Mr. BLAIR. The Prohibitionists being the chief; and is it not probable, then, this combination is made with the Prohibitionists in the hope of dividing the Texas delegation in the Senate and securing the support of the Senator's colleague?

Mr. COKE. The Senator can answer that question to suit himself. [Laughter.] All that I have to say about it is that the statement heretofore made in the Senate, that has been repeated in the Senate, that the Republicans refused to put out a ticket because they were afraid to do it, is not true, and this platform proves it; the proceedings of the Republican convention at Austin prove it; the proceedings of the Republican convention at Gainesville are clear proof of it. Now, Mr. President, I hope since that statement has been nailed to the counter it will be allowed to remain there and will not be taken up and used again in this canvass. It is untrue. The facts show it to be untrue. The Republicans of Texas themselves have denounced it as untrue and certainly it ought to be taken to be untrue.

Mr. President, with reference to the difficulty in Fort Bend County, about which something was said a few minutes ago, I have a statement here in a paper from that county:

REPUBLICANISM VS. ASSASSINATION.

On the night of August 1, 1888, Mr. J. M. Shamblin, a peaceable and most worthy citizen of this county, was cruelly murdered by an unknown assassin while sitting quietly at his home at night, surrounded by his wife and children. On the front gate of Mr. Shamblin's yard was tacked a notice which read as follows, some alterations being made in the punctuation and spelling.

I will ask that this notice be read by the Secretary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

"I am just from town and full of h—ll in the neck. Mr. Shamblin, you have been holding Democratic meetings with the negroes, and you have said that any negro that don't vote the Democratic ticket is sticking a knife in your child's side. The Republicans have declared that no Democrat shall be allowed to hold any Democratic meeting in any private place among the ignorant race of negroes. It is said that Grandpa Harrison's pants won't fit Benny, but Benny is going to wear them before the end of time. The Republican party is going to hold their heads up if they die hard. We will have no Democrat to mislead the ignorant negro astray. You are the man to lead them astray and cut their throats and suck their blood. I am a Republican, and have no use for a d—n Democrat. This is a lesson to all d—n cut-throat Democrats to hold no more Democratic meetings with the ignorant negro race of people."

This notice was written on a slip of paper torn from a railroad time-book, and corresponded exactly with the missing page of a time-book found in the possession of William Caldwell, a negro, while the writing seemed identical with the writing of Caldwell. This notice was published in nearly every daily paper in the State, besides a large number of weeklies, and the general impression conveyed was that Mr. Shamblin had been assassinated for political reasons, and because he was an influential Democrat.

Mr. COKE. Mr. President, some two or three weeks afterwards Mr. Frost, a very prominent citizen of Fort Bend County, living in the same town with Mr. Shamblin, was going home about 9 o'clock at night, and as he opened his front gate was fired on from ambush and seriously and badly wounded. Mr. Frost was, like Mr. Shamblin, a prominent Democrat and white man. Steps were taken to try to ascertain who the assassin was. The people failed to find who he was, but suspicion rested very strongly upon three or four persons who were negroes, and they were ordered to leave. Shamblin had been mur-

dered in his own house surrounded by his wife and children; Frost had been shot down at his own gate as he was going home at night.

Mark the conservatism of those people when not being entirely satisfied, having strong proof, but not that which amounted to legal evidence, that certain parties were guilty of this assassination, they offered them no violence, but as a measure of defense, as a measure of self-protection, as a measure to preserve the lives of other citizens, simply ordered them to leave; and they did leave. That was a Democratic outrage; but two Democrats—one was murdered in the presence of his wife and children, and an attempt was made to murder the other, and he was grievously wounded when he was going into his own yard at night. That is the Fort Bend occurrence. That is the transaction denounced here by the Senator from New Hampshire as a Democratic outrage. That is all there is about that. No drop of Republican blood has been shed in Fort Bend County; but one Democrat has been brutally butchered and another crippled and maimed for life by the shot of a Republican assassin.

Now, as to Washington County, the Senator from Wisconsin says that three negroes were taken out and hanged. This is true; but he failed to state the whole truth, and it is as reprehensible in morals as in law to fail to state the whole truth as it is to fail to state the truth at all. These three negroes were taken out of jail and hanged. They were taken out by a masked mob; and why were they taken out? They were taken out because they were accessories to the murder of young Bolton, another white man.

Notice the fact, Mr. President, that the assassin's shot has yet struck no Republican. The blood that has been shed has been the blood of white men and of Democrats in Fort Bend County and in Washington County, except the three negroes who were taken out of jail and hanged by a masked mob. These three negroes, as I stated here on a former occasion, for safe-keeping, in view of the violence that was feared against them, were sent to Houston and placed in jail there, and just before court met, and when it was believed that the feeling had subsided, they were sent back for trial to Brenham. Then it was that the jail was broken into and they were taken out and hung. They were hung for that for which men from the earliest history of this country have been hung, and in the way that men have been hung ever since these United States have been a country. It was not right to take them from the jail and hang them. It was not right to do this; I do not justify it; but I do say that the motive which prompted these men to take and hang these negroes was the same motive that has prompted similar performances in every State in this Union. The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. HAWLEY] said that nothing of that sort has ever occurred in Connecticut. I was interrupted to be so informed when this question was before the Senate heretofore, and I excepted Connecticut. I do not believe there is a State in this Union in which mobs have not hung men, and I believe that there are some States every county in which have witnessed similar violations of law.

The effort to make this out political is unworthy of a Senator. There was nothing political about it. The man who fired the shot that killed young Bolton is, I believe, alive now. These negroes were accessories. The feeling engendered by the murder of Bolton prompted the breaking of the jail and the hanging of these negroes, and not any political motive or political purpose.

Another Democratic outrage which is paraded before the country is the killing of Joseph Hoffman. Hoffman was a candidate for a county office on the Democratic ticket. He was a Republican, but the same shot that killed Hoffman also killed Holt, the most active, aggressive, and pushing Democrat in Washington County. Hoffman and Holt were sitting together, and the assassin fired and killed both of them. Hoffman was running on a Democratic ticket, and Holt was one of the leading Democrats of the county; and yet the assassin who killed both of them with one shot is said to have perpetrated a Democratic outrage.

Hoffman is the only man in Texas, so far as the testimony before the Senate goes, who has been struck by a bullet, because there is no proof of any other. While he was a Republican he was running on a mixed ticket, on a Democratic ticket, and the man who was killed with him was one of the most extreme Democrats in the county.

These are the Texas outrages; these are the outrages that have been kept for two or three years to fire the Northern mind for the purpose of gaining votes for the Republican ticket!

Mr. President, I find in the platform which has been read in the hearing of the Senate—

We denounce the outrages in Fort Bend and in Washington Counties.

And the outrages in Fort Bend and in Washington Counties are those that I have recited to you. They speak of no others in this platform. In one hundred and ninety counties in Texas the transactions that I have narrated to you are the only ones they can rake and scrape to assail Texas on. I suppose two and one-half millions of people—people from every country under the sun, not homogeneous people like your people in the Northern and Eastern States, but they are people from everywhere, who have not yet had time to be fused into a homogeneous mass, a condition of society which presents the very best conditions for violence and personal collision, and yet only two counties are found in

the State where a mendacious Republican press are willing to frame a charge.

Mr. President, I dislike discussions of this character. I have to be driven into them. I believe there is no statesmanship in them. I believe they are derogatory to the dignity and character of the Senate. I believe they are disgraceful to this body. And yet my State has been attacked, my people have been slandered and traduced, and I speak in their defense only when driven to the wall. If gentlemen have anything legitimate to say against Texas let them say it. But when a great State like that is arraigned before the American people and the American Congress, I submit that charges of graver import than these should be brought against her.

I think, as I remarked awhile ago in answer to a question of my friend on my left, that we have 2,500,000 at least of people in Texas, and I will say about that 2,500,000 people that there are not 2,500,000 people in this Union who are doing more to make this a grand and a glorious country than they are.

We have there, Mr. President, the raw material of wool and of cotton and of hides to keep all the spindles and artisans in the United States who manufacture those materials going for an indefinite time. We have 8,000 miles of railroad, and it is being increased annually at the rate of from 1,000 to 1,500 miles. After feeding our people, we sent out \$175,000,000 worth of products to other States and to foreign countries for sale. We are discharging our duty the best we know how, and we think we know as well how as the Senator from Wisconsin and the Senator from New Hampshire. At all events we are attending strictly to our own business, and we challenge any State in the Union to present a better record for social order than the Republican platform of Texas by the clearest implication shows that we have.

I do not care to thrash over old straw. This question was up some ten days or two weeks ago and was discussed. It is brought up again. It seems to be kept on tap to be used on any and all occasions. I have nothing further to say about it than that the allegations made against the people of Washington County, the people of Fort Bend County, and the people of Texas generally, are infamous slanders and falsehoods such as should never have been heard in the American Senate.

Mr. SPOONER. Mr. President, I am surprised that the remark I made to the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BLAIR] has led the Senator from Texas [Mr. COKE] to repeat, with some variations not altogether creditable to him, I think, the speech which he submitted on another occasion. I did not intend, I assure the Senate, to bring into debate again by the remark I made the Washington County outrages. The Senator from Texas gratuitously informs me that a suppression of the truth is as bad as a falsehood. When I want a teacher in ethics, Mr. President, I shall not go to Texas for one.

The Senator says that this discussion, and I am warranted in supposing that he includes the discussion of kindred topics, is a disgrace to this body. That depends, in my judgment, upon the manner of debate. I know of no subject better befitting the dignity of the United States Senate than the maintenance of constitutional right in the citizen of the United States. I know of no question which dignified Senators can better afford in the discharge of their duty to investigate and to debate than questions affecting the well-being and safety of republican government, and to determine whether there be any place in the United States where the rights of citizenship are denied to men entitled to them. There is nothing in the subject which warrants the animadversion of the Senator from Texas, and so far as my participation in this debate is concerned there has been nothing in it, I submit, which tended to degrade the Senate or which was not in harmony with the dignity which should prevail here. The bandying of epithets about this Chamber is disgraceful, no matter what the subject of debate may chance to be.

I am not to be taunted by the Senator from Texas or any other Senator with half telling the truth. The day when the manners of the negro-driver could frighten men in the United States Senate has gone by and gone by forever. [Applause in the galleries.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER rapped with his gavel.

Mr. SPOONER. This is a place for debate, for argument, not for abuse. The assumption that I have prejudice or hatred against the State of Texas, or the people of Texas, or the people of the South, is utterly without foundation. I want to see the South prosperous. I have withheld no vote since I became a member of this body which could by any possibility tend to build up the South, nor shall I do so; but when I am charged by the Senate of the United States with the performance of a duty, when I am bidden to investigate charges against a county in the State of Texas, or in any other State, and in the discharge of that duty I find that the rights of citizenship are denied there, that the law is trampled upon there, and that men in high station wink at it, and that the people of a county applaud it, and not only applaud it but reward it, I should be unworthy a place in this Senate if I did not say so to the Senate, and say so to the people of the United States.

The Senator can not meet this case, his colleagues can not meet kindred cases, by saying that this is for political effect, that it is to arouse the public mind simply for election purposes. I wish it might arouse the public mind to rightly appreciate that there is a community where

Judge Kirk, the man who helped to plan and carry out the infamous outrages upon the franchise in Washington County, Texas, is decorated, is nominated again to preside over the orphans' court, and poor Joe Hoffman, the German-Republican soldier, is shot to death like a dog. If such things do not arouse the indignation of liberty-loving people, then the people of this country have undergone a change, and not a change for the better either.

Mr. President, I spoke with absolute sincerity the other day when I said that the whole debate and the entire subject was disagreeable to me. I wish there were no spot or place under our flag where a citizen can not exercise all the rights of a citizen. I take no pleasure in what I believe to be the fact, that in certain portions of this country those rights are denied and trampled upon for political purposes. It will not do for the Senator in answer to this to turn to us and say "We have so many thousand miles of railroad," "We have so many hides," "We have so many farms." You can not stop the ears of the people of the United States with greenbacks. They will not be deaf to petitions for relief or insensible to outrage and wrong perpetrated upon citizens; and the sooner that is realized in every part of this country the better it will be for us all.

The Senator from Texas the other day—and it showed how hard pushed he was for argument in this matter—when I read a letter from Joe Hoffman, in which he expressed his fear, and stated that he had been threatened, the letter of a brave, true-hearted man, which must touch every sensitive heart, challenged the authenticity of it because it was sent to me from Topeka by Judge Hackworth, and by the way I am told by the President of the Senate that Judge Hackworth is respected in Topeka, Kans., where he has built up a successful business.

Mr. COKE. They do not know him.

Mr. SPOONER. Perhaps not. We shall see.

Mr. COKE. They will find him out.

Mr. SPOONER. We shall see. He can vote there as he pleases, and can live there and can do business and is in no danger of being shot down and in no danger of being driven out. The Senator challenged the authenticity of the letter of Joe Hoffman upon the ground that it came from Hackworth. Mr. President, I have seen letters from Joe Hoffman, one of which came from Texas directed to Washington to a gentleman residing here. The post-mark is the Hempstead and Austin railway post-office, the same one that was upon the envelope containing Joe Hoffman's letter to Mr. Hackworth, which I read in the hearing of the Senate some days since. The matter of post-mark was the great point upon which the distinguished Senator from Texas wanted the Senate and the people of the country to ignore what was stated in that letter and to consider it as a fabrication.

I have a letter from a gentleman in Brenham, Tex., before me addressed to me, and it is post-marked in the same way. I have a letter also which did not come directly to me which states how Joe Hoffman died. It says:

He walked up the sidewalk as far as Murphy's, and there he met Jim—

That is, Jim Holt—

and told him that they were after us—

Referring to another, and not to Holt.

The letter states that they had been followed for nearly half an hour, and continues:

Jim, with an oath, said, "Joe, I will protect you; you are in no danger here;" and they both sat down in the front door, one on each side, facing the court-house, and had not sat there very long before the buckshot came. Joe jumped up and said, "Oh, Lord, what will become of my poor children?" and fell dead in the next door. Jim jumped up and tried to help Joe in the house, not knowing that he was shot, and while doing so he fell in a faint, and the doctor pronounced him also dead.

He did not die immediately, but since then has died. The other day the Senator from Texas repeatedly announced, and based a portion of his argument upon it, that Joe Hoffman was a Democrat. To-day he corrects that blunder—I beg pardon; I will endeavor to be more courteous than the Senator—he corrects that mistake and admits—

Mr. COKE. If the Senator will allow me, I stated that Mr. Hoffman was running on a Democratic ticket, not that he was a Democrat.

Mr. SPOONER. The Senate will remember the colloquy between the Senator from New York [Mr. EVARTS] and the Senator from Texas upon that subject, and I am very certain that my recollection of it is accurate.

Mr. COKE. I will remark that the Senator may possibly be accurate. I never heard of the case at all until I saw it in the newspaper dispatches; but that he was running on the Democratic ticket was certain, and that is what I stated certainly when I spoke the other day.

Mr. SPOONER. The Senator stated repeatedly, I think, that he was a Democrat and that he was running on the Democratic ticket. I stated that he was a Republican and that he was running on a union or mixed ticket, the formation of which was advised by Judge Hackworth, and in opposition to the regular Democratic ticket headed by Judge Kirk, which is the fact as I understand it.

Now, Mr. President, there can be no mistake about the accuracy and foundation of the charges made against the people of Washington County, Texas, as to the election which took place there in 1886, and the Senator from Texas can not successfully combat the facts nor meet the case in the way which it has pleased him to adopt.

I stated the other day to the Senator, and I state it again to the Senate and to the people, that the testimony shows that one ballot-box and the tally-list were forcibly seized by armed men at night, as they were being taken by officials to the county seat, from the custodians of them. I stated, and the testimony clearly shows it, that at one of the polling-places, Flewellyn, armed men, disguised, pushed their way into the room when the ballots were being counted, interrupted the officers in the discharge of that duty, and that one of the raiders was shot; the Senator says murdered. This was Mr. Bolton.

Mr. President, every colored man in the room at that poll—and there were three or more, I think—testified to the facts as I state them. Two white Democrats who were present, after some prevarication admitted some of the facts but denied others.

The Senator—and that is his wont in dealing with this transaction—discards as utterly unworthy of credit the testimony of colored Republican witnesses and accepts as God's truth, no matter by how many contradicted or how absurd in itself, or how inconsistent with circumstances, the testimony of one or two white Democrats.

Now, sir, I have before me a letter signed by the United States district attorney of that district, a Democrat appointed by this Administration, Rudolph Kleberg. It is also signed by Thomas H. Franklin, appointed by the Attorney-General as special counsel to assist in the prosecution of these men under indictment in the Federal court for perpetrating these outrages.

The testimony before the committee, not at all overthrown in my judgment, was that the man Bolton was in disguise; that he had on what was called a "slicker," or yellow oil-proof coat; that there was a handkerchief over his face, and I want to call the attention of the Senator from Texas and of the Senate in order to show what I hope no Senator here deems necessary should be shown, that this is not the work of a Republican committee gotten up now on the eve of election simply for partisan purposes, to the report these gentlemen made to the Attorney-General of the United States, dated December 21, 1887, which commences thus:

COCKE, DENMAN & FRANKLIN, ATTORNEYS,
San Antonio, Bexar County, Texas, December 21, 1887.

DEAR SIR: Yours of the 14th instant, requesting a report upon the Washington County election cases in United States district court at Austin, together with copy of letter from Senator COKE therein inclosed, received.

Replying thereto, we beg leave to say:

The indictment upon which a trial was had at the last term of said court at Austin contained the following counts:

First count, charging conspiracy to interfere with the officers of election at Flewellyn precinct, in said Washington County, in the performance of duties required of them by law, at which said election a member of the Federal Congress was voted for and elected.

Second count, charging conspiracy to commit similar offenses at Graball precinct.

Third count, charging the robbing of the ballot-box at Graball precinct.

Fourth count, charging general conspiracy to interfere with officers of election at Graball, Flewellyn & Lott's store.

The indictment is not before us and we state its contents from memory.

Motion was made to quash the bill and overruled.

The Government proved the following facts on the trial:

1. That an election was held as charged in the indictment, the candidates for Congress thereat being Hon. R. Q. Mills and — Rankin.

2. That the election precincts named in the bill were heavily Republican.

3. That there were two local parties in the field at said election, a straight Republican and "People's" or Democratic party.

4. That the Republican ticket was printed on a diamond-shaped ballot.

5. That at the precincts named in the bill the officers of election had decided to count the diamond-shaped ballots, but at other precincts they were declared illegal by the officers of election and not counted. At none of these last-mentioned polling places were the officers of election interfered with in any way.

6. That if all the diamond-shaped ballots cast had been counted, also the votes at Flewellyn, Graball, and Lott's Store, then the straight Republican ticket would have been elected by a large majority.

7. That on the night of the election whilst the officers of election at Graball were counting the votes, the ballots and ballot-box were forcibly taken by armed men, who were masked by having white cloths or handkerchiefs tied over the lower part of their faces.

8. That on the night after the election the ballot-box containing the ballots cast at Lott's Store was forcibly taken from one of the officers of election by masked and armed men while said officer was taking the same to the county seat, as required by law.

9. That on the night of the election armed and masked men undertook to take the ballot-box at Flewellyn, when one of them, subsequently proved to be Dewees Bolton, was shot dead by a negro named Polk Hill, who is now, we are informed, in jail in Milam County, Texas. The defendants contended that when shot Bolton was alone, unarmed, and unmasked; but—

I am asking now the attention of the Senate, not to any statement from Republicans of the Senate or elsewhere, but to this statement by the United States district attorney and his assistant in this case upon the subject of Bolton's visit to the polls and his disguise, etc.—

but this theory, we believe, was thoroughly demolished by the Government, Bolton's own father testifying that when he got to his son's body, shortly after the shooting, he (his son) had on a "slicker," or rain coat, and had a handkerchief knotted around his throat. The weather was dry and mild, and no necessity was shown for the use of such a coat on such a night.

10. That a number of negroes who were present when Bolton was shot were arrested and put in jail the day after the killing, and subsequently three of the number were taken from jail by a mob and hanged.

11. The Government then proceeded to show by evidence that the defendants were some of the conspirators who participated in the alleged conspiracy and the acts done in pursuance thereof. The testimony on this branch of the case was in the main circumstantial. It was shown that they took an active part in the canvass in the interest of the People's ticket; that some of them were candidates for office on that ticket; that some of them were at different voting places on election day armed; that some of them had threatened negroes because of their activity in the canvass; that some of them had threatened the life of some of the Government witnesses; that they were seen together leaving Chapell Hill on the night of the election and going in the direction of Graball; that later at night some of them were seen, together with other persons not

identified, and were guided into a short road to Graball; that defendant Kirk left Brenham about 5 o'clock of the evening of election day and rode to Chapell Hill; when next heard of that night he is at Flewellyn about midnight, making inquiry as to how the vote stood; that he called out the presiding election officer and held a brief conversation with him, then rode off, and shortly after the attempt was made to rob the box; that at 12 m. of that day he sent to D. D. Bolton the following telegram from Brenham: "Things here look gloomy; do your work."

Other circumstances tending to identify the defendants were proven, but we do not deem it necessary to here refer to them, but simply state that we believe the facts do show that the defendants on trial participated in the commission of the offenses charged.

The defendants each relied upon an alibi as a defense. None of them testified in their own behalf, but introduced a number of witnesses to establish that defense. In argument counsel for the defense conceded that grave offenses against the law had been shown by the testimony, but contended that the defendants were not the guilty parties. They also contended that the offenses committed were violations of the State and not the Federal statutes. The real issue in the case, however, is simply this: Are the defendants the persons or some of the persons who committed the offenses charged in the bill?

The Government did not undertake to show that these defendants had conspired to rob ballot-boxes, and had robbed ballot-boxes, with the single intent to affect the result of the Congressional election, for the result of their conspiracy and the effect of their acts necessarily affected the Congressional election, regardless of the motive which prompted the conspiracy and directed the acts.

We do not understand the law to be that one can rob a ballot-box in which citizens have cast their ballots for a member of Congress, and destroy the votes cast for such member, and then claim immunity from punishment under the laws of the United States upon the ground that his intent in the robbery and his purpose in such destruction was not to affect the Congressional contest, but to defeat some candidate for constable who had been voted for on the same ballots.

We think the authorities establish the law to be that the Federal statutes were enacted to secure fairness at Congressional elections, and to protect the citizen in the free exercise of his right of suffrage at such an election. We refer to the following adjudications:

Ex parte Yarborough, 110 U. S., 651. *Ex parte Siebold*, 100 U. S., 371-404. *United States vs. Jackson*, 25 Fed. Rep., 548. *United States vs. McBosdy*, 29 Fed. Rep., 897.

The jury trying the case found some of the defendants not guilty on the count charging them with the robbery of the Graball box and disagreed upon all other counts in the bill. None of the defendants have been acquitted on any of the conspiracy counts.

The stenographic report of the trial is in the hands of the clerk of the Federal court at Austin. It is very voluminous and in some respects inaccurate.

These cases have received our careful attention and the facts an impartial consideration by us. We have not allowed the Republicans of Washington County to give any political coloring to the prosecution, nor have we permitted our attachment to the Democratic party to sway us from the full performance of our duty as sworn officers of the Government in the prosecution of the defendants. We have given them a quiet, determined, and impartial prosecution, and believe it was demanded by the offenses committed and the facts connecting them with the commission of same.

Regarding the facts in our possession calmly and impartially, we are convinced that they show the commission of grave offenses against the laws of the Federal Government by the indicted parties; and if such offenses are left unprosecuted and the perpetrators unpunished the right of suffrage in this country can have no protection save that which each citizen may find in his own strong arm.

The stability of this Government depends on the virtue of its citizens, and that virtue can only be carried into the Government through the medium of the ballot-box; and if in one community the right of suffrage of a number of citizens is trampled upon by others, who are permitted by organized society to go "unwhipped of justice," then certainly the lawless element in any community is given full license to dominate over the virtuous, and order will soon resolve itself into chaos.

So believing, we feel that it is our duty to prosecute these cases to a final hearing, and if the defendants are acquitted that the responsibility of such acquittal should rest with a jury of their countrymen.

This being our duty, we must either do it and be true to our oaths as officers of the Government, or not do it and be false to our oaths and false to ourselves. If the Department of Justice wishes these prosecutions dismissed and shall so direct, we shall follow instructions, informing the court of our directions; but if we are not so directed we shall bring these cases to trial, if possible, and give the defendants a fair hearing and a vigorous prosecution.

Very respectfully, your obedient servant,

RUD. KLEBERG,
KLEBERG, KLEBERG & COMPANY,
Attorneys at Law,
THOS. H. FRANKLIN,
Special Assistant in Washington County Election Cases.

Hon. A. H. GARLAND,
Attorney-General, Washington, D. C.

Let the Senator give his attention to this report when he asserts the falsity and slanderous character of the allegations that wrong and outrage characterized that election.

Let it be remembered upon this subject that Bolton's own father testified that when he reached him after he was shot he "had on a slicker or rain coat, and had a handkerchief knotted around his throat;" and that District Attorney Kleberg says "that the weather was dry and mild and no necessity was shown for the use of such a coat on such a night."

Whether this was "disguise" or not under the circumstances the Senate and the country can judge. I appeal from the Senator to the testimony and to the United States district attorney and his associate.

What stronger corroboration could there be of the negro officers of that poll than this statement made by the Democratic United States attorney (and the special counsel) to his official superior, Attorney-General Garland?

Now, that was not all. This man Kirk, the county judge of that county, at the time a candidate upon that ticket which was called the People's ticket, was on the witness stand here. He was the ring-leader in the conspiracy, the representative of the Democracy in that controversy. He testified that along in the afternoon he heard that in the Republican precincts the vote was going strongly against them. The father of this dead man, Bolton, was a candidate upon the ticket, and Judge Kirk, after evading over and over again questions put to

him, squirming and prevaricating like a witness who did not dare to tell the truth, admitted that he had sent to Bolton, the elder, a telegram in the afternoon of election day, saying that things looked gloomy.

I asked him repeatedly, "Did you say, 'Things look gloomy; get in your work, or do your work?'" He could remember, he testified, that he sent a telegram saying "Things look gloomy;" but although the telegram was followed by the death of his friend engaged in "getting in the work," which I believe he bade him to do, he could not remember, he testified, whether he used the words, "Get in" or "do your work," or any words of the kind. On the trial in Austin the telegram was produced, and it read, "Things look gloomy; do your work."

Can any man misunderstand that? What was the "work?" The "work" was that which followed in that county. It was the raid upon the ballot-box at Flewellyn; it was the raid upon the ballot-box a little later at Graball, and not a witness, Democrat or Republican, denied that armed men came to the Graball poll-box and demanded that the count be stopped and that the ballots be delivered to them, as I recollect it; it was the Lott's Store affair also. This was the "work," and it was efficiently done.

Another significant fact is that about 5 o'clock on that afternoon Judge Kirk, who was at Brenham, the county seat, 16 or 17 miles away from these polling-places, hired a horse at the livery stable and rode to three, I think, of the polls where these men a little later "got in their work." Thus it will be seen that there was not only one but three or four instances, as the Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER] knows, in Washington County where the polls or ballots and returns were interfered with, and they were all colored Republican precincts, of course.

Mr. TELLER. There were four.

Mr. SPOONER. Beyond any possible question there was not an honest election nor a fair count.

How are these allegations, established as they are, sought to be met? By telling the people the number of thousands of miles of railroad they have in Texas, the number of hides, the number of sheep, the capacity of Texas to set the spindles going all over the United States! Is this sufficient?

Mr. President, the rights of citizenship are higher than the interests of trade. Nothing can be dearer than those. We want the trade of the South; we want increased and ever increasing commerce between the sections, but if it is only to be had upon the condition of indifference to outrage upon the rights of citizenship, and violations long continued and boldly avowed of the Constitution, then sir, the price of such trade and commerce is too high!

In a few days the report of the committee upon this case will have been presented. All the testimony will be laid before the Senate. That it has not been done before is no fault of mine. I assisted in taking the testimony, but I was not chairman of the subcommittee and was charged with no duty in connection with preparing or submitting the report.

I stated on another occasion that I did not consider isolated cases of outrage upon citizens chargeable necessarily to the people of an entire State. The first day that the Senator from Texas who sits at my left [Mr. REAGAN] intervened in this Louisiana debate I so asserted. I reassert it now, with this qualification. The people of a State are not responsible for it unless they approve it and adopt it. They are not chargeable with or responsible for outrages perpetrated unless there be there a public sentiment which sustains those who perpetrate them and which exempts those who perpetrate them from punishment. The same is true, of course, as to a county or city. I regret to say that there was too much of this sentiment in the State of Texas, it appears to me, which tolerated if it did not approve these things done in Washington County.

The testimony of ex-Governor Ireland before the committee was that, although he was informed while yet governor of the State of the fact that these three colored men, who had simply been arrested upon suspicion, who had had no trial, no hearing, no chance for their lives, had been taken out and hanged, he offered no reward for the apprehension of the murderers. The testimony showed that no steps were taken by the officials of the county—and the county attorney elected at that election and the county judge were Democrats—up to the time the last evidence was given before our committee to attempt to ferret out the perpetrators of these outrages or to bring them to justice.

When these men were indicted by a grand jury in the United States court and brought to trial charged with these outrages upon the ballot-box, believed by the Democratic officials who prosecuted them to be guilty, and after one jury had disagreed and another acquitted them, as was probably to be expected, they being defended by eminent volunteer counsel, some of the leading Democrats of Washington County raised a fund, as I am informed, and I think there is some testimony before the committee to that purport, to pay the expenses of the defense. Some of them purchased a gold-headed cane for one of the counsel, and they passed resolutions thanking counsel that they had defended these gentry without asking any fee.

It does not seem to me, however it may seem to the Senator from Texas, as if in this instance the public sentiment of Texas was as

strong and vigorous as it ought to have been in securing punishment to those who so grievously trampled upon the rights of its citizens.

Now, Mr. President, a few words generally upon this subject and I shall be through with it. For introducing the resolution providing for an investigation into the circumstances attending the death of Joseph Hoffman, with especial reference to ascertaining whether he was killed because of the testimony he had given or was expected to give before a Senate committee, I have been charged by numerous Democratic papers North and South with "flaunting the bloody shirt," with being "narrow" and "sectional," and with being a "South hater."

I care nothing for that. That is now to be expected. I venture to say that whenever any one from this time forth in the Senate of the United States gives heed to any man's petition alleging that he has been outraged in his rights of citizenship in any Southern State at a national election and raises his voice for investigation he will be denounced as narrow-minded and sectional and as a flaunter of the bloody shirt. That will deter no man, however, from the discharge of duty.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. COKE] said the other day in substance, "Let us alone; what we want is to be let alone." That was the cry of the South once before. All we want is what we are entitled to have, and that is that every man in the United States who is entitled under the Constitution of the United States to vote and to exercise the rights of American citizenship pertaining to the elective franchise, whether he lives in Texas or in Louisiana or in Wisconsin, shall exercise the right undisturbed and undismayed.

Is that asking too much? Bloody shirt, forsooth! We are not talking about the war. I hear nothing said about the war here. This is current; this is something that is happening now, which we were charged to investigate, and which the resolution pending before the Senate provides for investigating. "It is a condition which confronts us."

Shall we be deterred from listening to such voices as Joe Hoffman's because these Senators say "You are preventing the return of fraternal feeling?" For myself I say no, Mr. President. The Republican party has accepted the results of the war. The people of the North have accepted the results of the war. The South piled a mountain of debt upon our people and they are cheerfully paying it, and have been for over a score of years. You never hear a grumble or a whimper about its amount, nor a word about its origin.

They filled the land with the graves of our citizens and friends. We walk quietly among them and strew them with flowers, with sorrowing hearts, from which the bitterness is quite gone. That wrong was long ago forgiven, evidenced by due form of law, representing the sentiment of the Northern people.

The Executive Departments and the foreign service contain a great number of those who served against the Union. We do not like it, in large part because of the methods by which the result has been brought about, and we shall prevent an early recurrence of it if we can. But our protest is a peaceful and a quiet one. In it there is nothing of violence. We all rejoice in a restored Union, in a people living under one Constitution. We only insist that that Constitution shall be everywhere obeyed, and the rights which it guarantees everywhere recognized and observed.

The only men I know of in this country who have not accepted the results of the war are our friends from the South. It is not the people of the North. One of the results of the war, whether a wise one or an unwise one, was that the male negro of proper age should have the right to vote. It was given him by the Constitution. The South has to all intents and purposes deprived him of it. It is useless to attempt to deny it. It is vain in reply to it to talk about the purchase of votes in Rhode Island. The Senators from Rhode Island can take care of that charge when they are present. The vote of the Southern Republican has disappeared. The negro has ceased in the last few years to cast his vote and have it counted. His citizenship, new born and highly prized, is barren of fruitage for him, except of bitterness. Where has that ballot gone? Has the negro become a Democrat? Nobody can pretend it. Has he grown weary of the ballot? Who so bold as to claim that? It is not consistent with the characteristics of the race.

The negro, just brought out from bondage into the light of freedom, placed beside his master in respect of legal rights with the great badge of sovereignty, the ballot, in his hand, told by the Constitution that he had a right to walk beside his old master and overseer up to the polls and deposit his vote as a citizen of the United States, was as proud of it as any human being could be of a kingly crown. Has he grown tired of it, as a child wearies of a toy, and cast it aside? Who believes it? No man who stops to think.

What has become of that ballot? Thirteen or more large volumes printed by the Government, filled with testimony taken during a series of years by direction of Congress, of outrage piled upon outrage, massacre piled upon massacre, fraud upon fraud, explain why it is that the colored vote of the South is gone. "There is little violence now," it is said. "The cases are only sporadic; all is quiet, and peace reigns." Peace!

He makes a solitude, and calls it—peace.

Years of intimidation and fraud and wrong have done their work and accomplished their purpose. How long is this to last? The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WALTHALL]—and I know of no man who has more thoroughly my respect and my admiration for every manly quality—made a speech the other day upon the subject, temperate, dignified, and eloquent; but he who I believe would willingly deny to no man his rights was bound to say, practically—I do not attempt to give his language—that where the negroes are in a majority, and voting would elect their tickets, white or black, the superior race, the white race, will not yield to that result.

That is what we are told, also, by the Senators from Texas and Louisiana. What does it mean in its full significance? This at least: That the Constitution which gives the negro the right to vote is to be nullified, is to go for nothing wherever that vote is such that if cast and counted it would be potential. It means the systematic and avowed continuance of denial, by force where it is necessary, by threats where they will answer, by fraud where that is adequate, of rights given by the Constitution as plainly as the right to trial by jury, or the right to the free and unrestricted worship of God.

I admit it is in some of its aspects a delicate, difficult, and troublous problem. But it is a mistake to suppose that it is a matter of purely local concern which affects simply the people of the South. We of the North have great, almost vital interest in it. Before the war three-fifths only of the negroes entered into the basis of representation. Now, under the new order of things, they are all counted. It was inevitable that the elevation of the negro to the plane of citizenship should bring about a corresponding enlargement in the Southern basis of representation. No man for a moment could suppose that that increase in the basis would ever have been granted except as the natural concomitant of negro suffrage. The Southern States receive, by reason of the change in the basis of representation, born out of the enlarged suffrage, additional representation in the House of Representatives and the electoral college. Without those members the political complexion of the House of Representatives to-day would be different. Without those additional votes in the electoral college the political complexion of the Administration would be different.

To wield the increased power growing out of the enlarged representation, granted solely upon the enlarged suffrage, and to deny the right of suffrage is utterly indefensible from any standpoint, and has relation not simply to the local affairs of the South, but it is a matter of vital consequence to the whole people. Thus it comes about that by reason of systematic denial of constitutional right, by methods which I will not elaborate, for they are familiar to the country, our friends from the South have disproportionate power in the Government, in the Halls of Congress, and in the Electoral College. When the North protests against this inequality it is not a good answer to say that it is a "race issue," and that the white race, whatever comes, will rule. This is simply an assertion of the right of minority rule, and that I charge to be its effect in the Government to-day. We are told that it is to be permanent, at any rate so long as the colored and white Republicans together constitute, where their votes are cast and counted, a majority.

I do not know, sir, how long the people of the North will be willing to tolerate this condition of affairs, but I undertake to say that they will not tolerate it always; that it will bring in time a condition of public sentiment at the North which will solidify the North against the South until this inequality is removed, and that the time will come, however unpopular it may be to-day in some quarters, when one standing in the Senate of the United States, or elsewhere, and protesting against intimidation, fraud, and outrage in the South, which deprives the negro of his vote, and at the same time gives to the South this disproportionate power in the Government, will not be put down in public estimation by denunciation, or by the cry of "bloody shirt," "South hater," or the assertion that it is a matter of purely local concern. I deny that it is a matter of local interest simply whether every man who has a right to vote in Texas for member of Congress is permitted to vote or not. The people of Wisconsin are interested in it. It is not simply a matter of interest to Georgia whether a few people there may elect more members of Congress than the great mass of people in the State from which I come.

This is not simply a matter of justice to the negro; it is a matter of justice to the North; it is a matter of maintaining constitutional equality among the States, and a matter that affects the interests of the whole people, and that goes to the foundation of our system of government. This attempt to extinguish upon the race plea, or any other, the exercise of the right by the colored man or the white Republican, clearly possessed under the Constitution, to vote as he chooses, and to have his vote counted as cast, and returned as counted, is an outrage not simply upon the negro, but it is a crime against the North and against our system of government. If the suffrage be not kept pure and free the blood of our body-politic is poisoned. This condition will bring trouble in the South itself in the not distant future, of a serious kind, not pleasant to contemplate.

Mr. President, this bold proclamation of intention to deny in any section of the country rights conferred by the Constitution is not likely to be of other than deleterious influence in respect for and observance of the law generally. Those who habitually and with impunity disregard, by force and otherwise, rights as sacred as the right to vote are

likely to lose respect for other rights and to hold in diminishing reverence the majesty of the law.

Call this partisan speech, if it be agreeable so to do. Appeal, by way of foil to it, to the desire of our great cities for Southern trade. I prophesy that the time will come, and is not far distant, if it be not already here, when this question of constitutional rights, of fair play and justice, so dear to the people of the United States will be deemed of greater worth and higher importance than any question or consideration of trade between the sections or of politics.

I think the assault which we are now endeavoring to meet upon the industries of the United States and the interests of labor, and upon the industrial independence of this country, to be due largely to this disproportionate power exercised by the South in the affairs of this Government. It is this that brings about the singular fact that the great State of Texas, not distinguished especially for its manufactures certainly, though it may be for its hides and some other things, furnishes to the country a chairman of the committee on Ways and Means, and that so many of his confrères upon that potential committee represent States not distinguished at all for great manufacturing interests, or for the dignified and prosperous labor which pervades the North. The singular fact that gives Arkansas a representative upon that committee and leaves New York without one is marked evidence of the undue power exerted by the South in the Government to-day, because of the extinction of the negro vote.

Mr. President, I did not intend or expect, as I stated at the outset, to be drawn into this debate to-day at all. I had not intended when the resolution should be reported from the committee, providing for an investigation into the circumstances attending the death of Joseph Hoffman, to occupy the time of the Senate in further debate upon the Washington County election of 1886, but I have felt called upon, partly by what the Senator from Texas has deemed it proper for him to say, although I think some of his utterances were discourteous and, so far as I am concerned, gratuitous, and partly because of the manner of his speech, to ask the attention of the Senate for a few moments. My observations have been desultory and have taken more time than I intended. I make no apology for it, however, as I know of no subject more entitled to attention.

Mr. COKE. Mr. President, the facts alleged against Texas are the transactions in Washington and Fort Bend Counties. The Senator from Wisconsin makes no explanation of the Fort Bend County transaction. He bases his entire remarks upon the transactions in Washington County.

Mr. SPOONER. Will the Senator allow me?

Mr. COKE. Certainly.

Mr. SPOONER. I have not investigated the Fort Bend transaction. I have made no argument in the Senate now or at any other time about the Fort Bend transaction. I have simply confined myself to the subject-matter which was committed to me and to other Senators by the Senate.

Mr. COKE. The Senator has confined himself to the Washington County transaction. I call attention again to the fact that the indictment of the State of Texas by the Republican convention at Fort Worth, which adjourned about three days ago, is confined to transactions alleged to have occurred in Fort Bend and Washington Counties. No allegation of any charge is made as to any other county than those two.

For the purpose of showing that the negroes who were hanged were justifiable, and therefore that it was very much more criminal conduct on the part of the mob who hanged them, the Senator has asserted that they were justifiable in killing Bolton, because he says Bolton went to the polls armed and disguised.

Mr. SPOONER. I assume that the Senator would not willingly misrepresent me.

Mr. COKE. I will not.

Mr. SPOONER. I have never admitted for one moment, because I regard the testimony as clear and overwhelming upon the subject, that the three negroes who were hanged had anything whatever to do with the killing of Bolton any more than the Senator from Texas had. I asserted this, and I assert it again, I believe Bolton was killed, as the district attorney says he was, by Polk Hill, who is in jail under indictment. He has been tried once, I think, and the jury disagreed, and he is to be tried again. I justified on a former occasion the killing of Bolton upon my understanding of the testimony that he went there armed to interrupt the count, and to demand the ballot-box and the tally-list. I justify it now.

Mr. COKE. Mr. President, standing here as a Senator of the United States from Texas, I put my assertion as to what that testimony means against the assertion of the Senator from Wisconsin, and I do say that the proof shows conclusively, the weight and bulk and mass of the proof, that Bolton was unarmed; that he was undisguised; that he simply went to the poll as he had a right to do, and was shot down by this negro, Polk Hill, and that other negroes who were there, and three of whom were hung, were accessories to the crime.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. COKE. I did not interrupt the Senator. I will yield to him this time, but not again.

Mr. SPOONER. I do not mean to—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas yields.

Mr. SPOONER. The Senator says he puts his statement of the testimony against mine. That of course he has a right to do, and that of course I expected him to do and I am willing he should do. I should like to ask him what he has to say about the testimony of Bolton's father, referred to in the district attorney's communication, and also about the statement of the district attorney and his assistant?

Mr. COKE. I was going to refer to that. With regard to the statement of Bolton's father that young Bolton had a handkerchief tied around his neck, that he had a slicker on, anybody who could manufacture those facts into a circumstance of suspicion against Bolton is certainly of an exceedingly suspicious nature.

Mr. SPOONER. Then I submit the Senator ought to secure the removal of that district attorney as incompetent.

Mr. COKE. The proof is here in this record that the night was cold enough for an overcoat. Two witnesses testified to that. One of them testified that he carried the supper of one of the men who was at the polls to him, and was told to bring his overcoat with him. Another witness swears that when the shooting occurred he was lying on an overcoat asleep.

Nothing is more common in the South than for one of these slickers, as they are called—they are wet-weather overcoats, that is all—to be worn by people. There is nothing more common; and as for Bolton having a handkerchief tied around his neck, it is a very common habit among laboring people to attire themselves in that way. Is it suspicious that a man should have a handkerchief tied around his neck? Is it suspicious that he should have an overcoat on when others found it cold enough for an overcoat that same night? Yet those two facts are adverted to by the Senator from Wisconsin as evidence that Bolton was there armed and disguised.

I assert the fact to be—and because it has to rest on the assertion of either the Senator from Wisconsin or myself is certainly not my fault, because he belongs to the committee which has charge of the testimony, and he should have it on every Senator's desk—I assert the fact to be that the testimony proves conclusively that Bolton was murdered by a negro, and that the negroes hung were most probably accessories to the fact before and after. I do not justify the taking out and hanging of these negroes in Brenham. It ought not to have been done; but it was done by a mob who were moved to do it, not because of any political reason, not to subvert any political purpose, but because Bolton had been murdered in cold blood by this negro, Polk Hill, and the others were along with him.

I say that is the fact. I have here a volume of the testimony, one that I procured from the Senator from Alabama [Mr. PUGH], who is a member of the committee, and it is through his grace alone that I have any of the testimony. I have it here before me, and I shall ask, unless the Senator from Wisconsin will agree that it shall be inserted in my remarks, that the proceedings of the coroner's inquest in regard to the killing of Mr. Bolton be read by the Secretary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no objection it will be so ordered. The Chair hears no objection.

The matter referred to is as follows:

PROCEEDINGS OF THE CORONER'S INQUEST IN REGARD TO THE KILLING OF W. D. BOLTON.

COUNTY OF WASHINGTON, State of Texas:

An inquest taken the 3d day of November, A. D. 1886, at R. T. Flewellen's residence in said county of Washington, before J. A. Vernon, justice of peace of said county, upon the view of the dead body of W. D. Bolton, by William Ford, J. T. Lott, M. A. McCalip, S. H. Hatfield, John Alexander, S. T. Aubrey, good and lawful jurors of said county, who, being in due form sworn, say that the said W. D. Bolton came to his death at about 11 o'clock p. m. by a shotgun wound in the hands of Poke Hill, and further believe that Chad Felder, William Davis, John Glass, Felix Kinlow, Stewart Jones, and Ande Hays, and Stephen Jackson were accessories to the killing of deceased; and further believe that deceased came to his death by the advice of Ed. Lockett.

J. A. VERNON,
J. P. Precinct No. 1, Washington County, Texas.
W. G. FORD.
S. T. AUBREY.
H. H. HATFIELD.
J. T. LOTT.
J. R. ALEXANDER.
M. A. MCCALIP.

[No. 1.—Testimony of William Davis, duly sworn.]

I, William Davis, was sitting near the house of R. T. Flewellen, by a tree, and heard two reports of a shotgun and a noise in the house. Going up to the house, I saw Poke Hill coming out of the door of said house, saying, "I have killed two men and my gun is empty; Davis, give me your gun." There was here five men with shotguns, with the names of John Glass, Felix Kinlow, Poke Hill, Stewart Jones, Ande Hays, all colored men. Stephen Jackson told us, "if we want a gun to go and get mine." This happened on the 2d day of November, 1886.

WM. (his x mark) DAVIS.

[No. 2.—Testimony of Alfred Jones, sworn.]

Mr. Ed. Lockett told me, "It is our duty to guard this box at R. T. Flewellen's place," and through the advice of Mr. Ed. Lockett, John Glass, Ande Hays, Felix Kinlow, Poke Hill, and William Davis came here with shotguns. I did not hear of any threats to intimidate any person on the ground on the 2d day of November, 1886.

ALFRED (his x mark) JONES.

[No. 3.—Testimony of A. H. Rogers, duly sworn.]

The first I know of it was at about 11 o'clock p. m., while I was lying on my bed in the room where the election was held. To my best recollection I saw Poke Hill, Ande Hays, and Felix Kenlow and Stewart Jones in the said room, but I did not see any guns in the room. I saw Poke Hill going out several times prior to the shooting, but never after the shooting, on the 2d day of November, 1886.

A. H. ROGERS.

[No. 4.—Testimony of John Glass, duly sworn.]

I saw William Davis, Felix Kenlow, Poke Hill, Stewart Jones, Ande Hays with shotguns on the place of R. T. Flewellen's. The report of the shotgun woke me up, and I did not see anybody after the shooting, which happened about 11 o'clock p. m. on the 2d day of November, 1886.

JOHN (his x mark) GLASS.

[No. 5.—Testimony of Ande Hays, duly sworn.]

I was in the room where the election was held, my gun was sitting on the gallery of the house; when the door south in room opened deceased, after being invited to come in, was shot directly after Poke Hill went out of the north door, his gun being out on the gallery; deceased came in quietly and said nothing about the box and was not disguised. The shooting took place on the 2d day of November, 1886. There was in the room Chad Felder, Felix Kenlow, Poke Hill, and Stewart Jones; I believe that Poke Hill is the man who done the shooting. Gunshot was fired in the north door, deceased killed in the south door. I am satisfied that Poke Hill was the man, as he was standing in the door.

ANDE (his x mark) HAYS.

[No. 6.—Testimony of Dick Robertson, duly sworn.]

I was the presiding officer of the ballot-box on the R. T. Flewellen place on the 2d day of November, 1886. We were counting the votes when the shooting took place. Some one knocked on the door, and after being asked to come in, deceased was let in. The same time the door opened, Poke Hill, who was sitting in the room, got up and went to the opposite door, and a shotgun was fired by a ginger-colored person. I feel satisfied that a darkey of the description of Poke Hill did the shooting, unless somebody was standing behind the door; he had full time to pick up a shotgun. The election was going on quietly and I deemed it not necessary to have any guards whatever on the ground. At the time of the shooting there were in the room present Lewis Pennington, Chad Felder, Tom Jones, Felix Kenlaw, and Ande Hays.

J. R. ROBERTSON.

[No. 7.—Testimony of William Cawse.]

I was one of the clerks of election held on the place of R. T. Flewellen. There was in the room at the time of the shooting Felix Kenlaw, Ande Hays, Lewis Pennington, Chad Felder. The same time that the south door opened, Poke Hill left his seat and ran to the north door and opened the same door, and directly a shot was fired and deceased fell to the floor. The election was quiet, and it was not necessary to have any guards.

WM. CAWSE.

[No. 8.—Testimony of Felix Kenlaw, duly sworn.]

I was sitting in the room looking on. Poke Hill was sitting near me, and as soon as somebody knocked on the door Poke Hill, who got up and ran to the opposite door, picked up his shotgun, which was out on the gallery, I saw him, cocked the gun and shot the deceased, and I knew it was Poke Hill who did the shooting. He told me himself that he had killed a man, and laughed when he said it. I was lying under the bed and could see plainly. There was present in the room Ande Hays, Stewart Jones, William Cawse, Poke Hill, and the officers of the election. The shooting took place about 11 or 12 o'clock p. m., in the room of the house of R. T. Flewellen. The election was quiet and orderly.

FELIX (his x mark) KENLAW.

[No. 9.—Testimony of Lewis Pennington, duly sworn.]

I was one of the judges of the election held on the 2d day of November, 1886. The election was going on quietly and orderly. I was busy counting votes when somebody knocked on the door; the same time Poke Hill got up from his seat and ran to the door. I do not know who did the shooting, which took place about 11 o'clock p. m. Outside the officers of the election, there were present in the room Chad Felder, Ande Hays, Felix Kenlaw, and Poke Hill went out the door.

LEWIS (his x mark) PENNINGTON.

[No. 10.—Testimony of Tom Jones, duly sworn.]

I was one of the clerks of the election, sitting at the table with my back toward the south door. I saw Poke Hill go to the north door before the south door opened. As soon as the door opened I turned my face, and saw a white man coming in the door with uplifted hands holding a pistol, and as soon as I saw the person I went out of the same door. I know that Poke Hill had a gun on the ground. There was present outside of the officers Chad Felder, Ande Hays, Poke Hill. The shooting took place on the 2d day of November, 1886, in the house of R. T. Flewellen.

T. M. JONES.

[Statement of Lewis Pennington, being re-examined.]

I did not see anybody coming in the door disguised with a pistol in hand. I was sitting close to the fire-place in plain view of the two doors.

LEWIS (his x mark) PENNINGTON.

[No. 11.—Testimony of Ephraim Jones, duly sworn.]

I was taking supper to Jones and along with it a shotgun to guard the polls; then I went out and went to sleep on John Glass's overcoat and I never woke up till I heard two reports of a shotgun. I ran off around the house and made for home. There had shotguns in possession, William Davis, Felix Kenlaw, Poke Hill, Ande Hays, for the protection of the box under the advice of Chad Felder. The election was going on quietly. The shooting was done at about 11 o'clock p. m., in the house of R. T. Flewellen, on the 2d day of November, 1886.

EPHRAIM JONES.

[No. 12.—Testimony of Stephen Jackson, duly sworn.]

I was on the election ground on the 2d day of November, 1886, and Alfred Jones and Poke Hill asked me for a pistol, but I declined it, but let Poke Hill have my shotgun, loaded, to keep the polls guarded. My gun was returned to me, both barrels empty, by Sallie Jones, wife of Oliver Jones.

EPHRAIM (his x mark) JONES.

This is to certify that this is a true and correct statement of the testimony given.

P. KÜHNEL, Recorder.

THE STATE OF TEXAS, County of Washington:

I, C. F. Herbst, clerk of the district court of Washington County, Texas, do

hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of the original inquest papers in case of W. D. Bolton, deceased, now on file in said court.

Given under my hand and the seal of said court, at office in Brenham, this 5th day of February, A. D. 1887.

[SEAL.]

C. F. HERBST, Clerk.

Mr. COKE. If Bolton was murdered, as I honestly believe he was, as I believe the testimony shows he was, while it does not justify these men in taking these negroes out of jail and hanging them, it does remove the deed from the category in which the Senator from Wisconsin has placed it, that of being a cold-blooded, premeditated murder for a political cause. Politics had nothing to do with it. These white men were incited by the brutal murder of Bolton, and they avenged him in this way. Polk Hill, the man who pulled the trigger and fired the gun that killed Bolton, is alive now. He was taken up to the Milam County jail. The three men who were hanged, unfortunately were brought back to Brenham to be tried, and the authorities were mistaken in supposing that the feeling against them had subsided. That is the statement of that transaction.

Here is the platform of the Republican convention which met at Fort Worth three or four days ago, which charges the Fort Bend and the Washington County transactions as all the outrages they have to complain of in Texas, and I have stated the history of these, so that the Senate can see for itself whether they were Democratic outrages.

The fact is patent, it stands out in bold relief, that no Republican was killed until Hoffman was killed, and that with Hoffman was also killed the leading Democrat of Washington County.

No Republican was killed in Fort Bend County, but one Democrat was killed and another was attempted to be killed. Bolton was a white man and a Democrat, and he was murdered in Washington County. Hoffman was running on a ticket that the Democrats were friendly to, and he was sitting with Holt, the leading Democrat in the county, and was killed with Holt by the same shot. That is the whole of it.

With reference to the testimony of the district attorney and the counsel employed by the State, I know both of them well; they are both good men, both honest men, both honorable men; they are like all other lawyers, though. They have identified themselves with this case, and although they had two trials, presided over by a Republican judge and the law charged as strongly as it was possible to charge it against the prisoners, the theory of these gentlemen was reversed; it was denied in the verdict of the jury who acquitted the prisoners. They are not impartial witnesses; they are witnesses whose judgment can not be relied upon, because they have been heated up in the prosecution of the case.

The Senator from Wisconsin makes divers and various charges against the people of the South, and especially against the people of Texas and the people of Washington County upon testimony which he does not exhibit here, upon private letters which he doubtless is not at liberty to exhibit.

Mr. SPOONER. If the Senator will allow me—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. COKE. Yes, sir.

Mr. SPOONER. What I have said about this matter this afternoon was in reply to a review by the Senator from Texas of the testimony not before the Senate. I did not inaugurate it. I want to say in regard to the letter which the Senator says I am not at liberty to exhibit, that I would exhibit it cheerfully if it were not for the fact that I fear it would cost the writer his life, and the writer fears it also.

Mr. COKE. That is a sample of the way in which the people of my section of country are talked about. I have a letter in which the Senator's name is called in connection with the eviction in the State of Iowa of families of poor helpless women and children, evictions that parallel in atrocity and circumstances of pathos any that have ever occurred in Ireland.

Mr. SPOONER. Mr. President—

Mr. COKE. I decline to be interrupted in the middle of a sentence. I say the Senator's name is mentioned in that letter, but I do not condemn the Senator upon it. I do not condemn the people of Iowa upon it, because men, women, and children were ejected from sections and quarter-sections and subdivisions of land at the suit of a great railroad corporation, land that they had occupied some of them for forty years, so this informant tells me, some of them for twenty years, and he gives an instance of a poor woman who saw everything she had in the world thrown into the road and her home of many years taken from her. She became insane, so this informant states, and now is in a lunatic asylum. He gives the facts.

I do not use such a letter for the purpose of making allegations against the people of Iowa or against the Senator from Wisconsin. I would not do it. He has not hesitated to brand the people whom I have the honor to represent in a way that in my judgment would justify me in using this letter for all it is worth.

There is one thing, Mr. President, the people of the South have never done. They have never warred on women and children. They have never taken at the behest of railroad corporations the homes from women and children and left them in the public road to starve and freeze or take care of themselves. If the Senator desires to make an

issue, let him make it; I will meet him. He will find that there are blows to receive as well as to give. The slanders that have been hurled at the people I represent shall not go unanswered, for they are slanders, come from what source they may.

Mr. SPOONER. Mr. President, we started in to debate the Texas outrages. Very much to my surprise, the result is a debate by the Senator from Texas upon what I suppose may be deemed the Spooner outrages. I do not know to what the Senator from Texas alludes. I want to say, however, in regard to his speech, or that portion of it personal to myself, two things: In the first place, it will not divert the attention of the people of the United States from the outrages perpetrated in Washington County, Texas, upon the ballot. The people will be too discriminating not to see that it is a pettifoggery effort to divert the attention of the jury from the trial of the case to something which does not relate to the case.

In the next place I want to say—and I shall endeavor to keep myself entirely within parliamentary bounds, and if I shall succeed in doing that I will succeed where the Senator from Texas, with his greater age and his greater experience, has signally failed several times today—that the man outside of this Chamber who states that as counsel or as owner, directly or indirectly, in any way whatever, I was the instrument of turning any man or woman in Iowa or out of Iowa from his or her land or from his or her cabin, whether a quarter-section or a quarter of an acre, is a liar. I say that of any man who makes that charge outside of the Senate.

I suppose the Senator refers to the fact that after I became a member of the Senate I argued a cause in the Supreme Court by printed brief between the Chicago, Milwaukee and St. Paul Railway Company on the one hand and the Sioux City and St. Paul Railway Company on the other. I was employed to argue that cause before I was elected to the Senate or before I ever thought of being a candidate for the Senate. It was not a controversy in which any individual was interested. It was not a controversy in which the United States was interested. It was a controversy simply between two railway corporations as to which was entitled to overlapping lands. I discharged that duty. That ended my connection with that client, and I have never had from that day to this any professional connection with it or any knowledge of its litigation.

Mr. COKE. I desire to ask the Senator—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. SPOONER. Certainly.

Mr. COKE. I ask the Senator if it was not charged—I do not say that the Senator was counsel, I say that his name was mentioned in this letter—

Mr. SPOONER. In what?

Mr. COKE. I say the Senator's name was mentioned in the letter to which I have referred, and I ask the Senator if there was not a charge made in the State of Iowa that there was collusion between the two railroad companies, and that this collusion excluded the consideration of questions that it was believed would redound to the interest of settlers on the land? I ask if that charge was not made?

Mr. SPOONER. I do not know anything about what charge was made in the State of Iowa, and I do not know what charge was made in the letter to which the Senator refers. The Senator from Texas is at liberty to use any letter he has in his possession referring to me. I argued that cause in the Supreme Court of the United States and that ended my connection with the business. What has been done since in the way of evictions I know nothing whatever about.

Mr. COKE. I ask the Senator if there were not charges of collusion between the counsel in the case which excluded questions in which the settlers were interested, and if a member of Congress from Iowa did not telegraph to Governor Larrabee to send the attorney-general of that State here to intervene and protect the rights of settlers against the collusion?

Mr. SPOONER. I know nothing about that. I know that a day or two after that cause was argued in the Supreme Court of the United States a falsehood and a slander appeared about my connection with it in relation to my discharge of duty in the Senate. In one of the newspapers published in the city of New York it was charged that I offered on the floor of the Senate and advocated an amendment for a client whom a day or two afterwards I represented in the Supreme Court of the United States. That charge was utterly false. I offered an amendment in the Senate under circumstances which rendered it necessary for me to do it for my opponent in that cause, for a railroad company in whose service I had never been a moment in my life, and I voted against my client and for a bill which the then Senator from Minnesota, Mr. McMillan, representing that interest, fought to the utmost of his ability. Beyond that charge which was made in the newspaper, which was false and unjust in itself, and which was answered—

Mr. COKE. I know nothing about that charge.

Mr. SPOONER. Beyond that I know nothing about the matter to which the Senator refers. If anybody has been evicted in the State of Iowa, I suppose it has been in proceedings in the courts. I know nothing whatever about any such matter. I never had any connection whatever with it.

While I have not been at all personal to the Senator from Texas, my relations with him have been entirely pleasant. I have simply attempted to do my duty in discussing questions which were involved in an investigation made by me in conjunction with other Senators under an order of the Senate; and while I regard his attempt in defense of the State of Texas as of a character to draw me personally into disrepute in the Senate or in the country, as of a character which outside of the Senate I would denominate differently from what I would do here, I want to say to the Senator that he in part, as I have been informed—I will not say it—

Mr. COKE. Say it.

Mr. SPOONER. I have discussed this case upon its merits.

Mr. COKE. Say it.

Mr. SPOONER. I shall not go into personalities of the sort in the Senate.

Mr. BUTLER. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, October 1, 1888, at 12 o'clock m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, September 27, 1888.

The House met at 12 o'clock m. Prayer by Rev. J. A. PRICE, of Washington, D. C.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. McCook, its Secretary, announced that the Senate had agreed to amendments of the House to bills of the following titles:

A bill (S. 249) to prevent the manufacture or sale of adulterated food or drugs in the District of Columbia; and

A bill (S. 3168) regulating admissions to the institution of the Association for Works of Mercy in certain cases, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the following concurrent resolutions of the House:

A resolution for printing 5,000 copies of the report of Capt. M. A. Healy, of the United States revenue marine, upon the cruise of the revenue-steamer Corwin in the Arctic Ocean in the year 1884;

A resolution for printing 5,000 copies of the report of Capt. M. A. Healy, of the United States revenue marine, upon the cruise of the revenue-steamer Corwin in the Arctic Ocean in the year 1885; and

A resolution for printing 3,000 copies of the report of Lieut. Charles C. Rogers, United States Navy, on the Panama Canal.

The message also announced that the Senate had adopted the following resolutions; in which the concurrence of the House was requested:

A resolution for printing 5,000 additional copies of the report of the Superintendent of the United States Coast and Geodetic Survey for the year ending June 30, 1887; and

A resolution for printing the report of the Commissioner of Education for 1887 and 1888.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the additional amendments of the House to the bill (H. R. 10060) prescribing the times for sales and for notice of sales of property in the District of Columbia for overdue taxes.

The message also announced that the Senate had non-concurred in the amendment of the House to the joint resolution (S. R. 110) in aid of the sufferers from yellow fever, asked a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses, and had appointed as conferees on the part of the Senate Mr. EDMUNDS, Mr. ALLISON, and Mr. COCKRELL.

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

A bill (H. R. 4039) granting a pension to Mary A. Pfeiffer;

A bill (H. R. 10881) granting a pension to Nancy J. Cotner.

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

A bill (S. 1839) for the relief of Daniel C. Rodman and others, sureties on the bond of Ozias Morgan;

A bill (S. 2182) to amend sections 4488 and 4489 of the Revised Statutes requiring life-saving appliances on steamers;

A bill (S. 3098) concerning the settlement of the boundary lines between Connecticut and Rhode Island;

A bill (S. 3124) creating three additional land offices in the State of Colorado;

A bill (S. 3390) to create the Lincoln land district in the Territory of New Mexico;

A bill (S. 3427) to amend section 4474 of the Revised Statutes of the United States;

A bill (S. 3438) to refund illegal internal-revenue tax collected of the late Alexander W. Baldwin, as United States district judge for the district of Nevada;

A bill (S. 704) granting a pension to Thomas Redmond, late private Company K, Fourth United States Infantry;

A bill (S. 1598) granting to Truman A. Morton a pension of \$24 a month;

A bill (S. 2363) for the relief of John W. Combs;

A bill (S. 2374) for the relief of David Gray Purman;

A bill (S. 2623) granting an increase of pension to James Patterson;

A bill (S. 3104) granting an increase of pension to Albert H. Smith;

A bill (S. 3387) granting a pension to Charles S. Hamilton;

A bill (S. 3397) granting an increase of pension to Caroline M. McDougal;

A bill (S. 3423) granting a pension to Irene Rucker Sheridan, widow of General P. H. Sheridan;

A bill (S. 3428) granting a pension to Mary C. Thompson;

A bill (S. 3429) granting a pension to Maria N. Abbey;

A bill (S. 3435) granting a pension to J. C. Haworth;

A bill (S. 3453) granting an increase of pension to Alfred T. McKinsey;

A bill (S. 3456) granting a pension to David O. Sanborn;

A bill (S. 3457) granting a pension to Abigail Farley;

A bill (S. 3462) granting a pension to John Watson;

A bill (S. 3477) granting a pension to Minerva Griffith;

A bill (S. 3479) granting a pension to Sarah J. Powers;

A bill (S. 3492) granting a pension to John Parkinson;

A bill (S. 3502) granting a pension to Juliana Roitsch;

A bill (S. 3513) granting pensions to Powell's Battalion of Missouri Mounted Volunteers; and

A bill (S. 3540) granting a pension to Mary P. Myers.

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

A bill (H. R. 200) granting a pension to Walter O. Watson;

A bill (H. R. 201) granting a pension to Edward Waters;

A bill (H. R. 508) granting a pension to Sarah F. Hawkins;

A bill (H. R. 968) granting a pension to H. S. Sayre;

A bill (H. R. 1085) granting a pension to Thomas Rains;

A bill (H. R. 2073) granting an increase of pension to Daniel Willborg;

A bill (H. R. 2120) granting a pension to Elizabeth Evans;

A bill (H. R. 2139) granting a pension to George Rhody;

A bill (H. R. 2471) granting a pension to Anna M. Noyes;

A bill (H. R. 2472) granting a pension to Lydia A. Eaton;

A bill (H. R. 2474) granting a pension to Joseph Lincoln Young;

A bill (H. R. 2566) for the relief of Phillip Kopplin;

A bill (H. R. 2689) granting a pension to Johanna Geyer, widow of Gustav W. Geyer;

A bill (H. R. 2716) granting a pension to J. W. Leight;

A bill (H. R. 2788) granting a pension to Lieut. George T. Russell;

A bill (H. R. 3152) for the relief of Arlington M. Harrington;

A bill (H. R. 3504) for the relief of John German;

A bill (H. R. 3801) granting a pension to Nelson J. Crook;

A bill (H. R. 3908) increasing the pension of Jesse L. Garrett;

A bill (H. R. 4038) granting a pension to Victor, Gertrude, Margaret, and Helen, minor children of Lieut. George R. McGuire;

A bill (H. R. 4102) granting a pension to Mary A. Carr;

A bill (H. R. 4820) granting a pension to Ellen Kelley;

A bill (H. R. 5174) granting a pension to Statira Young;

A bill (H. R. 5193) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin Franklin;

A bill (H. R. 5740) granting a pension to Anson Ward;

A bill (H. R. 6022) granting a pension to Smith Bodkins;

A bill (H. R. 6201) granting a pension to John Robeson;

A bill (H. R. 6309) for the relief of Mary A. Covey;

A bill (H. R. 6409) for the relief of Perry R. Nye;

A bill (H. R. 7185) granting a pension to Samuel Neikirk;

A bill (H. R. 7410) for the relief of settlers upon Old Camp Sheridan military reservation;

A bill (H. R. 7457) granting a pension to Eleanor D. Heath;

A bill (H. R. 7485) granting a pension to Mrs. Susan V. Wilcox, mother of Martin V. Wilcox;

A bill (H. R. 7657) granting a pension to Mary Woodworth, widow of Ebenezer F. Woodworth;

A bill (H. R. 7912) for the relief of Frances P. Vernon;

A bill (H. R. 8200) granting a pension to Lydia Ann Wilber

A bill (H. R. 8553) granting a pension to Arabella Davis;

A bill (H. R. 8748) to increase the pension of Richard Jobes;

A bill (H. R. 8993) for the relief of Shadrack W. Brown;

A bill (H. R. 9106) granting a pension to Peter Liner;

A bill (H. R. 9148) to grant a pension to Jane Robinson;

A bill (H. R. 9169) granting a pension to Tempy M. Johnston;

A bill (H. R. 9182) granting a pension to Ransom Riley;

A bill (H. R. 9341) granting a pension to Mrs. Dulcena Noel;

A bill (H. R. 9358) to increase the pension of Rosalie O'Sullivan;

A bill (H. R. 9370) granting a pension to Susan Bates, widow of Thomas Bates, late private Company A, Twenty-sixth Regiment, Michigan Volunteers;

A bill (H. R. 9371) granting a pension to Betsey Williams, widow of William R. Williams, private Company C, Eighth Regiment Michigan Volunteers;

A bill (H. R. 9719) for the relief of Thomas Shackelford;

A bill (H. R. 9862) granting a pension to Benjamin F. Bair;

A bill (H. R. 9935) to increase the pension of Isaac Hurd;

A bill (H. R. 9975) granting a pension to Joseph Welsh;

A bill (H. R. 10007) for the relief of Henry Rose;

A bill (H. R. 10017) granting a pension to Samuel Anderson;

A bill (H. R. 10103) granting a pension to William Fairbanks;

A bill (H. R. 10106) to place the name of Matilda Spangler on the pension-roll;

A bill (H. R. 10121) granting a pension to Sarah A. Mason;

A bill (H. R. 10122) granting a pension to Margaret Quinton;

A bill (H. R. 10159) granting a pension to Jenny Buell;

A bill (H. R. 10171) granting a pension to Rachel Rogers;

A bill (H. R. 10173) granting a pension to Catharine Mulligan;

A bill (H. R. 10210) to increase the pension of Philip Thomas;

A bill (H. R. 10224) granting a pension to Elias H. Hall;

A bill (H. R. 10241) increasing the pension of Richard Porter;

A bill (H. R. 10245) granting an increase of pension to Hannibal Kimball;

A bill (H. R. 10256) to place the name of Lucy Wager, of Hillsdale, Mich., on the pension-roll;

A bill (H. R. 10258) to place the name of Cyrus Millins, of Ogden Centre, Mich., on the pension-roll;

A bill (H. R. 10274) granting a pension to Joseph W. Filler;

A bill (H. R. 10342) granting a pension to John Dauper;

A bill (H. R. 10504) granting a pension to Mary Hooper;

A bill (H. R. 10563) granting a pension to William S. Latham;

A bill (H. R. 10629) granting a pension to Washington Ryan;

A bill (H. R. 10661) granting a pension to Mrs. Sophia Vogelsang;

A bill (H. R. 10672) granting a pension to Mighill H. Patten;

A bill (H. R. 10687) granting a pension to Charles Junot;

A bill (H. R. 10705) granting a pension to Mary L. Tanner;

A bill (H. R. 10708) granting a pension to Jane E. Knoble;

A bill (H. R. 10738) to increase the pension of George C. Quick;

A bill (H. R. 10824) granting a pension to Mary A. Van Buskirk;

A bill (H. R. 10827) for the relief of Catharine Teegardin;

A bill (H. R. 10907) granting a pension to Henry Mitchell Youngblood;

A bill (H. R. 10944) granting a pension to Victoria May;

A bill (H. R. 11005) granting a pension to Ester Gaven;

A bill (H. R. 11021) to increase the pension of Charles Hahneman;

A bill (H. R. 11029) for the relief of Mary Vanbuskirk;

A bill (H. R. 11030) granting a pension to Susan E. Latture;

A bill (H. R. 11057) granting a pension to Margaret Gray;

A bill (H. R. 11222) granting a pension to Elizabeth Heckler;

A bill (H. R. 11243) granting a pension to Mary E. McQueen; and

A bill (H. R. 11332) granting a pension to Eliza S. Glass.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendments House bills of the following titles; asked a conference with the House on said bills and amendments, and had appointed as conferees on the part of the Senate Mr. DAWES, Mr. JONES, of Arkansas, and Mr. STOCKBRIDGE:

A bill (H. R. 6612) to grant right of way through the Indian Territory to the St. Louis and San Francisco Railway Company, and for other purposes;

A bill (H. R. 7186) to authorize the Leavenworth and Rio Grande Railway Company to construct and operate a railway through the Indian Territory, and for other purposes; and

A bill (H. R. 7843) granting to Citrus Water Company right of way across Papago Indian reservation in Maricopa County, Arizona.

The message also announced that the Senate insisted on its amendments, disagreed to by the House, to the bill (H. R. 10896) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in the appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1888, and for prior years, and for other purposes, agreed to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses, and had appointed as conferees on the part of the Senate Mr. HALE, Mr. ALLISON, and Mr. COCKRELL.

ISAIAH FULLER.

The SPEAKER laid before the House a letter from the Acting Attorney-General, recommending the appropriation of \$301.50 in favor of Isaiah Fuller; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

ACCOUNTS OF UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a letter from the Acting Attorney-General, asking an appropriation to pay certain accounts of United States attorneys; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

RE-ENTRY OF HOMESTEADS.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the bill (S. 3559) to amend section 2304 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, to allow persons who have abandoned or relinquished their homestead entries to make another entry.

Mr. McRAE. Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to consider that bill now. This measure passed the House substantially in the general bill, and I hope consent will be given to take up the Senate bill and pass it.

The SPEAKER. The bill will be read, after which the Chair will ask for objection.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. Speaker, to avoid the consumption of time, I ask the gentleman to allow that bill to remain on the table until tomorrow morning, as I wish to look at it in the mean time.

Mr. McRAE. Very well.

The SPEAKER. Without objection the bill will be held for the present.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

MONUMENT AT SARATOGA.

The SPEAKER laid before the House Senate bill 3460, appropriating \$10,000 for the completion of a monument to commemorate the surrender of Burgoyne at Saratoga; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on the Library, and ordered to be printed.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:
To Mr. BOOTHMAN, indefinitely, on account of important business.
To Mr. OWEN, for ten days, on account of important business.
To Mr. PENINGTON, for one week, on account of important business.

To Mr. FUNSTON, indefinitely, on account of important business.

To Mr. ENLOE, indefinitely, on account of important business.

To Mr. HOGG, indefinitely, on account of important business.

To Mr. BERRY, for this day, on account of private business.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

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

A bill (S. 1591) granting an increase of pension to Madison M. Meredith;

A bill (S. 1101) granting a pension to Rachel A. Sinkinson;

A bill (S. 1582) for the relief of the estate of Lucien Gougan;

A bill (S. 145) for the relief of Edward Braden and Job W. Angus;

A bill (S. 1500) granting a pension to Margaret M. Miller;

A bill (S. 1044) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to state and settle the account of James M. Wilbur with the United States, and to pay said Wilbur such sum of money as may be found due him thereon;

A bill (S. 2201) for the relief of Laura E. Maddox, widow and executrix, and Robert Morrison, executor of Joseph H. Maddox, deceased;

A bill (S. 1668) for the relief of A. M. Woodruff;

A bill (S. 3471) to authorize the construction of bridges across the Kentucky River, and its tributaries, by the Louisville Southern Railroad Company;

A bill (S. 1958) granting an increase of pension to Eleanor B. Goodfellow;

A bill (S. 2711) restoring Phebe McLaughlin to the pension-roll;

A bill (S. 2720) granting a pension to John B. Ross;

A bill (S. 2836) granting a pension to William E. Taylor;

A bill (S. 3276) granting restoration of pension to Sarah A. Woodbridge;

A bill (S. 3125) restoring the right of pre-emption to Alfonzo Roberts;

A bill (S. 320) for the relief of John D. Adams;

A bill (S. 2887) granting a pension to George H. Johnson;

A bill (S. 2838) granting an increase of pension to Betsy A. Mower;

A bill (S. 2675) granting an increase of pension to Lieut. James R. Durham;

A bill (S. 2411) for the relief of C. A. Williams and others;

A bill (S. 2346) granting increase of pension to Jennie Hart Mul-lany; and

A bill (S. 937) for the relief of David L. Brainard and others.

SUNDY CIVIL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. BURNES. Mr. Speaker, as a privileged question I call up the conference report on the sundry civil appropriation bill. The report was read yesterday and has been printed. And on that I demand the previous question.

Mr. PLUMB. I rise to make a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. PLUMB. I desire to know whether the report is subject to amendment.

The SPEAKER. Conference reports are not subject to amendment. The previous question was ordered; and under the operation thereof the report was adopted.

Mr. BURNES moved to reconsider the vote by which the conference report was adopted; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

MONUMENT AT TRENTON, N. J.

Mr. LEHLBACH. I ask unanimous consent to consider the bill (S. 599) in regard to a monumental column to commemorate the battle of Trenton, in the State of New Jersey, and appropriating \$30,000, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The bill will be read, after which the Chair will ask for objection.

The bill was read at length for information.

Mr. KILGORE. I demand the regular order.

Mr. STONE, of Kentucky. I ask unanimous consent—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas has demanded the regular order, which is the call of committees for reports, and that cuts off all requests for unanimous consent, unless the demand for the regular order be withdrawn.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. BLOUNT. I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the call of the committees and that members having reports be permitted to file them with the Clerk.

Mr. WHITE, of New York. As the regular order has been demanded, is it in order to dispense with the call of the committees?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that it is the custom when the regular order is demanded to proceed with it, and the regular order now is the call of committees for reports. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BLOUNT] asks to dispense with that, and that gentlemen may file their reports with the Clerk.

The gentleman asks unanimous consent to dispense with the regular order. Is there objection?

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

RELIEF OF GAUGERS.

Mr. HENDERSON, of North Carolina, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported back with amendment the bill (H. R. 11397) for the relief of certain gaugers and other internal-revenue employes who have been assigned to duty and have rendered service before the date of their qualification; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

The SPEAKER. The hour for the consideration of bills commences at nineteen minutes past 12 o'clock.

BONDS OF DISBURSING OFFICERS, ETC.

Mr. TOWNSHEND. The Military Committee, I believe, would have the right to complete the consideration of bills reported yesterday.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the pending bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 8873) in relation to bonds of disbursing officers and to monthly payments of the Army, with amendments by the Senate.

Mr. TOWNSHEND. I will state that I am authorized by the committee to request non-concurrence in the Senate amendment and ask a conference.

Mr. HOLMAN. What is the amendment?

Mr. TOWNSHEND. It is not an important one, simply a matter of detail.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is advised from the Clerk's desk that this bill is in the hands of the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. TOWNSHEND. The Committee on Military Affairs has authorized a report.

The SPEAKER. It can only be considered by unanimous consent. The rule of the House is that this hour is set apart for the consideration of bills reported on a previous day.

Mr. TOWNSHEND. Then I ask to withdraw the bill and surrender the hour. I believe it is not in order to substitute another bill.

The SPEAKER. It is not.

Mr. TOWNSHEND. Then I withdraw the bill.

RAILWAY MAIL SERVICE.

Mr. BLOUNT. I call up House bill No. 4930, relating to the railway mail service, and, for the purpose of saving time, I move that the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union for the purpose of considering the bill.

The motion was agreed to.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole, Mr. RICHARDSON in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is now in Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union for the purpose of considering the bill indicated by the gentleman from Georgia.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Postmaster-General may appoint and assign to duty one general superintendent to superintend the railway mail service, who shall be paid a salary of— dollars a year; one assistant general superintendent of railway mail service, who shall be paid a salary of \$3,500 a year; eleven division superintendents of railway mail service, who shall each be paid a salary of \$2,500 a year; one chief clerk of railway mail service, to be employed in the Post-Office Department, who shall be paid \$2,000 a year; and as many chief clerks of railway mail service as may be necessary, who shall each receive a salary of \$1,500 a year. The general and assistant general superintendent and division superintendents shall also be paid their necessary and actual expenses while traveling on the business of the Department; and chief clerks shall be paid the like expenses, not to exceed \$4 per day to each, but the allowance for traveling expenses to any clerk shall not exceed \$300 in any fiscal year. The salaries and expenses for such superintendents and clerks shall be paid out of the appropriation for the transportation of the mail on railways.

The amendments proposed by the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads were read, as follows:

In line 5, before the word "dollars," insert the words "four thousand."

In line 7, after the word "thousand," strike out the words "five hundred."

In lines 8, 9, and 10 strike out the words "eleven division superintendents of railway mail service, who shall each be paid a salary of \$2,500 a year."

In line 19 strike out "four" and insert "three."

In lines 19, 20, and 21 strike out the words "but the allowance for traveling expenses to any clerk shall not exceed \$300 in any fiscal year."

Mr. BLOUNT. Mr. Chairman, there is one branch of the public service whose growth, with the consequent expenditure, is cause, not of complaint, but of congratulation to the whole country. I beg the attention of the committee for a few moments to a statement illustrating this growth. I have here a paper prepared officially by the Post-Office Department making a comparison of this service on the 30th day of June, 1887, with the same service on the 30th day of June, 1879, and I ask attention to the figures.

The number of miles of railroad over which the mails were carried in 1879 was 79,000. On June 30, 1887, the mileage was 131,000. The annual transportation of mails by the railroads in 1879 was 93,000 miles. In 1887 it was 116,000 miles. The miles of service by railway post-office lines in 1879 was 52,000. In 1887 it was 107,000. The number of postal clerks employed in 1879 was 2,609. The number employed on June 30, 1887, was 4,851. The number of pieces of mail-matter handled by railway postal clerks in 1879 was 2,659,000. In 1887 the number was 5,851,000. In other words, the amount of mail-matter handled in this branch of the service in 1887 was twice and a half as great as the amount handled nine years ago.

The expenditures nine years ago were about \$33,000,000. To-day they amount to about \$61,000,000.

We have this enormous service on our hands. The interest in it is as wide as the country. It touches all our people. It affects all their business relations. The importance of the correct and efficient handling of these mails and the proper management of this fund is of a magnitude scarcely to be overestimated.

This work can not be accomplished without the Government being able to command for positions requiring large intelligence and judgment suitable talent and capacity, and this can only be done by its being able to pay proper compensation. This bill proposes an increase of only \$23,000 altogether over the present rates of compensation.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON], referring the other day to the increased cost of the postal service, failed to do justice to this side of the House in respect to that subject, and especially in regard to one item. In the matter of railway mail transportation, the rate of compensation was reduced 10 per cent. by the Forty-fourth Congress, under the lead of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HOLMAN]. In the Forty-fifth Congress (or the Forty-sixth, I am not certain which at this moment) I had charge of the bill, and then the compensation was reduced by the amount of 5 per cent., making the entire reduction in the rate of compensation for railway mail service 15 per cent. from the former rates. Taking the total compensation now paid, \$17,000,000, it is easy for gentlemen to see that a very large saving has been effected annually under the operation of those laws.

This bill proposes to increase the salary of the general superintendent by the amount of \$500. It fixes the salary of an assistant general superintendent at \$3,000. It proposes an increase of \$600 in the salary of the chief clerk of the railway mail service. It increases the salaries of fifty-four chief clerks \$100 each, making \$5,400, and it makes an allowance for the traveling expenses of these clerks not exceeding \$13,500. These items make a total annual increase of expenditure of about \$23,000.

In regard to the proposed increase of salary of the general superintendent, as a matter of course I have no personal knowledge of what salary is sufficient to secure the services of a proper person to discharge the very important duties of that office; but the necessity for this increase has been urged upon the committee time and again in the last Congress and also in this Congress. During the last Congress I know that the Postmaster-General found great difficulty in procuring a proper superintendent, and I know that his success in that respect was due entirely to his personal relations with the gentleman appointed. I know, further, that the superintendent was constantly endeavoring to get away, and that, on the change of administration, notwithstanding urgent solicitations, he found that his private business necessitated his leaving the Department, and continued persistent efforts throughout several months to get relieved from the responsibilities of the office. And I know that the same thing is true of the present superintendent, and that his employment is only temporary. I know, also, the great importance of the office, and I know that the Postmaster-General has been and is exceedingly, keenly, anxious to obtain the highest talent for the head of this enormous service.

That item of increase amounts to only \$500. More was recommended, but the committee did not see fit to put it in the bill.

I wish now to call the attention of the House to the salary of assistant superintendent. It seems like a new office, but many years ago, during the Forty-fifth Congress, as the law then stood there were two general superintendents. Congress abolished one of the offices, leaving one remaining. Under the change of law the Postmaster-General detailed a post-office inspector to do the work of assistant general superintendent. His salary was \$1,600. His per diem was \$5 a day. It was really more than the salary proposed by this bill. It continued up to the administration of the Post-Office Department by Mr. Vilas, who declined to assign an officer to the service. So then within three

or four years we have been paying more than the sum indicated for this purpose.

The seeming increase of expenditure does not practically exist. It is better to do directly what you desire to do. Instead of detailing an inspector paid out of another fund and put into this place without law, it is better to understand what the service requires and designate the officer for that purpose.

The importance of this office, sir, is scarcely to be overstated. It does happen oftentimes that the general superintendent of the railway mail service is necessarily taken away from here. It is not long since when the mails were obstructed in the great Northwest, when trains ceased to run by reason of certain strikes, and the Postmaster-General felt it to be his duty to send the best officer there. The result was, by excellent management of this officer the United States mails were carried, although freight and passenger transportation entirely ceased. So we have now in the State of Mississippi almost a suspension of mail carriage. Only two or three days ago, from Cairo to Mobile, no trains were permitted to run through that State. When a train was started from Cairo to New Orleans, it was doubtful whether it would be allowed to run through. Such a situation required the best talent the Government had. The general superintendent withdrawn from this great service, shall we leave it to a clerk? It seems to me a statement of the fact is demonstration of the necessity.

The next item is as to the increase in the salary of the chief clerk of the Post-Office Department. This amounts to the sum of \$600. The present and former Postmasters-General have recommended and urged it to be necessary with a view to getting proper talent. It is a small amount and one not to quibble over.

There is an increase in the salary of fifty-four clerks. Postal clerks are graded from \$900 to \$1,400 in the matter of salary. This item does not relate to those on trains distributing mails generally. By virtue of law there is detailed at headquarters out for different divisions and subdivisions sometimes a chief clerk, whose business it is to look out in reference to the matter of handling the mails, to examine clerks to see whether their conduct is correct, and whether their transaction of the business assigned to them is properly done, and to see that schemes of distribution are changed as new offices and routes are created. It so happens that it is made the duty of these clerks to do this thing with the same salary of the higher class of clerks on the trains, but there is no provision for their expenses. The expense every day traveled is taken out of this salary, and in many places if their full duty is done their expenses nearly absorb their salaries. Is it not clear therefore to this House that such a condition of things ought not to be allowed? It results necessarily in a strong inclination on the part of the clerk to remain at his office with a view of saving this expense. This is not deemed advisable.

There is an increase of \$100 of actual salary. Clerks on the trains of the highest class are paid \$1,400. This proposes as to fifty-four clerks of the higher class they shall have an increase of \$100 each, making \$1,500 instead of \$1,400, and their traveling expenses.

This is the substance of this matter, amounting only to the sum of \$23,000. I have brought it forward because the Department has deemed it of importance to the service, and that service belongs equally to all parts and classes of the country. There are none of us who are not directly interested in it, and I think none but will assent to the proposition that if this service is as large as indicated by the official report there should be no possibility of damages coming to it by refusing a small increase to employes. Gentlemen will observe, in the vast body of employes clamoring from every class of the service for increase of salary, the committee have brought to your attention no bill inviting you to larger expenditure.

Mr. KERR. I would like to ask the gentleman if the increased office rent allowed to postmasters is not really with a view to increase salaries?

Mr. BLOUNT. That is true; and it has been recommended by every Postmaster-General of whom I have any knowledge, belonging to all parties, for many years past; and has been kept off the bills by reason of points of order. It belongs to no administration, and so far as I am concerned I am quite content to admit that there was a purpose in the increase of salaries to remedy certain inequalities as far as practicable. If there was an error in it I am willing to assume whatever share of responsibility comes to me and to my side of the House. I am willing to assume any responsibility looking to the betterment of the service without reference to party views which may be connected with it.

Mr. KERR. Let me ask the gentleman if the increase will not require larger estimates for the next year?

Mr. BLOUNT. Oh, we have provided already four hundred and odd thousand dollars for this current fiscal year. It has been provided already, and by unanimous consent of the House. Not a single gentleman objecting on either side, the legislation was put into the bill authorizing it; so I think the country can assume that it meets the approval of all parties.

Mr. KERR. When was that unanimous consent given?

Mr. BLOUNT. Well, sir, I can not recollect exactly the date. I recollect that it was done, and by reason of it legislation took place by which the bill passed the House and finally became a law. The Jour-

nal will disclose the exact date, if my friend shall have occasion to ascertain hereafter.

Mr. KERR. I ask if it was not early in the session, when few persons had their attention addressed to the subject or thought of it at all?

Mr. BLOUNT. I do not know at what stage people began to think. The attention of the country was called to it by Republican and Democratic Postmasters-General for years past.

If no gentlemen desire further to be heard, I will move that the committee now rise.

Mr. SOWDEN. I wish to be heard.

Mr. BLOUNT. How much time does the gentleman want?

Mr. SOWDEN. I propose to rise in my own right in opposition to the bill.

Mr. BLOUNT. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the general debate be limited on this bill, if I have the floor for that purpose.

The CHAIRMAN. It can only be done by unanimous consent.

Mr. BLOUNT. Unless consent is given I shall move that the committee rise to limit debate.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman indicate any time?

Mr. SOWDEN. I propose to claim the time to which I am entitled under the rules of the House. I rise in opposition in my own right.

Mr. BLOUNT. Then I move that the committee now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and Mr. CRISP having taken the chair as Speaker *pro tempore*, Mr. RICHARDSON reported that the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union having had under consideration the bill H. R. 4930, had come to no resolution thereon.

Mr. BLOUNT. I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union to resume consideration of the bill H. R. 4930; and pending that I move that all general debate on the same be limited to fifteen minutes.

Mr. SOWDEN. I rise to make a parliamentary inquiry. Can the time be limited? Is not a member entitled to one hour under the rules of the House when he rises in opposition?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Under the rules of the House, after general debate has been entered upon it is in the power of the House at any time to limit it.

Mr. SOWDEN. I hope it will not be limited.

Mr. BLOUNT. I have no objection to debating the bill, but there are but two hours within which it can possibly be considered. If the gentleman desires to resort to any and every method to defeat the bill of course he can do so. I will not be responsible.

Mr. SOWDEN. I only want but a short time myself; but I believe that others want to be heard.

Mr. DINGLEY. I desire to suggest that there are several gentlemen on this side who would like about five minutes each, and fifteen minutes would seem scarcely long enough.

Mr. SOWDEN. I will state for the information of the gentleman from Georgia that personally I do not care to occupy more than from three to five minutes.

Mr. BLOUNT. Will the gentleman be content with ten minutes?

Mr. SOWDEN. Certainly, although I may not occupy that much time.

Mr. DINGLEY. I think fifteen minutes will be enough on this side.

Mr. BLOUNT. Then I will ask unanimous consent that the general debate be limited to twenty-five minutes after we go into Committee of the Whole; and if the gentleman from Pennsylvania does not desire so much as ten minutes I will reserve what he does not use for myself. I move, therefore, that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and, pending that, that all general debate on the bill be closed in twenty-five minutes.

The motion to limit debate was agreed to.

Mr. BLOUNT. I wish to ask unanimous consent now, if it may be done, that the hour be extended until this bill is finished. To-morrow will be Friday.

Mr. DINGLEY. We may as well do that, as there is no other business to-day.

Mr. BLOUNT. I hope there will be no objection to the request.

Mr. HOLMAN. Until the gentleman having charge of the sundry civil bill returns—

Mr. BLOUNT. That has been adopted.

Mr. HOLMAN. Well, the deficiency bill. For the moment I desire to interpose an objection.

Mr. BLOUNT. I will state to the gentleman from Indiana that I would have no objection, if it would suit his wishes, that the committee shall rise at any time during the consideration of this bill to enter upon the business he suggests.

Mr. HOLMAN. I hope the agreement will not be made at present.

Mr. BLOUNT. The gentleman objects?

Mr. HOLMAN. I do object to extending the hour for the present.

Mr. BLOUNT. Then I would suggest, if it be agreeable to gentlemen on the outside of the House, that general debate be closed now, and they will be entitled to five minutes' debate under the rule.

Mr. DINGLEY. That would be entirely agreeable to me.

Mr. BLOUNT. I ask that that be done.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. By a vote of the House the debate has been limited to twenty-five minutes. That vote will have to be reconsidered.

Mr. BLOUNT. Then I move to reconsider the vote by which the debate was limited to twenty-five minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. BLOUNT. Now I ask unanimous consent that the general debate be closed, and that we proceed in committee to discuss the bill under the five-minute rule.

Mr. HOLMAN. I think every gentleman who desires to speak upon a bill of this importance should have the opportunity. There ought to be reasonable time.

Mr. BLOUNT. I move that when the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole for the consideration of this bill all general debate be limited to five minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

The motion that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole was agreed to.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, Mr. RICHARDSON in the chair.

Mr. SOWDEN. I regret that my friend from Georgia [Mr. BLOUNT] exhibits so much anxiety to press this bill to a vote. It seems to me unfortunate, not only on his part, but on the part of the committee having this bill in charge that its passage should be so earnestly urged at this time, particularly since it would increase the present number of Federal offices and add considerably to the salaries of the officers already employed in this branch of the public service.

It proposes to increase the annual expenditures in the railway mail service \$23,000. It increases the salary of the general superintendent \$500 per annum. It seems to me that we can add nothing to the fitness and capacity of this very worthy officer by increasing his salary. So far as I know, he is thoroughly competent, and discharges the duties of his office in a most satisfactory manner, and is well paid for his services. There are undoubtedly many good and competent persons who would be glad to have his place at the present salary. If it were contended that in adding to his salary \$500 annually we would correspondingly add to his competency and fitness, there might be some excuse for the proposed bill and the contention of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BLOUNT]. Unless he can satisfy this House that such is the fact I for one shall certainly vote against it.

Mr. BLOUNT. Will my friend allow me—

Mr. SOWDEN. No; I have only five minutes. This bill also provides for the creation of a new office, namely, an assistant general superintendent of the railway mail service, who is to receive an annual salary of \$3,000. The efficiency of this particular branch of the public service has never been questioned, and why the creation of this new office, with this additional expenditure of the public money, I am unable to comprehend, and would be pleased to have the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BLOUNT] explain it. It is certainly a departure from the obligation of this Administration to the tax-payers of the country. It is pledged to an honest and most frugal administration of the Federal Government.

For more than twenty-five years the party represented by this side of the House denounced the Republican party for keeping in office a large number of unnecessary office-holders at the expense of the people, and promised to correct this evil in the event of their accession to power by abolishing all unnecessary offices and the dismissal of all needless officials. In the face of this obligation we are now asked to do exactly the opposite in the pending measure.

It is also proposed to increase the salary of the chief clerk of this Department \$600 per annum. What salary does this officer receive now? Is it not ample? Is there any complaint that it is too low? Are there not hundreds who would be glad to have it at the salary he now receives? Is the service to be correspondingly benefited by the proposed increase of his salary? If not, why this proposition and whence the necessity for it?

Again, it is proposed to increase the salary of fifty-four clerks \$5,400 annually, besides allowing them \$3 per day for actual traveling expenses.

Mr. BLOUNT. Oh, no.

Mr. SOWDEN. Oh, yes; there are fifty-four chief clerks and the proposition is to increase their salaries \$100 each, which makes the sum total \$5,400, as stated. Why this proposition? Whence the necessity for it? Do these men complain that they are not well paid? Is the service threatened with their resignation unless this advance is provided for them? I have no doubt but that in the gentleman's district from Georgia, like in mine, there are any number of good Democrats who would gladly accept these clerkships at the present rate of compensation. I would like to know from the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BLOUNT] what urgent necessity there is for the passage of this bill.

It is estimated that the traveling expenses provided for in this measure will not exceed \$13,500 per annum. What assurances have we for this conclusion on the part of the committee presenting the report accompanying the bill? Heretofore these expenses were cheerfully borne by these clerks, whose salaries were deemed ample and satisfactory.

Is this Democratic economy? Are we in a position to add these increased expenditures to the already too large demands upon the public Treasury, and especially since the other side charge that we have increased the public expenditures under this Administration some \$90,000,000 above the expenditures of the last Republican administration? This bill proposes to add to the annual expenses \$23,000. In my opinion there is no necessity for it, and it comes with ill grace from this side of the House, since we stand pledged to the abolition of all unnecessary offices, the lopping off of all needless expenses, and the most rigid economy in the expenditure of the public moneys.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. HOPKINS, of Illinois. So far as I am concerned I believe we ought to pay an adequate salary for the service, but the bill as presented by the committee it seems to me is imperfect. Under the law as it exists at present the general superintendent has a salary of \$3,500 per annum, and his duty is to designate the different chief clerks, prescribe their duties, supervise their conduct, and look after their interests, and so on. In the present bill the committee propose to change that and relieve him of that duty entirely and put it in charge of the Postmaster-General, and still raise his salary \$500 per annum.

Mr. BLOUNT. It does not change the duties.

Mr. HOPKINS, of Illinois. Unless there is some good reason given for this by the chairman of the committee who has this bill in charge, all who are in favor of retrenchment and economy should oppose this increase of salary of the superintendent. If the bill proposed to impose on him extra duties which would require a higher order of ability, either executive or otherwise, then of course the salary should be increased accordingly. But if the superintendent is simply to perform the duties which have already been performed by the present superintendent and those who have preceded him, I see no reason just at this stage for increasing his salary \$500 per annum.

Now, it would be better to modify this bill so that instead of having the superintendent of the railway mail service appointed by the Postmaster-General he should be appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. According to the statement made here this morning by the chairman of the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads, this branch of the public service has increased so much that it has become of gigantic magnitude, and this office is of such a character that the capabilities and qualifications of its incumbent should be passed upon by the Senate of the United States. That is a criticism that I make upon this bill, and which I desire to bring to the attention of the chairman of the committee. If this proposed increase of salary is to be adopted, then I think the bill should be amended so as to have this officer appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate; but if he is to be shorn of a large proportion of his duties, as is proposed in this bill—

Mr. BLOUNT. That is not proposed here. This bill makes no change in that respect.

Mr. HOPKINS, of Illinois. Well, there is nothing to show that. The law of 1887 prescribes the duties of this officer and fixes his salary at \$3,500.

Mr. BLOUNT. This bill does not change the duties at all; but if the gentleman thinks it does, I have no objection to an amendment.

Mr. HOPKINS, of Illinois. Another point is this: there are fifty-four chief clerks, and it is proposed to raise the salary of each of them \$100. Under this bill the number of these chief clerks is not limited to fifty-four; there may be as many of them as the Postmaster-General may think necessary. Of course that leaves the matter entirely within the discretion of the Postmaster-General, and if he should be so disposed, political considerations might control the appointment of a number of these officials.

A matter of that kind should be regulated and guarded in the bill itself. This branch of the public service is reduced to such exactness that the chairman of the committee must know to-day how many chief clerks are really necessary, and certainly the superintendent of the railway mail service knows. From the increase of the business between 1879 and 1887, as stated by the chairman of the committee [Mr. BLOUNT] here to-day, the officers of the Department must be well able to judge of the number of these clerks that will be required, and certainly there ought to be some limit prescribed to the appointment of these officials, so that their number shall be increased only as the increase of the business demands.

Again, in regard to this assistant superintendent of railway mail service with a salary of \$3,000 a year. The service has gone on thus far without any such officer and without the payment of any such salary, and before this bill is passed I for one would like very much to have the chairman of the committee explain to the House why it is necessary to create this new office, with this large salary—

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

Mr. SOWDEN. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendments proposed by the committee must first be considered.

Mr. KERR. I ask to have the committee amendments read.

The Clerk read the first amendment, as follows:

In line 5, before the word "dollars," insert the words "four thousand."

Mr. BLOUNT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word

for the purpose of replying to some criticisms that have been made here. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SOWDEN] says that this is an increase of \$23,000 in the way of salaries. I wish to call the attention of the House to this statement, which shows that of the \$23,000, \$13,500 will be required to pay the traveling expenses of the clerks who are required to go out on the different routes for the purpose of examining the employees, etc.

Mr. SOWDEN. I wish to ask the gentleman whether it is not true that this bill, if it were enacted into law, would increase the annual expenditures \$23,000, regardless of the character of the expenditures?

Mr. BLOUNT. I answer, Mr. Chairman, that that is the truth, but I am not going to suppose that the reason and intelligence of this House are so bridled that when they shall find that they are directing these clerks, the highest class of clerks they have, to travel over the country for the purpose of examining the men who are engaged in handling the mails, it will insist that these clerks shall put their hands into their own pockets and pay their traveling expenses.

Mr. MILLIKEN. I wish to ask the gentleman whether those expenses are not paid by the Government now?

Mr. BLOUNT. They are not; and that has been a subject of complaint by administration after administration; but under the rules of this House it was impossible to get consideration of it. You have tied down this House under your rules so that the great Departments of the Government generally can not get before Congress for the purpose of presenting these questions, and when they do come here, instead of the House understanding the real state of the case, instead of their understanding that this difficulty is an old and grievous one, gentlemen express astonishment that this "new" thing has been brought in! I could have kept it back, but I have chosen to bring it in here; and I now submit it to the reason and the judgment of the House.

Mr. MILLIKEN. What are the salaries of those clerks?

Mr. BLOUNT. They are \$1,400 a year, and out of that must be paid their traveling expenses; while many of the very men whom they go out to examine are getting salaries of \$1,400 a year without any such deduction. The highest class of clerks known to the law have their salaries exhausted in this way, just as you exhausted the salaries of your third-class postmasters by making them rent houses for you, and pay for fuel, and so on.

Mr. JOHNSTON, of North Carolina. Do not those clerks get their railroad transportation free?

Mr. BLOUNT. They have to pay their hotel bills and sleeping-car expenses.

Mr. JOHNSTON, of North Carolina. But their railroad transportation is free, is it not?

Mr. BLOUNT. Their mere railroad transportation is free; but they travel a great deal at night, and if they sleep they have to pay for their berths just as you would have to do, and when they go to a hotel they have to pay their hotel bills.

Mr. JOHNSTON, of North Carolina. Do they not have to do the same thing when located in the city of Washington? Do they not have to pay here their board or hotel bills, etc.?

Mr. BLOUNT. Many of them have families located at some particular point, and there is a very great difference in the cost of living when the men are away from home and obliged to incur traveling expenses. In reference to the large class of inspectors in various Departments of the Government, Congress has never thought it just that the burden of traveling expenses should fall upon them, but they have been allowed a per diem.

Now, Mr. Chairman, with my observations as to fifty-four clerks, I have disposed of \$13,500 of the \$23,000, leaving less than \$10,000 involved in this question of increase of salaries. I want to show now that the amount is still less. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HOPKINS] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SOWDEN] have referred to the creation of the office of assistant general superintendent at a salary of \$3,000 as an increase to this amount. I beg the attention of those gentlemen to this fact. Under a former administration the practice was (and there is authority of law for it) to detail an inspector for this purpose; and this inspector has been in the habit of traveling from one end of the country to the other, his salary being \$1,600 and his per diem \$5 per day, making his compensation about \$3,400.

Mr. HOPKINS, of Illinois. Will the gentleman allow me to interrupt him a moment?

Mr. BLOUNT. With great pleasure.

Mr. HOPKINS, of Illinois. Will the adoption of the bill now proposed by the committee do away with that office?

Mr. BLOUNT. That is the purpose. If the language of the bill is not sufficiently explicit in that respect, I am perfectly willing it shall be amended.

Mr. HOPKINS, of Illinois. The point I make is that there is nothing in the bill which would do away with that office; and if this bill should become a law this officer could be detailed in the same manner as he has been; so that the passage of the bill would result in an increased expenditure of \$3,000 for this new office.

Mr. BLOUNT. There are two answers to the gentleman's suggestion. In the first place, the law allowing this assignment provides for a contingency which, if this bill be passed, will not occur. If we have

an assistant general superintendent of the railway mail service the Department is not likely to be forced to the employment of a postal inspector. There was a time when there were two of these assistant superintendents, and those positions being abolished, the Department, operating under an absolute necessity, began to detail this inspector under authority of law, at an expense, as I have said, of something like \$3,400 a year.

If my friend from Illinois is not satisfied with the language of the bill, I have no objection to an amendment inhibiting the detail of any postal inspector in connection with the office of general superintendent of the railway mail service. So that in reality, as will be seen, this item of \$3,000 amounts to scarcely anything at all. So far as concerns the chief clerk, I care very little about that. The main item of expense is the increase of \$5,400 for fifty-four clerks, and also the traveling expenses, somewhere in the neighborhood of \$13,000.

Mr. SOWDEN. Mr. Chairman, I confess my surprise at the flippant manner in which the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BLOUNT] speaks of the proposed increased expenditures provided for in this bill. He says that the increased expense by reason of the creation of this new officer, to be known as the assistant general superintendent of the railway mail service, will amount to "only \$3,000," and that the total increased expenditure under this bill amounted to "only \$23,000."

Mr. BLOUNT. The gentleman is making a very fine speech which he attributes to me, and replies to. I do not think I made that sort of a speech.

Mr. SOWDEN. This is just what the gentleman said, that "only \$23,000" was involved in this bill, and "only \$3,000" of it by reason of the creation of the new office of assistant general superintendent. Why, sir, \$500 here, \$3,000 there, \$600 here, \$3,400 there, and \$13,500 here make up the \$23,000 total increase provided for in this measure; and if we keep on piling up the amounts in this way it will soon reach "only" \$100,000 more. How lightly we are inclined to speak of these vast sums of money! It is a stultification, sir, of the party represented by a majority in this House to even submit a proposition looking to the further increase of the number of offices already provided by law and to add to the long list of office-holders, of which there is already too much complaint.

With more than one hundred thousand Federal officers it would seem, from the proposition before the House, that this vast army is to be still further increased. We have already created too many additional offices, and the time has come when a halt in this direction should be commanded. We can not afford such stultification. Let us rather ascertain what unnecessary offices there are, and, if any, lop them off. Let no proposition emanate from this side of the House to increase them. If the gentleman having this matter in charge can satisfy this House, or a majority of its members, that this proposed increase of salaries and the appointment of an assistant general superintendent of the railway mail service will essentially add to the efficiency of the public service, then there may be some reason for the urging of the passage of this bill.

Here are fifty-four clerks whose salaries it is proposed to increase \$100 each per annum, besides their traveling expenses, not to exceed \$3 per day. It strikes me that my friend from Georgia [Mr. BLOUNT] would lose his zeal for the passage of this bill if he knew the political complexion of the majority of these officers. I think I may safely venture to remark that out of the fifty-four there are scarcely ten who are of the same political party represented by this side of the House. I believe if he investigated the political character of the parties interested in this measure, outside of the general superintendent, he would find that a large majority of them are politically opposed to the party to which he belongs, and perhaps even the man whose office he is seeking to establish may come from the other side. These suggestions, however, should have no effect whatever upon the merits of this bill if the efficiency of the public service is involved, and if the gentleman championing it can convince the House that its passage would materially improve it.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. BLOUNT. Mr. Chairman, I do not know the political complexion of these fifty-four clerks.

Mr. SOWDEN. Neither do I.

Mr. BLOUNT. I do not know what is to be the political views of the gentlemen who may get the offices hereafter when the salaries shall be increased. I do not think, sir, that with a service as important as this the House should resolve itself into a political meeting and get off campaign speeches when the people are expecting wise legislation; and the man who undertakes to trifle with a service of this kind, belonging to this or any other of the great Departments of the Government, will find the people of the country have a higher idea than the mere squabbles around the ballot-box for office.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SOWDEN] undertook to portray the speech I had made and said it was summed in the declaration that it was only \$23,000, and this after I had taken occasion to give the reason which had been furnished by the Postmaster-General and by his predecessor, each of whom, by reason of his eminent ability and experience, was entitled to greater consideration than the gentleman from Pennsylvania, who has given no attention or very little to the subject.

The gentleman is astonished to find that I should be willing to increase the expenditures of a service now \$61,000,000, by the amount of \$23,000, when most of it is to give per diem to clerks. Now, the gentleman from Pennsylvania is not the person, he has not the record in legislation in this House, to assail me as wanting in proper regard for public expenditure. He has served on the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, which has cost this Government more in that direction than has been expended by any Congress in the history of the country.

Mr. SOWDEN. The record will not show that or bear out the gentleman's statement.

Mr. BLOUNT. I will take the opportunity to demonstrate the fact at the proper time.

Mr. DINGLEY. And his particular building was not added to the expenditure. [Laughter.]

Mr. BLOUNT. No. The building at Allentown was so important it was absolutely necessary to override the veto of his own President. [Laughter.] If he wants to appeal to partisan views—

Mr. SOWDEN. I am not like the gentleman. I do not appeal to partisan views.

Mr. BLOUNT. You made no partisan appeal when you said we were in the presence of a Presidential election, and it would not do.

The CHAIRMAN. The hour for the consideration of bills has expired.

The morning hour having expired for consideration of bills, the committee informally rose; and the Speaker having taken the chair, Mr. RICHARDSON reported that the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4930) relating to railway mail service, and had come to no resolution thereon.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

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

A bill (H. R. 1923) providing for the establishment of a life-saving station at the harbor of Kewaunee, Wis., and at other places therein named;

A bill (H. R. 10068) granting a pension to Lieut. Starkey R. Powell;

A bill (H. R. 10934) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell township maps or plats remaining on hand in his office; and

A bill (H. R. 11101) to include Sapelo Sound, Sapelo River, and Sapelo Island in the Brunswick collection district, in the State of Georgia.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. HOLMAN. I move that the House take a recess until 4 o'clock this evening—

Mr. McMILLIN. Pending that I move that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. HOLMAN. I trust my friend will yield to me for a moment.

Mr. McMILLIN. I will hear the gentleman's statement, and withdraw the motion temporarily.

Mr. HOLMAN. My purpose in moving to take a recess until 4 o'clock was with a view that in case the conferees on the general deficiency bill make a report by that time it could be received and ordered to be printed in the RECORD so as to appear to-morrow morning. The same object, however, can be secured if unanimous consent is obtained now that the conclusion reached by the conferees, if they shall reach a conclusion to-day, may be printed in the RECORD of to-morrow morning.

Mr. McMILLIN. I think that is right.

Mr. HOPKINS, of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, there was an understanding, on this side of the House at least, that the bill called up by the gentleman from Georgia should have consideration to-day until it was concluded.

Mr. McMILLIN. No; that is a mistake.

Mr. BLOUNT. There was objection made to that request. The gentleman from Indiana objected.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana now asks unanimous consent that if the conferees on the general deficiency bill come to a conclusion to-day the report may be handed in to the Clerk and ordered to be printed in the RECORD of to-morrow morning. Is there objection?

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

Mr. McMILLIN. I move that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. CHEADLE. I rise to a question of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER. But the motion to adjourn is pending.

Mr. HOPKINS, of Illinois. I hope an adjournment will not be had in the face of such an important bill as that now pending.

Mr. McMILLIN. But that bill is not now pending. It is not before the House, the hour having expired.

The SPEAKER. The Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads will have another hour hereafter for the consideration of the bill.

The question being taken on the motion of Mr. McMILLIN, the House divided; and there were—ayes 46, noes 25.

So the motion was agreed to; and accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 27 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned.

PRIVATE BILLS INTRODUCED AND REFERRED.

Under the rule private bills of the following titles were introduced and referred as indicated below:

By Mr. C. H. ALLEN: A bill (H. R. 11519) granting a pension to Mary Ellen Burrill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CHEADLE: A bill (H. R. 11520) granting a pension to Julius L. Benson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIAMS: A bill (H. R. 11521) to pension James H. Sirrine—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11522) to increase the pension of Thomas Foley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WISE: A bill (H. R. 11523) for the relief of William A. Brown and Frederick R. Brown, Fred. R. Brown and John R. Brown—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

The following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk, under the rule, and referred as follows:

By Mr. C. H. ALLEN: Petition of Patrick Carr, Company I, Thirtieth Massachusetts Volunteers, for relief—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Mary Ellen Burrill, for a widow's pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. J. M. ALLEN: Petition for reference of sundry war claims to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BRUMM: Petition of John G. Dooley and some 200 others, citizens of Schuylkill County, Pennsylvania, in favor of the service-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FORNEY: Petition of S. D. Warren, of De Kalb County, and of Thomas S. Winn, heir-at-law of Drucilla Winn, of Cherokee County, Alabama, for reference of their claims to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LANHAM: Petition of William H. Kelton, of Coryell County, Texas, for the reference of his claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. J. J. O'NEILL: Petition for the relief of members of the Holland Horse of Missouri—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. J. D. STEWART: Petition of Claudius P. Cassin, of Fulton County, Georgia, for reference of his claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. STONE, of Missouri: Petition of William W. Kennedy, of Missouri, for reference of his claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. ROGERS: Petition relating to the suppression of trusts—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O. B. THOMAS: Papers in the case of William Miller, for relief—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. A. C. THOMPSON: Petition of citizens of Jackson County, Ohio, to prevent the adulteration of food—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WHITTHORNE: Petition of John D. Caron, for payment of his war claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, September 28, 1888.

The House met at 12 o'clock m. Prayer by Rev. J. A. PRICE, of Washington, D. C.

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

GENERAL INDEX OF JOURNALS OF CONGRESS.

Mr. CARUTH, by unanimous consent, submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Accounts:

Resolved, That the Committee on Rules be hereby authorized to reappoint the person recently employed under the resolution of May 22, 1882, at the rate of compensation fixed by the said resolution, to assist in the preparation of a general index of the Journals of Congress under the resolution of June 18, 1878, to be paid out of the contingent fund of the House until an appropriation shall be made.

CLAIMS ALLOWED BY ACCOUNTING OFFICERS, ETC.

The SPEAKER laid before the House a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting schedule of claims allowed by the accounting officers, the balances of which have been exhausted or carried to the surplus fund; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

REFERENCE OF BILLS.

The SPEAKER laid before the House Senate amendments to bills of the House of the following titles; which were referred as follows, namely:

The bill (H. R. 6612) to grant the right of way through the Indian Territory to the St. Louis and San Francisco Railway Company, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Indian Affairs;

The bill (H. R. 7186) to authorize the Leavenworth and Rio Grande Railway Company to construct and operate a railway through the In-

dian Territory, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Indian Affairs;

The bill (H. R. 7843) granting to the Citrons Water Company the right of way across the Papago Indian reservation in Maricopa County, Arizona—to the Committee on Indian Affairs; and

The bill (H. R. 7516) to increase the pension of Sylvester Stearnes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

MARY F. PFEIFFER.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4039) granting a pension to Mary F. Pfeiffer.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that this is merely a formal amendment of the Senate to insert the name of the company in which the soldier served.

Mr. HENDERSON, of Illinois. I ask the House to concur in the Senate amendment.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

NANCY J. COTNER.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 10881) granting a pension to Nancy J. Cotner.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that in this case the amendment is also merely formal, to strike out "E" and insert "C;" and if there be no objection the amendment will be concurred in.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. PLATT, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agreed to the report of the conference committee on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate numbered 110 to the sundry civil appropriation bill.

SUFFERERS BY YELLOW FEVER.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the joint resolution (S. R. 110) in aid of sufferers from yellow fever, with House amendments disagreed to by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. If there be no objection, the House will insist upon its amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

REFERENCE OF SENATE BILLS.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House Senate bills; which were severally read twice, and referred as follows, namely:

The bill (S. 3438) to refund illegal internal-revenue tax collected of the late Alexander W. Baldwin, as United States district judge for the district of Nevada—to the Committee on Claims.

The bill (S. 1839) for the relief of Daniel C. Rodman and others, sureties on the bond of Ozias Morgan—to the Committee on Claims.

The bill (S. 2182) to amend sections 4488 and 4489 of the Revised Statutes, requiring life-saving appliances on steamers—to the Committee on Commerce.

The bill (S. 3427) to amend section 4474 of the Revised Statutes of the United States—to the Committee on Commerce.

The bill (S. 3124) creating three additional land offices in the State of Colorado—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the bill (S. 3390) to create the Lincoln land district in the Territory of New Mexico.

Mr. HOLMAN. I ask unanimous consent that this bill, the title of which has just been read, be allowed to remain on the Speaker's table for the present.

The SPEAKER. Without objection that order will be made. There was no objection.

BOUNDARY LINE, CONNECTICUT AND RHODE ISLAND.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the bill (S. 3098) concerning the settlement of the boundary line between Connecticut and Rhode Island.

Mr. RUSSELL, of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of that bill.

The SPEAKER. The bill will be read subject to the right of objection.

The bill was read.

Mr. HOLMAN. I wish to inquire whether this has been considered by the Committee on Foreign Affairs?

Mr. RUSSELL, of Connecticut. A similar bill was introduced in the House and referred to the Judiciary Committee. A subcommittee have considered it.

Mr. ROGERS. As is well known, Mr. Speaker, it is almost impossible to procure a quorum of any committee now. Something like a week ago this bill was referred to a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, of which I have the honor to be chairman, and I have personally given it the best consideration I could. I think there is no sort of doubt, if we could get the committee together in order to submit it, it would receive the unanimous indorsement of the committee.

It is to ratify an agreement between the two States named, they having agreed upon the line, and all interests affecting the United States are properly preserved, I think. Under the Constitution, however, the assent of Congress must be given before the agreement between the