

Jennie M. Van Arsdale, to be postmaster at Arlington, in the county of Hudson and State of New Jersey.

John T. Rosell, to be postmaster at Freehold, in the county of Monmouth and State of New Jersey.

Mitchell G. Hall, to be postmaster at Cordele, in the county of Dooly and State of Georgia.

Henry D. Attwood, to be postmaster at Brunswick, in the county of Glynn and State of Georgia.

Miss Ella M. Henry, to be postmaster at Elberton, in the county of Elbert and State of Georgia.

Ellen L. Bailhache, to be postmaster at Martinez, in the county of Contra Costa and State of California.

Robert Carson, to be postmaster at New Brunswick, in the county of Middlesex and State of New Jersey.

Pickens B. Hall, to be postmaster at Waynesboro, in the county of Burke and State of Georgia.

Josiah Freeman, to be postmaster at Nantucket, in the county of Nantucket and State of Massachusetts.

John J. Wheeler, to be postmaster at Crown Point, in the county of Lake and State of Indiana.

Henry V. Van Dusen, to be postmaster at Los Angeles, in the county of Los Angeles and State of California.

Joseph M. Hollywood, to be postmaster at Brockton, in the county of Plymouth and State of Massachusetts.

Joseph L. Noyes, to be postmaster at Georgetown, in the county of Essex and State of Massachusetts.

Mrs. Eunice J. Eastman, to be postmaster at Potsdam, in the county of St. Lawrence and State of New York.

Orville C. Robinson, to be postmaster at Fort Edward, in the county of Washington and State of New York.

John F. Jenkins, to be postmaster at Sing Sing, in the county of Westchester and State of New York.

Edgar Hoyt, to be postmaster at Katonah, in the county of Westchester and State of New York.

Joseph A. Sneed, to be postmaster at Newburg, in the county of Orange and State of New York.

George H. Scott, to be postmaster at Coxsackie, in the county of Greene and State of New York.

Orange Sackett, to be postmaster at Avon, in the county of Livingston and State of New York.

Newton M. Wardwell, to be postmaster at Adams, in the county of Jefferson and State of New York.

Asa C. Cary, to be postmaster at Fort Fairfield, in the county of Aroostook and State of Maine.

Daniel A. Curtis, to be postmaster at Machias, in the county of Washington and State of Maine.

Peter W. Carpenter, to be postmaster at Ypsilanti, in the county of Washtenaw and State of Michigan.

John S. Heald, to be postmaster at Hartford, in the county of Van Buren and State of Michigan.

Kirke W. Noyes, to be postmaster at Paw Paw, in the county of Van Buren and State of Michigan.

Homer B. Bryson, to be postmaster at Carlisle, in the county of Nicholas and State of Kentucky.

Samuel T. Howard, to be postmaster at Le Roy, in the county of Genesee and State of New York.

James A. Webster, to be postmaster at Warsaw, in the county of Wyoming and State of New York.

John E. Shields, to be postmaster at Alderson, in the county of Monroe and State of West Virginia.

Samuel B. McLanahan, to be postmaster at Elizabethtown, in the county of Lancaster and State of Pennsylvania.

Simkin B. Welch, to be postmaster at Montpelier, in the county of Williams and State of Ohio.

George H. Tyler, to be postmaster at Chillicothe, in the county of Ross and State of Ohio.

Daniel R. Shriver, to be postmaster at Manchester, in the county of Adams and State of Ohio.

Walter S. Reeve, to be postmaster at Moorestown, in the county of Burlington and State of New Jersey.

Arthur F. Elmendorf, to be postmaster at South Orange, in the county of Essex and State of New Jersey.

Ancil B. Mayhew, to be postmaster at Seymour, in the county of Baylor and State of Texas.

Hiram A. David, to be postmaster at Wolfe City, in the county of Hunt and State of Texas.

James Perry, to be postmaster at Postville, in the county of Alamahee and State of Iowa.

Samuel Sturgeon, to be postmaster at Garner, in the county of Hancock and State of Iowa.

George W. Jamison, to be postmaster at Oelwein, in the county of Fayette and State of Iowa.

William R. Morgan, to be postmaster at Hot Springs, in the county of Fall River and State of South Dakota.

Arthur W. Dampier, to be postmaster at Northfield, in the county of Rice and State of Minnesota.

John H. Sprout, to be postmaster at Blue Earth City, in the county of Faribault and State of Minnesota.

Frank Lewis, to be postmaster at Worthington, in the county of Nobles and State of Minnesota.

Henry Humphrey, to be postmaster at Lake Crystal, in the county of Blue Earth and State of Minnesota.

Myron D. Gibbs, to be postmaster at Tracy, in the county of Lyon and State of Minnesota.

Robert A. Etter, to be postmaster at Monroe, in the county of Green and State of Wisconsin.

George Sackett, to be postmaster at White Haven, in the county of Luzerne and State of Pennsylvania.

Benjamin F. Lantz, to be postmaster at Taylorsville, in the county of Christian and State of Illinois.

Walter Colyer, to be postmaster at Albion, in the county of Edwards and State of Illinois.

Lorenzo D. Carter, to be postmaster at Oakland, in the county of Coles and State of Illinois.

Seth S. Boynton, to be postmaster at Oroville, in the county of Butte and State of California.

Leonard S. Calkins, to be postmaster at Nevada City, in the county of Nevada and State of California.

Agnes Ross, to be postmaster at Ravenswood, in the county of Cook and State of Illinois.

William E. Brand, to be postmaster at Highland Park, in the county of Lake and State of Illinois.

John M. Boicourt, to be postmaster at Golconda, in the county of Pope and State of Illinois.

Thomas Blair, to be postmaster at Staunton, in the county of Macoupin and State of Illinois.

Samuel H. Kellogg, to be postmaster at Colchester, in the county of New London and State of Connecticut.

Charles H. Edwards, to be postmaster at Portland, in the county of Middlesex and State of Connecticut.

George H. Cooper, to be postmaster at Montowese, in the county of New Haven and State of Connecticut.

Duncan A. Macbeth, to be postmaster at Snohomish, in the county of Snohomish and State of Washington.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, January 6, 1892.

The House met at 12 o'clock m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

The Clerk proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of yesterday.

Mr. BLANCHARD. I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk be directed to dispense with the reading of the titles of bills introduced on yesterday.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Is there objection?

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

The remainder of the Journal was then read and approved.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows: To Mr. LAWSON, indefinitely, on account of sickness.

To Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee, for ten days, on account of illness.

To Mr. WHEELER of Alabama, for two days, on account of important business.

To Mr. MCRAE, indefinitely, on account of sickness.

To Mr. BOATNER, for ten days, from and after to-morrow.

To Mr. TARSNEY (on motion of Mr. DE ARMOND), indefinitely, on account of illness.

THE ELEVENTH CENSUS.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore* laid before the House a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, asking immediate action upon the estimate for the appropriation for the Eleventh Census; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

CHARITIES, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore* also laid before the House a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting the report of the superintendent of charities for the District of Columbia for the year ending June 30, 1891; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

SUSQUEHANNA RIVER.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore* also laid before the House a letter from the Acting Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, the report of the examination and survey of the Susquehanna River above Havre de Grace, Md.; which was referred to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

FIFTH ANNUAL REPORT INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore* also laid before the House a letter from the acting chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting the fifth annual report; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

THE LATE HON. PRESTON B. PLUMB.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore* also laid before the House the following:

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES, December 21, 1891.

Resolved, That the sudden death of the Hon. Preston B. Plumb causes profound sorrow and deep regret to his associates in the Senate.

Resolved, That a committee of five Senators be appointed by the Vice-President to take order, with a committee of the House of Representatives, for superintending the funeral of the late Senator Plumb, and as a mark of respect for his memory that his body be removed from the capital to the State of Kansas in charge of the Sergeant-at-Arms, and attended by said committee, who shall have full power to carry this resolution into effect.

Resolved, That the Senate will, at 1 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m., to-day, attend in its Chamber the exercises incident to his funeral, and that these resolutions be communicated to the House of Representatives.

In pursuance of the foregoing resolution the Vice-President appointed as said committee Mr. PFEFFER, Mr. DOLPH, Mr. PADDOCK, Mr. RANSOM, and Mr. PALMER.

Attest:

ANSON G. MCCOOK, Secretary.

which was ordered to lie upon the table.

EXPORT TRADE IN CATTLE.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore* also laid before the House the joint resolution of the Senate (S. R. 10) in regard to the export trade in cattle; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

VACANCIES IN THE BOARD OF REGENTS, SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore* also laid before the House the joint resolution of the Senate (S. R. 18) to fill vacancies in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution; which was referred to the Committee on the Library.

RELIEF FOR THE FAMINE-STRICKEN DISTRICTS IN RUSSIA.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore* also laid before the House the joint resolution of the Senate (S. R. 21) authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to transport contributions for the relief of the suffering poor of Russia.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy be, and he is hereby, authorized to employ any ship or vessel belonging to the Navy of the United States best adapted for such service, for the purpose of transporting to the inhabitants of those provinces of Russia now suffering from want of food, owing to the failure of crops, such contributions as may be made by citizens of the United States for their relief, and, if necessary, to charter and employ, under the authority of the United States, a suitable steamship or ships for the same purpose. Any sum of money which may be necessary to carry out the object of this resolution is hereby appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated.

Passed the Senate January 5, 1892.

Mr. BLOUNT. Mr. Speaker, I desire to make a different request from that which I made yesterday to the House, with reference to this matter. I find some differences of opinion in relation to this resolution of the Senate, and that there is a desire to have it referred to a committee. It is easy to be seen that something must be done at an early day, if done at all. The Committee on Naval Affairs think, and I believe with a show of reason, that they have jurisdiction over the subject. Therefore I ask that it be referred to them, with the right to report at any time.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Why not take it up now and pass it?

Mr. KILGORE. I think the Committee on Appropriations have jurisdiction over this subject, and that it should go to that committee. If it requires unanimous consent to send it to the Committee on Naval Affairs, or to any other committee than the Committee on Appropriations, I shall object to it.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair will place before the House the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BLOUNT]. He asks unanimous consent for the reference of the resolution to the Committee on Naval Affairs, with the right to report at any time. Is there objection?

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I would like to inquire whether an objection will prevent the simple reference of the resolution to a committee under the existing status of affairs; and, if so, under what rule?

Mr. BLOUNT. Mr. Speaker, I desire to make a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair is of the opinion that a change from the ordinary proceeding under which resolutions have been so referred, which change would allow the right to report at any time, and which must carry with it the right to consider at any time, would be objectionable.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Under what rule?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. There has been no code of rules

adopted for the government of the body up to this time, but in the absence of such code of rules the Chair would be inclined to hold that the settled practice of the House heretofore would properly be looked to for the government of the body, until rules are adopted, in determining what is the parliamentary law.

Mr. HENDERSON of Iowa. Common parliamentary law, I think.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I do not understand that it has been the practice of the House, in the absence of rules.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair will state that the resolution is before the House to take such action as it may desire.

Mr. McCREARY. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. BOUTELLE. I hope it will be considered at this time.

Mr. McCREARY. Mr. Speaker, has there been any reference of the Senate resolution as yet?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. There has not.

Mr. McCREARY. Then, Mr. Speaker, I have a petition, sent to the Congress of the United States by Gen. Cassius M. Clay, a distinguished citizen, who represented the United States as minister to Russia for a number of years. As the petition is short, I ask that it be read.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. If there be no objection, the petition will be read in connection with the consideration of the resolution.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. Speaker, I will not object to the reading of the petition, but I make the point that it is the duty of the Speaker to refer that joint resolution to the Committee on Appropriations, or any other appropriate committee, without any further order upon the part of the House, unless a motion be made to the contrary. I submit that to the Speaker.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair will state, in response to the point made by the gentleman from Texas, that in the absence of a code of rules governing the House the inclination of the Chair would be to submit the matter to the House; but in that disposition the Chair thinks that the first question in order would be its reference to a committee. That being voted down the House can proceed to its consideration.

Mr. BLOUNT. Then, Mr. Speaker, I hope the House sees the situation, and will vote down the motion for its reference, for if it should be referred to a committee without leave to report at any time this matter is smothered by a single objection.

Mr. KILGORE. I suppose we can trust the Committee on Appropriations.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. If there be no objection the petition forwarded to the desk by the gentleman from Kentucky will be read. The Chair hears no objection.

The petition was read, as follows:

RUSSIA—THE PETITION OF CASSIUS MARCELLUS CLAY.

To the President, the Senate, and House of Representatives of the United States of America:

Your petitioner, the undersigned, would respectfully represent that he is a native-born citizen of Kentucky and the Federal Union, exercising his constitutional right. He learns that a food famine exists in the Russian Empire, extending over vast areas of land and millions of peoples, which that Government, with all its great resources and humanity, may not be able to meet. That the Russian autocratic dynasty and people have from the earliest times been on the most friendly terms with this nation. Especially in our last war did they stand in moral support and avowed defense of the union of these States against all Europe and Great Britain, not that she loved the North more than the South (for she did not), but because she loved the nation more than both. That in the opinion of this petitioner, in spite of calumnies and sensational misrepresentations, Russia thus saved the life of the Republic. Moreover, that the Russian people are the most hospitable and humane on earth; that civilization and Christianity demand a common sympathy and aid from nations as well as individuals.

Therefore, the undersigned, having had large opportunities of knowing, asserting only what he believes, prays that this Government come promptly to Russia's aid by the donation of food and money.

1. Cornmeal, ground not too fine, made of white grain, having had plenty of sunshine, and kiln-dried to prevent souring, and then sacked, should be shipped by general order, at once.

2. This meal mixed with pure water, when milk can not be had, into a plastic mass, salted and baked well done on iron gridirons or smooth boards, is a wholesome and nutritious and palatable food. I eat it every day. This bread is in the vegetable world what eggs are in the animal economy, and our pioneers and the Indians made hunting and war excursions on it ("parched corn"), and did well without other food.

3. Southern cooks who are experts should be sent on to form schools to teach the Russians the art of making corn bread. Yellow corn—extreme northern corn—without sun, oil, or flavor, with condiments, and too finely ground, is the cause of distaste for corn bread.

4. Money should be donated, to be distributed under Russian control, for the purchase of seeds, as oats, spring wheat, etc., for next year's crop.

5. The Americans are now expending millions on the Columbian Exposition for 1893. This is well enough, but let this pride of display be cut short and the money be given to the starving men, women, and children of Russia. This would be more useful and glorious than anything that can be done at Chicago.

CASSIUS MARCELLUS CLAY.

WHITE HALL, MADISON COUNTY, KY., December 16, 1891.

Mr. BLOUNT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House proceed to consider the Senate resolution.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman from Georgia moves that the House proceed to the present consideration of the resolution.

Mr. KILGORE. I make the point of order that under the rule adopted yesterday it is the duty of the Speaker to refer the Senate resolution to the appropriate committee.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair has stated what course it would take.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of order.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOLMAN. I submit that the parliamentary law of this body requires the consideration of that measure in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair will first state that till the consideration has been entered upon or pending consideration it is within the power of the House to refer the resolution. The Chair has already indicated that he would hold that a motion to refer would have precedence over a motion to consider; and the gentleman from Texas, if he desires to have a reference of the resolution, can accomplish that purpose by making a motion to refer, which the Chair has indicated has precedence over a motion to consider.

Mr. HOLMAN. But my point of order went one step further.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. While no code of rules has been adopted, the Chair thinks that the gentleman from Indiana is correct.

Mr. BLOUNT. Mr. Speaker, so far as I am concerned I have no objection to the House going into Committee of the Whole to consider it.

Mr. KILGORE. I make the motion, Mr. Speaker, as indicated by the Chair, that this joint resolution be referred to the Committee on Appropriations. That committee has the right to report at any time, and it is not required to give it that power.

Mr. BLOUNT. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair will state the question. The gentleman from Texas moves that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Appropriations, with leave to report at any time.

Mr. KILGORE. No, sir; I did not ask that, for it has that power under the law.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Very well; the Chair misunderstood the gentleman's statement. The gentleman from Texas moves that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Appropriations. The Chair thinks that is in order.

Mr. BUSHNELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the resolution be read.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The House will suspend for a moment to receive a message from the President.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT.

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. PRUDEN, one of his secretaries.

RELIEF OF SUFFERING IN RUSSIA.

Mr. BLOUNT. Mr. Speaker, on the question of jurisdiction—

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. Speaker, I want to submit a question of order.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. KILGORE. I understand that a motion to refer is not debatable.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair will state that until the previous question has been ordered debate may be had on this proposition.

Mr. KILGORE. Then I demand the previous question.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. But the gentleman from Georgia has the floor. [Laughter.] The Chair entertains the motion of the gentleman from Texas for reference, but will recognize the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BUSHNELL. I ask that the resolution be read, that it may be understood.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The resolution has been read once, but if there be no objection it will be reported again.

The resolution was again reported.

Mr. BLOUNT. I wish first to call the attention of the House to the question raised here as to the jurisdiction of this resolution. It is urged that the Committee on Appropriations has jurisdiction of it, and that that committee has the right to report at any time upon any measure that may be referred to it. The Committee on Appropriations, as well as others—the Committee on Military Affairs, the Committee on Naval Affairs, and others having jurisdiction of appropriations—have their jurisdiction specifically assigned to them. The Committee on Appropriations has jurisdiction of "appropriations of the revenue for the support of the Government as herein provided, viz: for legislative, executive, and judicial expenses, for sundry civil expenses, for fortifications, for the District of Columbia, for pensions, and for all deficiencies."

Upon these matters the Committee on Appropriations have the right to report at any time, but beyond this they have no such power. It was intended to vest the Committee on Appropriations with this authority, because these matters relate to the machinery of the Government; but there never was and there never has been in that committee in and of itself, anything that should give to it a power not given to any other of the committees of this House. There was a reason for giving that committee that power, and the power may be exercised within the range of that reason; but beyond that the committee has no such right as is claimed for it here. Now, this pending proposition relates to a use of the Navy of the United States which can not properly take place except by the legislation of Congress.

The Secretary of the Navy has no power to use a Government vessel for any purpose that is not authorized by law. Therefore the question of this change of the law *pro tanto* is by the very rules of this House specifically referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs. The jurisdiction of that committee to make recommendations to the House in regard to the law governing the use of the Navy excludes, if the other point that I have discussed does not, the idea of the Committee on Appropriations having jurisdiction of this matter.

Now, sir, I had hoped that there would be no objection to the reference of this joint resolution. I delight in the conservative tendency of the rule and practice of this House which requires that important matters shall be considered by committees before the House undertakes to legislate in regard to them. But the character of this joint resolution is such that it appeals at once to the humanity of the entire country. It is a simple proposition. Liberal donations have been made by the American people for the relief of the starving people in Russia, and there is no proposition here to take money out of the Treasury for that purpose. It is simply proposed to lend certain vessels of the United States, or, if that can not well be done, to make an appropriation of \$100,000 to procure vessels to transport these supplies to sufferers in Russia.

Deferring to a disposition existing in this House not to act hastily, I have sought to have this matter referred to some committee with the right to report it any time, because without that express authority the resolution may not be reported promptly, so that the consideration of it may be postponed for weeks or for months.

Now, what precedents have there been for this action? In 1847 the Congress of the United States provided ships for the conveyance of relief to the suffering Irish people. In 1880 the two Houses of Congress provided, just as this joint resolution does, for the chartering of ships by the Navy Department to transport supplies for the relief of the Irish people, with this difference, that in 1880, so eager was the American Congress to answer the call of humanity which came from distressed Ireland that the proposition was voted that there should be an indefinite appropriation, so that there should be no possible obstacle in the way of the consummation of the national wish.

Mr. KILGORE. I understand the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BLOUNT] to quote two precedents in relation to Ireland. There are always demagogues enough in the country to pander to the Irish vote. I do not, therefore, ask the gentleman about that, but I ask him whether he can point to any provision of the Constitution which authorizes the making of this appropriation? That is the question.

Mr. BLOUNT. Mr. Speaker, when we have determined to consider this resolution the question of its constitutionality, which is now raised by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILGORE] will be in order, and it will be competent for this House, if it finds that it has not the power to pass this joint resolution, to vote it down. I am now inviting the attention of this body to the propriety of considering it now, rather than being put substantially in the attitude that we will not consider it at all.

Mr. DOCKERY. Will the gentleman allow me a question?

Mr. BLOUNT. Certainly.

Mr. DOCKERY. Mr. Speaker, I quite agree with the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BLOUNT], that the Committee on Appropriations has no jurisdiction to report this resolution at any time unless that jurisdiction is given by the House. I do not care to enter now upon the question of jurisdiction as between the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Naval Affairs, inasmuch as the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations has not made a point of order upon that question; but, if I did not misunderstand the gentleman from Georgia, he moved to proceed to the consideration of this resolution now.

Mr. BLOUNT. I did. I made that motion for the reason that objection was made to giving the committee the right to report the joint resolution at any time, which meant that this measure was not to be considered at all, or at least that it was not to be considered for months.

Mr. DOCKERY. Would it not be in order, under the view of

the gentleman from Georgia, to move to refer the matter to the Committee on Naval Affairs, with the right to report it any time?

Mr. BLOUNT. I have no objection at all to that; but the question has been raised as to the reference of this resolution to the Committee on Appropriations, and that is what I have been discussing.

Mr. DOCKERY. The point upon which I insist is that this matter should be considered by some committee, and I am quite willing that that committee shall have the right to report upon it at any time.

Mr. BLOUNT. I do not care what committee considers it. At one time it seemed that the Committee on Foreign Affairs might have jurisdiction of it. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HERBERT] claims jurisdiction of the question for the Committee on Naval Affairs. I do not care whether that committee or the Committee on Appropriations or some other committee shall consider the matter; but I think that in view of the action of this House in the past it well becomes this great Democratic majority not to put this manifestation of national sentiment under its feet.

Mr. SNODGRASS. The gentleman will allow me an inquiry in regard to the precedents in matters of this kind. Have not the resolutions of this character, for the relief of suffering in Ireland, been referred in previous Congresses to the Committee on Appropriations?

Mr. BLOUNT. No, sir. I have before me the report from the Committee on Naval Affairs in 1880, made by Mr. Whitthorne, of Tennessee, then chairman of that committee, bringing a matter of this kind before the House, and the House agreed to the adoption of a Senate bill carrying out the object.

Mr. SNODGRASS. How was it in 1847, when the first appropriation of this character was made?

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. At that time there was no distinct Committee on Appropriations *eo nomine*, but the general subject of appropriations was a part of the jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means. The duties which had previously belonged to the Committee on Ways and Means were divided and distributed about the close of the war, when Mr. Thaddeus Stevens was chairman of that committee.

Mr. CULBERSON. But that committee with its combined jurisdiction made the report referred to.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. That may be possible; I have not looked into that matter.

Mr. BLOUNT. I will detain the House only a moment further; I had not thought of discussing this matter at any length.

I have not before me the record of the action which was taken in 1847 in this House. In the Senate the measure came from the Committee on Naval Affairs. Though I have not before me any record as to the action of the House, my impression is that it also came from the Committee on Naval Affairs in this House. Be that as it may, however, the latest action of this kind by this House was in 1880; and the rules in relation to the jurisdiction of matters of appropriations are practically the same at this time that they were in 1880. It is thus shown what has been regarded as the appropriate jurisdiction with reference to matters of this sort.

Mr. Speaker, before yielding the floor, I would like at this stage of our proceedings to take the opinion of the Chair on the question whether or not, if this proposition be voted down, the Chair will then entertain a motion to refer this resolution to the Committee on Naval Affairs with the right to report at any time.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair thinks that the latter part of the proposition would require unanimous consent.

Mr. BLOUNT. I desire then, Mr. Speaker, that the House may see the real attitude of this resolution. If the proposition to refer this resolution to a committee, with the right to report at any time, is subject to be defeated by the objection of a single individual, and thus this resolution postponed for months, while the starvation of humanity is going on, awakening the sympathies of the civilized world, I hope the House will vote down the proposition for reference, and agree to consider the measure now. Let it be amended if the House so desires, but let it not be stifled.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I yield ten minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HERBERT].

Mr. HERBERT. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire how my friend from Georgia [Mr. BLOUNT] happens to have control of all the time so that he can yield to the gentleman from Alabama?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Georgia has yielded to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. KILGORE. The gentleman from Georgia has his own time; and the gentleman from Alabama, I take it, would have his own time.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair will state that there

being no regular code of rules it is somewhat embarrassing to determine exactly the line in which the debate should run. But in the absence of any limitation of debate, it has been the custom to allow each member in discussion an hour. The Chair will, however, recognize the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILGORE] in due time.

Mr. KILGORE. I assume, from what I understood to be the ruling of the Chair, that no gentleman can control any time except that which he chooses to occupy himself.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. It has been so long the practice to allow each member an hour on any matter under discussion unless there has been a specific limitation of time that the Chair will in this instance follow that practice. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Texas later. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HERBERT] will proceed.

Mr. HERBERT. Mr. Speaker, the measure before the House consists of two branches. The first proposition is that the Secretary of the Navy shall be authorized to use naval vessels for transporting to some port in Russia food supplies donated by the people of the United States. Considering this proposition by itself there can be no doubt that under the rules of the House the Committee on Naval Affairs, and that committee alone, has jurisdiction of the proposition.

Then comes the second proposition—that the Secretary of the Navy, if he finds himself unable, with the naval vessels at his disposal and suitable for the purpose, to transport all the provisions which may be donated, shall have authority to use \$100,000, or so much of that sum as may be necessary, to carry out the purposes of the resolution.

If that proposition stood by itself, then it may be admitted that the jurisdiction over this matter would be properly, if the House did not order otherwise, in the Committee on Appropriations. Therefore we have here a case of concurrent jurisdiction between two committees. This is not an unusual condition. There are many instances of it which will occur to every member of the House. There are many measures or resolutions introduced before the House of which two, three, or even four committees would have concurrent jurisdiction. In order, therefore, to decide which one of two or more committees having concurrent jurisdiction of a proposition or resolution should have control of it for examination and report, we are to look at what is the gravamen of the proposition itself, taken as a whole.

It seems to me that this is clearly found in the first proposition embodied in this resolution, namely, that the Secretary of the Navy shall use naval vessels, as far as practicable, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of the resolution. That, I say, is the gravamen of the resolution, and much more is that the case when we find that the appropriation provided in the second branch of the resolution is itself to be entirely under the control of the Secretary of the Navy. In other words, the second branch of the proposition, or the second proposition as a whole, is really an adjunct of the first.

So, Mr. Speaker, it is perfectly clear in this view of the case that it is the duty of the Speaker of the House, if that question should be left to him, to refer the matter to the Committee on Naval Affairs. But, as I understand the position of this matter before the House now, it is not left to the Speaker to decide upon this question of reference. There is a motion pending which is to be decided by the House itself.

I move, therefore, Mr. Speaker, as a substitute for that motion, if it be in order at this time, that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs, with leave to report at any time.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair thinks the proper way to reach that point would be to vote down the motion of the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. HERBERT. Then I ask the House, that being the view of the Chair, to vote down this proposition, in order to make way for a motion which I shall submit myself, if the gentleman from Georgia does not do so, that the whole matter may be referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs, with leave to report at any time, or with instructions, if need be, to report in ten days. I will make the motion in that form, and it seems to me, sir, that the House ought to take that course in this matter.

It is clear that this is the proper course, because we ought to be accurately and fully informed, after an examination of the question, as to how many naval vessels can be used, or what vessels can be used for the purpose of carrying out the intent of this legislation before the House can act intelligently upon the motion. I, therefore, if the motion of the gentlemen from Texas is voted down, will submit that motion, in case the gentleman from Georgia does not do so.

Mr. BLOUNT. I desire to reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. Speaker, the only question before the House now, as I understand the matter, is a choice as between committees. The advocates, the partisans of this scheme—measure, or job, or scheme, whatever you choose to call it—

Mr. BLOUNT: Will the gentleman from Texas allow a question?

Mr. KILGORE. Yes, sir; but it seems you are a little "previous." I have not got started yet or concluded a sentence. [Laughter.]

Mr. BLOUNT. I have to be "previous." We have to do that in order to keep even with you. [Laughter.]

Mr. KILGORE. Very well; what is the question?

Mr. BLOUNT. The gentleman from Texas says the only difference is as to the jurisdiction of these committees.

Mr. KILGORE. I said as to a choice of committees.

Mr. BLOUNT. Very well. Now, I am willing that the gentleman shall have his choice of committees, if he will agree that whatever committee it goes to may have leave to report at any time.

Mr. KILGORE. Has not the Committee on Appropriations the right to report at any time?

Mr. BLOUNT. General appropriation bills and nothing more.

Mr. KILGORE. I say, Mr. Speaker, this is a matter of choice between two committees, and the advocates of this measure want it to go to the Committee on Naval Affairs, and the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs himself contends that it properly belongs to that committee. There is evidently a "junket" in this scheme for naval officers and other agents and employes of the Government.

Now, I can not see why they should object to its going to the Committee on Appropriations, who would investigate the matter and report speedily, if the exigency of the case demanded a speedy report.

I suppose the Committee on Naval Affairs are prepared to report now. If we give them the right to report at any time, that will give the advocates of the measure the right to call it up at any time, and that makes it a privileged question. We have lost sight of the main question, which is as to what committee shall have jurisdiction of this case. I do not see why we should hesitate to trust the Committee on Appropriations, composed as it is of the average men of the House—I will not say the best men [laughter], but composed of the average material of the House, and perhaps those best fitted for that committee of any of the members of the House. Why not let it go there? But we have drifted away from that question and gone into a consideration of the merits of the case. I really think, Mr. Speaker, that the proposition as to the authority of Congress to enact this character of legislation should go to the Committee on the Judiciary, and that committee should be required to report as to the authority of Congress in the premises.

But just a word or two as to the merits of this question. In Texas some years ago we had a famine which covered thirty counties of that great State and included thousands of people. It was a drought-stricken country; fearfully stricken, too, it was. People were compelled to surrender their homes and the accumulations of years of toil and privation on the frontier, and to move back to the settlements to save themselves and their families from starvation. Texas came before Congress with a proposition to extend to them relief—charity if you please—in the nature of an appropriation of \$10,000 to buy seed for distribution among those people, and the Texas people were met with the objection that the Government had no authority to expend money for such purpose; that the only purpose—

Mr. RAINES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Texas yield for a question?

Mr. KILGORE. Well, not now. I do not wish to be disturbed at this moment. I was saying that the people of Texas were met with the objection that all appropriations must be for public purposes and not in the interest of the few; that it was the business of the people of this country to support the Government, and not the business of the Government to support the people; that it could only levy taxation for the purpose of paying the legitimate expenses of the Government, properly and economically administered. And I heartily concur in that view of the Texas bill, and the same rules ought to apply to this measure. It is not the duty nor is it in the authority of Congress to dispense charity to our own people. It is not an eleemosynary institution.

But if the Government has not the authority to extend charity to our own people by appropriating money collected from the people to pay the expenses of this Government, it certainly has not the authority to extend charity to Russians, to people abroad, whatever may have been done heretofore on this subject.

Now, it was stated in the papers yesterday that there were destitute families here in Georgetown. It has been stated in the papers that in the State of Durango, in Mexico, thousands of people are dying of starvation. Every year, as the years go by, suffering will exist somewhere. Every year communities are stricken by flood, by epidemics, or by famine. And every year and every day Congress would be called upon to extend charity

to suffering people in every quarter of the globe if we should countenance this policy by adopting this resolution.

This resolution has never been submitted to a committee. It was introduced in the Senate and passed fifteen minutes after its introduction. It never has been considered with any deliberation anywhere. Let it go to the Committee on Appropriations, which is, in the main, responsible for the appropriations that this body must make. Let that committee consider it, and when they have considered it let the House take it up and dispose of it. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BRYAN] for five minutes.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. COMPTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. COMPTON. My point of order is this: As yet this House has adopted no rules under which to operate, and it therefore must be operating under a code which is familiar to very many of us here on both sides of this House, denominated general parliamentary law. Under that code debate upon a proposition for reference is not to be had. There is no rule of general parliamentary law which allows debate upon a motion for reference; much less does it allow debate upon the merits of the pending proposition. Gentlemen are extending this debate away from the naked question of the reference into the field of the merits of the question pending behind the proposition for reference, and I maintain, sir, that all this debate is out of order, and I make that point.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair held that it was the right of the House at this time to consider the measure, but that the proposition to refer took precedence, and the Chair thinks that debate is in order at this time.

Mr. COMPTON. Does the Speaker hold that the motion is debatable?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair so holds.

Mr. COMPTON. I will not appeal.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Speaker, the people of Nebraska have had raised against their appeal for governmental assistance a principle which is involved in the bill under discussion. In the summer of 1890 the western portion of our State was visited by an unparalleled drought, and many of the people living on that land usually so fertile and productive were brought to actual want. Private charity was first exhausted, then the State made a liberal contribution, and finally, at the request of the State Legislature, the members of Congress from Nebraska, together with the members elect, appealed to the Fifty-first Congress for additional aid from the Federal Treasury. We were met by the proposition that the General Government had no authority to appropriate money raised by taxation to care for its citizens temporarily in need. Precedents were cited to sustain the position, and I am satisfied that the decision reached by Congress was correct, although the application of the principle at that time was unfortunate for our people.

Last season our State was blest with a bountiful harvest, and her people, in company with sister States of the Northwest, have contributed liberally from their abundance to aid the inhabitants of Russia who are suffering as our people suffered a year ago and from the same cause. Their generosity is commendable and the object worthy.

It is to be hoped that a full share of the munificence of our people will reach those subjects of the Czar who bear the double burden of want and persecution. It might be proper to suggest that if other sections of our country whose industries are less susceptible than the farmers' to the influence of the weather were as liberal, transportation for the gifts of the Northwest could easily be provided without an appeal to Congress. But we are now asked to appropriate \$100,000, if necessary, to charter a ship to carry the food to Russia.

I ask, Mr. Speaker, what right have we, even if we had a full Treasury, which we have not, to provide for the carrying of the products of Nebraska to the suffering inhabitants of a foreign land, when we had not the authority last year to aid the distressed citizens of Nebraska?

As has been suggested, scarcely a year passes but some country is afflicted by flood or famine. Shall we aid them all? Will not a precedent be established? Will not other nations, and those, too, more like ours in form of government and more humane in the treatment of their own citizens, justly feel offended if we withhold from them the aid which some gentlemen seem willing to grant without investigation to one of the most despotic of nations? If this appropriation is made, Mr. Speaker, I fear a case may arise which will appeal as strongly to our sense of justice as does this to our sympathies. Our friends on the other side have been boasting that the McKinley law is throwing out of employment thousands of workmen in foreign countries and bringing them to actual want.

If it is our duty to aid those in other lands whom God in His wisdom has permitted to suffer, how much more imperative the duty to relieve those whom an American Congress in its folly has caused to suffer! [Laughter and applause.] It may be proper, if we have vessels convenient for the purpose which are not in use, to furnish these for the transportation of donations as an act of courtesy, but certainly this House will not attempt to charter private vessels for that purpose. I hope the bill will be referred to the committee, so that an amendment may be reported back, striking out the appropriation of \$100,000.

Mr. BLOUNT. Before the gentleman takes his seat I would like to ask if his object to have an amendment reported would be forwarded by reference?

Mr. BRYAN. I want to be sure that an amendment would be made, and I think that is the safest way. If the committee after consideration fails to report an amendment, an amendment can be made by the House.

Mr. BLOUNT. The resolution being referred to the committee, that would not necessarily follow.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from New York [Mr. RAINES].

Mr. RAINES. Mr. Speaker, I had originally supposed—

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. Speaker, I desire to make an inquiry.

Mr. RAINES. Later on. [Laughter.]

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. Speaker, I want to know in whose time the gentleman from New York is speaking?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair recognizes the gentleman in his own time. The gentleman from Texas, so far as the Chair observed, did not reserve the remainder of his time.

Mr. RAINES. Mr. Speaker, I had supposed that when this resolution came before this House it was one that had been evolved from the inner consciousness of some philanthropist for the benefit of the suffering and starving people in Russia. I find, judging from the remarks of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILGORE], that this is a resolution which is for the benefit either of the Naval Committee or the Committee on Appropriations, and is not in the interest of retrenchment and reform. Yesterday we had a resolution which was in the interest of retrenchment and reform, involving the amount of \$60, and reform and retrenchment lost the day. [Laughter.] If this resolution is to go to the Committee on Appropriations it is suggested that retrenchment and reform will win \$100,000 possibly, and that the Naval Department will be out that amount of appropriations.

Now, in regard to what the gentleman said as to the propriety of such an appropriation or expense of money, I want to ask him who has discovered that the American Congress had no right to make appropriations from the United States Treasury for the relief of the distressed and starving inhabitants of Texas? Was it the late President of the United States or was it not? The discovery has not been patented, Mr. Speaker. The American Congress is capable of deciding this question for itself. There is not a man on this floor who is not just as familiar now with this whole subject as he will be after we shall get a report covering ten lines from the Committee on Appropriations or the Committee on Naval Affairs. He knows the suffering exists; he knows the citizens of the Northwest and of the East are ready to contribute to their relief, and that they have petitioned this Government to provide the means for sending the provisions to their destined ports. He knows, if he has read the papers, that the Naval Department have decided that they have no shipping capacity to transport these provisions, and hence this appropriation of \$100,000 is asked, so that they may provide the means for conveying these provisions where they are needed.

Now, I say for one, and I think I speak for others around me, that we are opposed to any reference to any committee of this measure. I think we understand what is wanted. I think that if this charity amounts to anything, and is to do any good or is to accomplish the purpose designed, that the sooner it is carried out and they receive the benefit the better. And we are ready to vote for the proposition, not to refer, for there is no rule that requires its reference; but for the present and immediate consideration and immediate relief to the distressed. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. BOATNER. Mr. Speaker, if the advocates of this measure will point to any authority whatever, either expressed or implied, for passing this appropriation I do not think there will be ten dissenting votes in the House. The House would almost by unanimous consent agree to furnish the means to carry this charity to the distressed and suffering people of Russia. But while gentlemen are discussing the merits of the measure, they overlook the fundamental fact that this House possesses only delegated powers, and that there is not a line or syllable in the Constitution which authorizes, either directly or impliedly, the action which those who advocate this measure ask us to take.

For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I do not see how any Democrat

can vote for it, especially those who have for the last twelve months been writing to their constituents that there was no authority under the Constitution for the passage of the subtreasury bill; that under the Constitution of the United States we could not grant any relief to the agriculturists of our own community; that we could find no warrant in law for lending them money on any terms at all; I do not see how any Democrat of that kind can give his consent to vote for an appropriation of money which can not even be advocated under the general welfare clause, because that clause is confined to the general welfare of the United States.

I will say to gentlemen who are advocating this measure, that if they can find any authority, either expressed or implied, in support of this proposition, I am ready to vote for it; but in the absence of any authority at all, I do not see how any member can, in view of his official oath, conscientiously support it.

I agree entirely with the gentleman who has just taken his seat [Mr. RAINES], that we are just as well informed in regard to this matter now as we shall be after it has been considered by a committee and reported back, and that the measure ought to be taken up and considered and acted upon now. If this relief is to be extended at all, it ought to be done at once, without unnecessary delay.

Mr. OATES. Mr. Speaker, I do not agree with my friend from Louisiana [Mr. BOATNER] and the gentleman on my right [Mr. RAINES]. If the committee to whom this matter is referred does its duty—and the presumption is that every committee will do that—this House will be much better informed than they are now by the report of that committee in regard to the necessity or the absence of necessity for this action. It would be the duty of the committee to ascertain the facts and report them to this House as a basis for its action. We have some information now, but to my mind it is of an unsatisfactory character. Russia is a great nation of eighty or ninety millions of people. Where is the evidence before us that that Government is unable to take care of any portion of its own suffering people? And ought we not to have such information before we vote money out of the Treasury for this purpose?

Mr. BOUTELLE. Will the gentleman permit a suggestion?

Mr. OATES. I will yield for a suggestion.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I understand that the joint resolution before the House simply proposes to provide means of transportation. My information is that the substantial relief itself—flour and other food—has been already provided by corporations and individuals, citizens of the United States.

Mr. OATES. I thank the gentleman for that information, for I had it not before; but it does not change my view as to the necessity for further information. If contributions of charity which have already been made or agreed to be made for the relief of any portion of the people of Russia can not be transported by the Russian Government, then it must be that the distress is not very great, or else that Government is very negligent in making proper provision for its suffering people, and we have no right to assume, in the absence of proof, that any government would be guilty of such inhumanity.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. Will the gentleman permit me to make a suggestion just there?

Mr. OATES. Yes, sir.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. I desire to make a statement which may throw some light on the matter under discussion. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OATES] is probably not aware that on yesterday the president of the Red Cross Association, which bears a certain official relation to the United States under an international treaty, addressed a petition or letter to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House, accompanied by official communications from the gentleman at present in charge of the Russian embassy here, the Russian minister himself being absent. In those communications two statements substantially are made: first, that the suffering in Russia is great; second, that the acceptance by the Russian Government of the contributions of the American people would be grateful.

Another statement substantially made was, that while Russia would undoubtedly transport whatever America had to give, the time which would thus be occupied would be just about twice what would be required for us to transport this relief; because the cargoes, the contributions of Iowa, Nebraska, and other States, being accumulated at New York, where they have come over our railroads, they could be put upon ships provided by us under this resolution, and could reach Russia just about the time that the Russian ships could reach America. I make this statement because it is in the line of the gentleman's inquiry, and because these papers have happened to come under my eye.

Now, if the gentleman will allow me, I want to call his attention to another question, because I know how much he has studied this matter and what authority any statement from him carries. I wish to ask him whether he has any doubt of the constitutional

power of Congress, in a matter of foreign intercourse, intercourse between us and foreign nations, to vote an appropriation like this—a doubt which I confess I was much surprised to hear expressed by so very admirable a constitutional lawyer as my friend from Louisiana [Mr. BOATNER].

Mr. OATES. Mr. Speaker, I will endeavor to answer the questions of my friend in the order in which he has put them. His first statement is but cumulative evidence to show the necessity for an investigation of this subject by a committee. It is stated by the gentleman from Maine [Mr. BOUTELLE], as well as by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BRECKINRIDGE], that contributions have been made for the relief of the sufferers in Russia, and that speedy action is invoked in order that transportation for those supplies may be provided. If the necessity be so great to relieve the suffering in Russia, the gentleman's statement that it would take a great while for ships to come from Russia to transport these supplies is not an argument why this Government should expend \$100,000 in chartering vessels for such transportation. If there is force in the gentleman's suggestion as to the delay which would be occasioned by ships coming from Russia, then let Russia charter the vessels which she can find here to transport the supplies.

I want to be informed as to all these facts before I vote for such an appropriation, if, indeed, I vote for it at all, and upon that point I reserve my judgment. So, sir, I am in favor of a reference of this joint resolution. I would be in favor of referring it to the Committee on Appropriations if the motion of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILGORE] were so amended as to allow that committee to report at any time. I think it should go to that committee if the gentleman's motion were so amended; but if there be no rule which allows that committee thus to report, then I would be in favor of the proposition of my colleague [Mr. HERBERT] to refer the resolution to the Committee on Naval Affairs. I do not share in the apprehension of the gentleman from Texas that this is a mere junket and that the Committee on Naval Affairs would report without investigation. I take it for granted that this committee or any other committee charged with such responsibility would investigate, thoroughly investigate, the necessity for the passage of this resolution and report to the House the facts, and nothing but the facts. The facts are what we want. We want to know just what we are doing.

I am not in favor of the hot haste which would appear to be desired by the gentleman from New York on my right [Mr. RAINES]. That gentleman said that he would like to know from the gentleman from Texas or from some other gentleman who invented the idea that Congress has no constitutional right to appropriate money for the relief of the suffering people in any portion of this country and to vote public moneys to charities. He wanted to know whether that idea did not originate with President Cleveland, who vetoed the Texas seed bill. I can inform the gentleman that no one has a patent upon that discovery. It is old and sound Democratic doctrine that Congress has no such power; but his party, in view of the precedents they have established, are entitled to a patent for disregarding constitutional limitations in this respect. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

But, sir, the question in regard to such power is not a new one; it is an old one. It has been discussed in the Congress of the United States for many years and on different occasions. And in answer to the question propounded by my friend from Kentucky [Mr. BRECKINRIDGE] I will say that I have very carefully examined on previous occasions the debates upon the appropriations for the relief of suffering caused by the earthquake at Caracas, and for the relief of the starving Irish during the famine of 1848 as well as in 1880, the periods referred to by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BLOUNT]. From my investigation, it seems to have been the conclusion of a majority both in the Senate and in the House upon those occasions that the Constitution of the United States is a limitation upon the power of Congress within the territory over which the Constitution was intended to operate; in other words, that it is a limitation upon the parties to its creation; and although it seems paradoxical to say that Congress may aid the people of other nations with charity voted out of the Treasury but has no right to vote such charity to any portion of our own people, yet that seems to be the fact beyond controversy to the mind of any lawyer who will thoroughly investigate the question.

This results from the fact that the Constitution is a compact—national, it is true, in regard to every power by it delegated to or vested in the Federal Government; but that Government, under the decisions of the Supreme Court as well as by the best precedents of Congress, has no power except that which is derived from that instrument with reference to any matter within the territorial jurisdiction of the United States. But, sir, when this nation deals with another, it does not act through the States, but as one nation. It is so recognized by other nations. Great

Britain does not know any compact or agreement entered into between Massachusetts, New York, Georgia, and other States; she knows only the Government of the United States and deals with us as such. It was perhaps wisely left by that instrument to the sound discretion of Congress and the President to decide what powers may properly be exercised in dealing with other nations. This is almost a necessity, if not absolutely such, when you come to consider our relations with other nations.

But the case is different in respect to our internal affairs. When you read the history of the convention which framed the Constitution and of the conventions of the States which ratified it, you will see there the jealousy of the people for the rights and powers and privileges of their respective States, so that they were very chary of giving much power to the Federal Government and none, except such powers as were clearly delegated or granted. Hence the limit to the Federal Government, that it has no powers save such as are granted to it in the Constitution or such as are necessarily implied from express grants. What are implied? Why, sir, every power which is necessary in order to make the express grants efficacious and give them force and validity, but nothing more. Congress is invested with the choice of means to do this; as Chief Justice Marshall said, if the means are appropriate and adapted to the end they are constitutional. Farther than this the framers of the Constitution thought proper not to go; they thought proper to deny to Congress any other powers than those delegated in the instrument to be exercised over the people who were parties to its creation; but as to other peoples, as to foreign nations, there is no limit, and Congress can do whatever it pleases, being responsible to the people.

Congress, if it sees fit, has the power to pass this appropriation.

As to the question whether it should be passed or not I for one prefer to have information which will satisfy me that it is a proper and rightful appropriation to be made. I think, therefore, it ought to go to a committee. If I am to be forced to vote upon the measure in the absence of such information all I can do is to record my vote against it. If you show me that the measure is right, that it appeals to the hearts of us, that this is a real charity, one which ought to be granted where we have the power to grant it, I would favor the proposition. But in the absence of such information I can not vote for the measure. I hope, therefore, Mr. Speaker, that the resolution will be referred to one of the committees which have been suggested.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I would like to call the attention of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OATES], before he sits down, to what has probably escaped his observation—the fact that the President of the United States has officially called the attention of the House to this matter by a special message presented here yesterday.

Mr. OATES. That was probably very proper on the part of the President. He should regard with proper consideration and tender care the relations of this Government to all others, and it was therefore right and proper that he should call the attention of Congress to the question. But it does not follow that we should pass this resolution.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I was simply calling the attention of the gentleman to the fact in order to meet his suggestion that we might act with undue haste or before the necessary information was obtained, to show that this information was already in hand. It comes to us from the executive department of the Government, which has considered it.

Mr. OATES. I think it would be undue haste to pass a measure of this kind without proper reference to a committee under any circumstances. But when referred to a committee, and the committee examines the questions involved carefully and reports the conditions existing and all the facts to the House, I am then prepared to act upon it. I trust that step will be taken. It is not a matter of such grave importance as to require that it should be acted upon to-day. A day or two will not make any material difference, I imagine. I want the committee to have an opportunity to examine it and report upon it, and to report at any time, so that we may know that it is right, and I must know it before I can vote for it. If forced to vote without such investigation I shall feel it my duty to vote against it.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, I do not desire to take any part in the discussion of the merits of the question presented at this time, but simply to address myself to the proposed reference of the joint resolution to a committee of this House for examination and report. I believe that if there is any merit whatever in the charity proposed by this resolution it should not be delayed. To-day is the time for us to act, whether for or against it.

I reserve to myself, sir, my judgment in regard to the merits of the resolution; but I believe that there is no need of the investigation the gentleman from Alabama suggests. This question of the needs of the Russian people has been investigated and brought to our notice by a greater committee, so far as searching power is concerned, than this House can name—the press of the United

States of America. They have investigated the needs of that people, and we all know to-day whether Russia requires the assistance of the outside world or not.

I am opposed, therefore, to the reference of the resolution to any committee. Let us pass upon the question now and dispose of it, whether we shall transport this grain and these products to the people of Russia or whether we shall defeat the suggestion entirely. Now is the time.

Mr. BLOUNT. Mr. Speaker, I desire to make a parliamentary inquiry, with a view of facilitating action upon this matter if possible. There is now pending, as I understand it, a motion to refer to the Committee on Appropriations?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. That is the motion of the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BLOUNT. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HERBERT] gives notice that if that motion is voted down he will move the reference of this resolution to the Committee on Naval Affairs, with the right to report at any time. Now, I wish to know whether the Chair will entertain that motion or whether it is in order?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair will hold that it is in order to refer with instructions.

Mr. BLOUNT. With instructions to report at any time?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. With instructions, but not with leave to report at any time.

The Chair will state that it would also entertain the motion as an amendment to the motion of the gentleman from Texas. On an examination, the Chair thinks that it would be in order to move that as an amendment; in other words, that, like any other proposition, it is amendable.

Mr. BLOUNT. Then, again, Mr. Speaker, if the House shall vote down these several propositions, neither of which contains the right to report at any time, will the Chair entertain a motion to proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution at the present time?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair has held that the motion to commit being voted down, the resolution would be before the House for such disposition as it might see proper to make of it.

Mr. BLOUNT. I desire to ask the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILGORE] to withdraw his opposition or request, and that this joint resolution be referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs with the right to report at any time.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. Speaker, I suppose it is not a matter of any particular importance what committee considers the question so it is considered by a committee and properly reported and is properly before the House. I have had a number of my colleagues to suggest that this would be a fair solution of the matter, to withdraw the proposition to send it to the Committee on Appropriations and let it go to the Committee on Naval Affairs, to report at their pleasure. I am inclined to do that. They brought much pressure to bear on me, and I suppose I will have to give up. [Laughter.]

Mr. BOUTELLE. Mr. Speaker, I desire to be heard for a few moments only on this question of reference.

It is a very unusual thing for any member of the House of Representatives to object to having any measure sent to his committee, as all of the members of this body know; and I have no objection whatever to the reference of this proposition to the committee of which I am a very humble member, if it is to be referred at all. But I think it my duty, at this point, to call the attention of the House to the very obvious fact on the face of the resolution itself, and the circumstances surrounding it, that there is neither necessity nor excuse for referring the resolution to any committee.

The President of the United States in his brief message sent here on yesterday has stated the whole matter plainly. He has only stated what everybody who reads the newspapers knew in advance. He has stated the facts in regard to the prevailing distress in Russia. He has stated the facts in regard to the prompt efforts on the part of liberal-minded citizens of the United States in the Northwest to provide flour and other food products for the relief of these starving people; and he has also stated the condition of the Navy Department in regard to furnishing transportation for such supplies.

He says in his message:

The Secretary of the Navy has no steam vessel at his disposal that could be used for the transportation of these supplies, and I therefore recommend that he be authorized to charter a suitable vessel to receive them.

I understand the fact to be, Mr. Speaker, that when this matter was suggested to the Secretary of the Navy it was first proposed to tender the use of the old frigate Constellation for the purpose. I believe this historical old vessel has been used upon a similar errand in the past; but the capacity of that ship is limited. It would be impossible for that vessel to carry all the provisions required, and therefore, if another vessel is necessary to be char-

tered, the Secretary could just as well provide for sending the entire amount in a swift vessel, so that the beneficence of our people would be promptly received.

Mr. Speaker, "the quality of mercy is not strained." There is no necessity in this case for straining it through a committee of the House of Representatives. We know that the distress exists. We know that some of our generous people have come forward to vindicate our feelings of humanity, to vindicate the sentiments of friendliness existing between these two great nations, by tendering timely and prompt offerings of relief to a suffering people.

Let us not seek by technicalities to delay this generous and worthy act. The Constitution of the United States ought not to be pleaded against a case of humanity where the liberality and generosity of our Government and our citizens toward foreign peoples are involved. There was nothing in the constitution of France that sent Lafayette here to tender the use of his sword in behalf of the young Republic. There was no organic provision for the tendering of the services of Rochambeau and De Kalb, Von Steuben, Pulaski, and all those other heroic men who came across the sea to mingle their blood with that of our own defenders of liberty and to write their great names on the brightest pages of our country's history.

Mr. OATES. Does not the gentleman know that at that time France was a monarchy?

Mr. BOUTELLE. Certainly.

Mr. OATES. Then why is the gentleman talking about the constitution of France?

Mr. BOUTELLE. I say there was nothing in monarchical power or the traditions of royalty that could restrain that expression of sympathy on the part of the people of France toward the people of this country struggling for freedom. I say, Mr. Speaker, that this House owes it to itself to emulate the promptness and the grace with which the Senate have acted, and to pass this resolution unanimously and speedily.

Mr. BLOUNT. I shall not detain the House, except for a moment. I have taken occasion to examine the RECORD in relation to the action of Congress in 1847 and in 1880, in matters exactly similar to this. In each case the question was examined by a committee of the House and by a committee of the Senate before final action was taken by either body. Never before has a resolution of this kind been disposed of by being brought forward on the motion of a Senator and passed through the Senate, and disposed of in the same way in the House. I say this because I think it but due to this body to vindicate itself from any charge of a lack of fair consideration of this measure.

I would be quite willing to vote upon it at this time, but I do not think it unseemly at all to wait. The Committee on Naval Affairs may report this matter to the House under this agreement to-morrow morning, and we may then dispose of it. There never was such urgency in the consideration of a question of this kind in 1847 or in 1880.

I am in entire sympathy with my friend from Maine [Mr. BOUTELLE]. It is a question of humanity that appeals to all of us. But the matter of a day and of deliberate and regular consideration of it does not impair the character of our acts. I now ask unanimous consent that this joint resolution may be referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs, with the right to report at any time, and I trust there will be no objection.

Mr. SPENDLETON. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. For what purpose does the gentleman from West Virginia rise?

Mr. SPENDLETON. Mr. Speaker, several propositions are involved in this question, to which I think the attention of this House ought to be called. In the first place, we have no evidence whatever at present that there is any disastrous famine prevailing in Russia. I have here an article, published a few days ago in the Washington Post, supposed to come directly from high officials of the Russian Government, which states that this distress is entirely under the control of the Russian Government. Further, Mr. Speaker, why should not the distress, as reported in the newspapers, be under the control of the Russian Government? It is a Government which contains more than 8,000,000 square miles of territory, and has a population of nearly 120,000,000 of people, when you include Russia in Europe and Russia in Asia.

We are further informed that the Russian Government has today in gold, lying about in the great banks in the different cities of Europe, nearly \$150,000,000; money that is absolutely under control of that Government to-day, and which that Government can call for at any time or moment that it desires to make the call.

That fund is not called for by the Russian Government to relieve the poverty and distress of the Russian people, because Russia to-day is reserving it as a war fund. If she needs help she can use it, but she does not need it, and there is no reason why we should make contributions. Russia as she stands to-day is a menace to modern civilization. She is a threat to the peace

of the world, reserving her funds for war purposes and conflagrations; and the evidence that the American Congress has before it is that the famine, concerning which we are talking, is one that that Government can readily control if it desires to. All it has to do is to use a portion of its own surplus funds. The gentleman from Maine [Mr. BOUTELLE] talks about the traditional friendship that prevails between this country and Russia, and says that for that reason we should send supplies to that mighty Government. Can we have friendship between tyranny and liberty; between Asiatic despotism and modern civilization; between the inertia of barbarism and the spirit of progress? There is no friendship and there can be no friendship between such opposing forces. I hope the hour will come when we can clasp the Russian hand in honest and cordial friendship, but that day should not come until the Tartar has mended his ways; until Poland is free; until persecution for opinion's and religion's sake shall have ceased, and until constitutional government shall prevail from the Baltic to Bering Sea.

If there is any friendship between the two Governments, it is certainly a friendship of the Puritan and a blackleg, if a friendship of that character could prevail between such governments as the American and Russian Governments. Why, gentlemen, when you consider the question of sending charity to Russia, a question that the American liberty-loving citizen would ask is, Are the Jews of Russia, who to-day are being persecuted and driven forth from their native land by the hundreds of thousands, to receive a portion of this magnificent charity which our Government is to confer with a free hand upon the Russian people? If that question can be answered satisfactorily, there are men in this House who would probably vote an appropriation of \$100,000. The Hebrews would not receive the value of a dollar, and the whole of it would go to the very people that are urging forward the most wicked and heartless persecution the world ever saw. I for one would not vote it when I am perfectly satisfied that the Russian Government is perfectly capable of taking care of its own people.

Further, this House of Representatives is supposed to have been elected on the issue of retrenchment and reform; and are we to begin at once by appropriating \$100,000 for the benefit of the Russian people, when that Government can take care of her own, instead of appropriating \$100,000, if we are to appropriate it at all, for the relief of American citizens who might be found within a radius of a hundred miles of the city of Washington.

I believe, sir, that this resolution should not be referred to any committee, but that it should be considered at once and voted down; first, because it is unnecessary; second, because we are pledged to retrenchment and reform; and third, because it is unconstitutional.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent that this resolution be referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs, with leave to report at any time. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Texas has withdrawn his motion to refer.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOLMAN. In the event that the committee report back the measure, would it then be before the House with any additional rights resulting from the consent now given to report at any time?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Indiana that the right to report at any time has always, so far as the present occupant of the chair knows, been held to carry with it the right to consider at any time.

Mr. HOLMAN. But the consent now given to this motion would not waive the right to demand its consideration in Committee of the Whole?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. It would not waive any right that attaches to it under general parliamentary practice. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, I desire to say if there is no limit placed upon the time in which the committee are to report I shall certainly object. If the House is going to make an appropriation to help the unfortunate and suffering, the sooner it be made the better; and I ask the gentleman who makes the motion to refer it to the Committee on Naval Affairs if he can state in what time it will be ready to report? If he does not so state I shall object.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair does not know what the wish of the gentleman is in that regard.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Then I move that the committee be required to report within ten days.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair will state to the gentleman from New York that the right to report at any time carries with it the right to report within one day.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I understand that precisely; but I wish that it shall not be longer than ten days; and I make that motion as an amendment.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman from New York couples the request of the gentleman from Georgia with the additional provision that the committee shall report within ten days. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York as a modification of the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. BLOUNT. I have no objection.

Mr. STONE of Kentucky. What is the request?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. That the report shall be made within ten days. [After a pause.] Is there objection?

Mr. STONE of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, do I understand that it requires unanimous consent to refer to the Committee on Naval Affairs with instructions to report within ten days?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. It does. That request is made, coupled with the privilege of reporting for consideration at any time.

Mr. STONE of Kentucky. I object.

Mr. BLOUNT. I move that the House proceed to the consideration of the resolution.

Mr. HOLMAN. I shall oppose that motion. I move, in lieu of the motion made by the gentleman from Alabama, to refer this measure to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. BLOUNT. Does the gentleman propose that they shall have leave to report at any time?

Mr. HOLMAN. I have no objection; but it is objected to by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. STONE].

Mr. HERBERT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Georgia will allow me, as I understand the effect of the ruling as made by the Speaker—

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman from Alabama will suspend until order is restored.

Mr. HERBERT. Mr. Speaker, I was about stating to the House that, as I understood the effect of the rulings made by the Chair this morning, if this motion is made to refer this resolution to the Committee on Naval Affairs, it can not be coupled, without unanimous consent, with a leave to report at any time; but I understood the Speaker to say that it would be in order to refer it with instructions. I want to ask if it would not be in order to refer it to the Committee on Naval Affairs with instructions to report within ten days?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair thinks it would.

Mr. HERBERT. Therefore, if the gentleman from Indiana will permit, I will submit that motion for him.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman from Alabama moves to refer the joint resolution to the Committee on Naval Affairs with instructions to report within ten days.

Mr. HOLMAN. I withdraw the motion which I submitted.

Mr. BLOUNT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BLOUNT. Would that motion if adopted carry with it the right of consideration when the matter is reported back?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. That is a question which the Chair would prefer to look into a little before giving a definite opinion, but at present the Chair is inclined to think that it would not. The motion limits the time within which the report can be made and requires the committee to report within that limit, but the Chair does not remember an instance in which such an instruction has been held to carry with it the right to consideration when the matter is reported back. The Chair, however, will examine the question carefully.

Mr. BLOUNT. I wish to ask another question of the Chair for the guidance of the House in its action. I would like to know whether it is the opinion of the Chair that when this joint resolution is reported back by the committee it will simply take its place on the Calendar like any other measure.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair has stated his impression that the reference made in this way does not carry with it the right to have the matter considered when reported; but the Chair also stated that that was a mere impression, and that he would look into the question when it was raised in the House, and would be governed, of course, by whatever examination should show to be the proper ruling.

Mr. ENLOE. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ENLOE. As we are proceeding now without any rules, if the committee should report this joint resolution back within ten days, we still being without rules, might not the majority of the House take up and consider that report at any time?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair thinks it would be in the power of the House to consider it in any way and time that was not forbidden by any rule or established parliamentary practice. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Ala-

bama to refer this joint resolution to the Committee on Naval Affairs with instruction to report within ten days.

Mr. DICKERSON. I move to amend by striking out "Naval Affairs" and inserting "Appropriations."

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair will state that that was the original motion of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KIRGORE]. Did the gentleman from Texas withdraw his proposition to refer the joint resolution to the Committee on Appropriations?

Several MEMBERS. He did.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Then the amendment of the gentleman from Kentucky would be in order.

Mr. HOLMAN. I trust that my friend will withdraw that amendment.

Mr. DICKERSON. I will withdraw it, Mr. Speaker, at the request of the gentleman from Indiana, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. BLOUNT. I trust, Mr. Speaker, that this disposition of the matter will not be made.

Mr. HOLMAN. The proposition is withdrawn.

Mr. BLOUNT. What is withdrawn?

Mr. HOLMAN. The amendment of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. DICKERSON].

Mr. BLOUNT. Did the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. STONE] withdraw his objection?

Mr. STONE of Kentucky. No.

Mr. BLOUNT. Mr. Speaker, I understand that this is a proposition to refer the matter to the Committee on Naval Affairs with instructions to report within ten days.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. It is.

Mr. BLOUNT. And that is what I rose to speak to. I hope that the House will observe the situation in which this disposition of the matter would place us. The Chair has already indicated that it is at least doubtful whether, when this matter is reported back, it may be taken up on motion of the Committee on Naval Affairs. He has distinctly announced to the House that the right to report at any time here given is negative, and therefore we are confined to the question whether we shall consider this joint resolution now or postpone it indefinitely. Now, I submit, sir, that such dallying with a question of this character is without any precedent in the House of Representatives or in the Congress of the United States at any time in the past. [Applause on the Republican side.]

I trust that the gentlemen who constitute the overwhelming majority in this House for the Democratic party will, with a feeling of proper pride in the American people, take action now, as our fathers took action upon like occasions [renewed applause on the Republican side]—Webster, Clay, and a whole list of names that are honored in the history of this land, men whose fame was so bright as to dazzle and paralyze anyone who should have made the suggestion of a "job" in regard to a measure which they advocated.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if this were a matter that required any vast amount of information, I would rather have delay. I would rather take chances. But it is not such a matter. There are but two propositions embraced in it. The donations for the relief of these suffering people are already made by American citizens, given freely by our own people, and we have here simply a proposition to allow naval vessels to be used for the transportation of these supplies, and, beyond that, a proposition that in case naval vessels can not be found to answer the purpose, the sum of \$100,000 may be utilized to charter other vessels. Now, some gentlemen are insisting that we have not the constitutional power to appropriate this money. Very well; if we have not, let us strike out the \$100,000. Let the House express its sense upon that question. Let us strike out the \$100,000, if that is the judgment of the House, and let our naval vessels be used for this transportation.

I wish to say right here that in 1847 only the ships of the Navy were authorized to be used; there was no appropriation of money; and that was a time when we were engaged in the Mexican war and had an extraordinary demand for ships and men for naval purposes in connection with the war. I believe, sir, there would be no danger in the House taking up this matter now and striking out the appropriation of \$100,000. We should then have a simple proposition which we might go forward and adopt. I trust, therefore, that as we can not authorize a committee to report the resolution back at any time, we shall vote down the proposition for reference, and take up the joint resolution now. [Applause.]

Mr. CAMPBELL. I would like to ask the gentleman whether our Government is prepared to send any ships abroad at this time—whether we do not require them at home to protect the honor of our Government and the flag of the country.

Mr. BLOUNT. I leave that question to my friend from New York.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Alabama to refer.

The question being taken, there were—ayes 70, noes 99.

Mr. HERBERT. I ask for tellers.

Tellers were not ordered, only 28 voting therefor.

Mr. BLOUNT. I move that the House now proceed to the consideration of this joint resolution.

Mr. HOLMAN. I make the point of order that this is a measure involving an appropriation of money, and that, according to the parliamentary law which has been in force for over a hundred years as the law of this House, the measure must receive its first consideration in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. BLOUNT. I acquiesce in the point of order. I have no objection to the consideration of the resolution in the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. ENLOE. I make the point, Mr. Speaker, that it is not in order to proceed to the consideration of this resolution at the present time. We ought to be, and I suppose if the objection had been made at the proper time this morning we would now be, proceeding to execute the special order made yesterday. By the terms of that order it is specifically provided that:

Immediately after the reading of the Journal on Tuesday, January 5, 1892, the executive and other communications on the Speaker's table shall be laid before the House, to be referred to the appropriate committees, and thereafter the States and Territories shall be called for the introduction of bills and joint resolutions, memorials of State and Territorial Legislatures, for reference to appropriate committees, according to the provisions of Rule II, Fifth Congress, so far as the same is applicable, and shall proceed until the call is completed.

Now, I make the point of order that this being a communication upon the Speaker's table it could not be laid before the House under the terms of this special order unless it had been laid before the House yesterday.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair will state in response to the point of order made by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. ENLOE] that this resolution came over from the Senate yesterday and was laid before the House, and unanimous consent was asked that it remain upon the Speaker's table. It was again laid before the House this morning. The House has been engaged in the consideration of the question; it has had the resolution before it, and the Chair thinks that even if the agreement of yesterday did not cover the question the gentleman's point would come too late.

Mr. ENLOE. I wish to say that the House has been considering the question of reference, which might, perhaps, properly and rightfully come up for determination; but the present proposition is to consider the resolution itself, and I say such action is prohibited by the distinct terms of the order adopted yesterday.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair will remind the gentleman from Tennessee that the first ruling of the Chair on this subject was that it was in order to move to proceed to the consideration of the resolution, but that the motion to refer would take precedence. The gentleman from Georgia indicated that he desired the consideration of the proposition; and the debate was entered upon.

Mr. ENLOE. I differ with the Chair; but I shall not press the point of order further.

Mr. HOLMAN. I wish to make a suggestion to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BLOUNT], who has charge of this matter. The question which will go to the Committee of the Whole will be with regard to the appropriation of the \$100,000; and perhaps the House will give unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman from Georgia does not oppose the consideration of the resolution in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. BLOUNT. If the gentleman from Indiana desires that action I have no objection.

Mr. HOLMAN. Inasmuch as there is perhaps a single question which will come before the Committee of the Whole, my suggestion is that the House, by unanimous consent, consider the measure in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Is there objection to the suggestion of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HOLMAN], that the joint resolution be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole? The Chair hears none; and it is so ordered.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. Speaker, if the measure is now before the House for consideration I wish to submit a motion.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Clerk will first report the title of the joint resolution, after which the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HOLMAN] will be recognized.

The Clerk read as follows:

Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to transport contributions for the relief of the suffering poor of Russia.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to amend by striking out the last clause of the joint resolution—the one making the appropriation of \$100,000.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Clerk will read the words which the gentleman from Indiana proposes to strike out.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out the following words:

"And if necessary to charter and employ under the authority of the United States a suitable steamship or ships for the same purpose. Any sum of money not to exceed \$100,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary to carry out the object of this resolution, is hereby appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated."

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. Speaker, in support of that motion I wish to submit a few remarks. It is believed by gentlemen who are thoroughly well acquainted with the condition of our Navy that there will be no trouble whatever on the part of the Secretary of the Navy in supplying the necessary ships to transport these supplies to Russia. Naval officers perhaps will not like the work. Armaments will have to be removed and all of that, but no public interests will suffer.

In the next place this transportation, it should be remembered, is to be provided for the benefit of the people of a wealthy empire, one of the greatest powers of the globe, and it would seem hardly reasonable that the people of the United States should not only contribute with the generosity which always characterizes them to the relief of the hungry in Russia, but at the same time their Government expend a hundred thousand dollars for the transportation of such supplies from our ports to Russia. The Russian Government hardly merits at our hands such extraordinary consideration.

A great and wealthy power like Russia can well perform that duty for her own people. I hope, therefore, the motion to strike out will be adopted.

I wish to add my cordial indorsement of what has been well said on the floor of the House during this discussion, that in the present condition of our Treasury a positive degree of economy is expected of us by our people. To secure the object of this munificence does not require the appropriation of this \$100,000; and I trust the House will not agree that this item of unnecessary expenditure should remain in the bill. If Congress thinks these contributions of our generous people to the famishing people of Russia should be transported by us to the Russian ports, instead of Russia using her navy for that purpose, then our Navy clearly should be employed. Can you employ our Navy in any better way? Ships of war are only well employed in such a humane service. The officers of the Navy may not like this kind of work, but it is absurd to say that provision to feed people can not be shipped on war ships. It is the only use you have for them, at least for the present.

Mr. HERBERT. Mr. Speaker, I hope this motion of the gentleman from Indiana will prevail. To the gentlemen of my own party I desire to address myself very briefly. I do not think it worth while to say anything to the gentlemen immediately upon my right. I do not expect any member of this House who is responsible for the billion-dollar appropriations of the last Congress to vote in favor of this amendment. I take it for granted that every gentleman on this side of the House will vote solidly to commit the present Congress, as the very first step it shall take, in favor of this appropriation of \$100,000 of the people's money for the purpose of extending charity abroad.

Mr. BYNUM. Will the gentleman from Alabama permit me to make a suggestion?

Mr. HERBERT. Certainly.

Mr. BYNUM. I would like to call the attention of my friend to the fact that the amendment proposed will simply strike out the limitation and leave the Secretary of the Navy free to employ ships without limit of cost.

Mr. HERBERT. I do not know that the gentleman is correct in that proposition, but I take it for granted that the gentleman from Indiana, who proposes the amendment, will see that it is in proper form.

Mr. BYNUM. It should also strike out these words—
and, if necessary, to charter and employ, under the authority of the United States, a suitable steamship or ships, for the same purpose.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I think the gentleman from Indiana misunderstands the object of the amendment. If I understand the amendment correctly, it proposes that the Secretary of the Navy shall hire a ship, but the Russians shall pay the freight.

Mr. HERBERT. I will yield to the gentleman from Indiana to make what correction is necessary by way of an amendment.

Mr. HOLMAN. It is not necessary as an amendment. It simply amounts to this: The Clerk did not read the last clause of the bill which I propose to strike out. The original amendment, of course, embraced the entire proposition embodied in that clause of the resolution.

Mr. HERBERT. Well, I favor the purpose of the amendment, and took it for granted that the gentleman from Indiana would see that the amendment is so framed as to effect his purpose.

Now, the simple question presented at this time to the House of Representatives is just this: Shall the first step a Democratic House takes be to vote this expenditure of \$100,000 of the people's money? Why should we do it? Is not Russia able to do that for

herself? What reason can be given for it? Why, if it be the duty of Russia, shall we take it upon ourselves? I do not oppose the use of a ship, one or more, if they can be properly spared for this purpose; but I do say that the Democrats of this House ought to pause and consider well before committing themselves to an appropriation of this character.

Russia is one of the greatest governments in this world. In population and in extent of territory she far exceeds our country. Her Government is able to charter ships, and can to-day secure them by telegraph as speedily as we can. There is no reason why that Government can not charter to-morrow morning by telegraph every ship to be found in any port of America necessary to transport these donations. Russia knows better than this Government does whether her people are suffering. She knows whether they need these provisions. It is her duty to take care of her people. She is able to pay for the transportation of these donations, etc.; therefore I am opposed to the payment of this money out of our Treasury. It is said there are precedents for this proposition. If so, they are dangerous—dangerous in the extreme, and I think we should make haste to turn the face of the Government in the other direction. I do not care to occupy the time of the House in arguing the constitutional question. I put it simply upon economical grounds. I say if the people of Russia are suffering the Russian Government ought to know better than this House can without having made any investigation as to the facts.

Mr. TURNER. The gentleman from Alabama seems to assume that the Government of Russia is not only able to provide this transportation, but that it is her duty to do so as well?

Mr. HERBERT. Yes, sir.

Mr. TURNER. If that assumption is correct, is it even charity on our part to provide it?

Mr. HERBERT. Well, it would be much like the charity of many of these associations throughout the country that are formed for looking after the condition of the heathen of Borio-boola-Gha while they neglect the indigent and suffering at home. The gentleman means that it would really be an extravagant waste of the people's money, and in that I agree with him.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I sincerely trust that a Democratic House at the beginning of its administration will not be guilty of drawing so paltry a distinction as to send public ships abroad and higgie over appropriating the public money for the employment of private ships for the same purpose, when this is more economical and much more efficient. We own no vessels; and this is the only mode in which we can furnish relief.

This is sticking in the bark. If we are going to furnish relief let us do it as becomes a great nation, without higgling over so small a matter. To pretend to send is to give no relief. We have no ship of the Navy that can do it. It is simply "giving promise to the ear and breaking it to the hope." But if we intend to do, let us do it in good faith; let us charter these ships, load them with the contributions of the teeming Northwest, and send them as the contribution of the American people in an era when suffering makes all the world akin. This is the true ground upon which our fathers put it in 1847, the ground upon which that stalwart Democrat, Whitthorne of Tennessee, put it in 1880, whom I was willing to follow when he was in the House, and whose precedents I am willing to follow now.

It is constitutional; it is humane; therefore it is American, and therefore it is Democratic, and I for one am willing to take Democratic responsibility for it. If we are not going to do it, let us say so frankly. Let us say "we have not the power" or that we have not the will, or that we do not think that in this day we ought to furnish contributions to anybody in any national aspect. Then the country and the world will understand that in the intercourse of America with foreign people, we can commit war, we can cover our seas with our ships of war, we can give medals to sailors, we can decorate those who have saved our ships in foreign ports, we can thank Russia for relieving Melville in the Arctic Ocean, but that we are powerless to aid out of our abundance when God has blessed us with sunshine and rain, and when out of the fertile bosom of our American soil has come a teeming crop, and He has given scarcity and famine to others; that there are constitutional and partisan difficulties which make us stand by and see the suffering die and famine stricken people go to the grave. [Applause.]

Mr. OATES. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. Certainly, I always yield to the gentleman from Alabama with pleasure.

Mr. OATES. The gentleman's language is so eloquent that it is difficult for me to find a place where I can afford to interrupt him.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. There is no time when

I can not find a place to be interrupted by the gentleman from Alabama with pleasure. [Applause.]

Mr. OATES. Is not this appropriation for the purpose of transporting breadstuffs for the relief of suffering in Russia to go through the Russian Government?

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. I do not know whether it is to go through the Russian Government, or whether it is to go through that remarkable association which is in every nation, and known as the Red Cross Association.

Mr. OATES. Did not the gentleman state—

Mr. HITT. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. One moment. If it goes through the Russian Government, it will undoubtedly be properly distributed. And certainly the gentleman from Alabama is not willing to say by his action, as a diplomatic slap in the face of Russia, that she and her officers are not to be trusted with the distribution of our charity to her own suffering people.

Mr. OATES. The gentleman anticipates what I did not intend by the question. He goes beyond it. I understood the gentleman awhile ago to state that the larger part of his information was derived from the representative of the Russian Government here. It therefore seems that the Russian Government is accepting it for the relief of her suffering people, that the necessity is great, and that it would be gladly accepted. Now, is it any hardship, if that be true, that the generous contributions made by the people of this country for the relief of the suffering subjects of Russia should be transported to them at the expense of the Russian Government? If the Russian Government recognizes it and proposes, from all the evidences we have, to see to the distribution of these supplies, is it any hardship that that Government should pay the expense of transportation? It is not only the donations from our citizens for the relief of the suffering—if there be great suffering there, which I doubt not—but it is going further and asking an appropriation out of the Treasury of the United States to supply transportation, which Russia ought to supply for itself.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. But it is simply this: The citizens of the Northwest bring in their hands cargoes of breadstuffs and lay them down by the aid of the railroads at the port of New York. They have no transportation there. The American Government takes that contribution and lays it down at the port of Russia. In that way no time is lost. While we are debating suffering is increasing. It is simply a question, shall we do that which we do as a gentleman, graciously, or shall we do it niggardly and hesitatingly and incompletely? [Applause.] If we have the power to put it into the warehouse in New York, shall we not take it out of the warehouse and put it where the starving can get at it without further delay?

Mr. OATES. Does the gentleman consider it niggardly to inquire whether it be a proper appropriation of the people's money?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. With the permission of the Speaker *pro tempore*, I will say that I voted for the reference. That was voted down by the House, and now it is a question of consideration. I would have preferred it to have passed without the motion for reference. I would like this House to have done as the Senate has done, simply to have said without any debate, without any partisan reflection, without any other thing than the graciousness of a rich nation that has heard the story of suffering, to say, "Out of my abundance I do my part to relieve the suffering of people whose very suffering makes them akin to us."

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Debate upon the pending amendment is exhausted.

Mr. DOCKERY. I move to strike out the last word.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman from Missouri moves to strike out the last word, and will be recognized.

Mr. DOCKERY. Mr. Speaker, upon the threshold of this session, and whilst entering upon the consideration of the first appropriation we are asked to make, it may be well to invite the attention of gentlemen on this side of the House to the actual condition of the public Treasury.

The responsibility for the expenditure of the people's money, in so far as it has the approval of this body, must rest upon the Democratic party. I confess, sir, that I share the apprehension expressed by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HERBERT] that our friends of the minority may not at all times unite with us in exacting the most rigid scrutiny and economy in respect to the items and aggregate of appropriations. However this may be, it is beyond cavil that the country has the right to insist that Democratic Representatives shall hold fast to their pledges and limit expenditures to the actual needs of the public service.

Mr. Speaker, the statement of the Secretary of the Treasury shows the "net cash balance" in the Treasury January 1, 1892, to be \$34,574,128.30. The items of this apparent surplus are sub-

sidary and minor coin, \$14,108,985.35; deposits in national banks, \$15,437,669.91; and cash in Treasury vaults, \$5,027,473.04.

Deducting the unavailable item of subsidiary and minor coin, which is referred to by the Director of the Mint in his annual report as "an incubus of uncurrent coin," it is obvious that the available cash balance upon which the Treasury Department must rely to meet maturing and past-due obligations is but \$20,465,142.95.

Although Secretary Foster's statement discloses an excess of expenditures over revenues for the first half of the present fiscal year of \$273,464.57, it is yet probable that the current revenues, together with the meager Treasury surplus, would be entirely adequate to meet the demands of an economic administration, were it not for the overlapping and overdue liabilities imposed by the billion-dollar Congress.

The aggregate liabilities upon the national income for the present fiscal year are \$544,531,672.55, but after deducting the amount required by the sinking fund, together with the estimated postal receipts, we ascertain the liabilities for ordinary current expenditures to be \$422,501,521.29, or \$211,250,760.64 for the half year just closed. The expenditures for the same period having been but \$176,018,751.88, it becomes manifest that \$35,232,408.76 of the appropriations are still unpaid.

In addition to this outstanding liability, the accomplished clerk of the House Committee on Appropriations [Mr. Courts] estimates that the unexpended appropriations of the last fiscal year aggregate \$30,256,177.80. In other words, of the appropriations made by the billion-dollar Congress for the last fiscal year, and the first six months of the present year, there remains \$65,488,186.56 unpaid, with a Treasury surplus of only \$20,465,142.95, whilst current expenditures are outstripping current revenues.

If to this unpaid mortgage upon the resources of the Government is added the \$25,364,500 of 4½ per cent bonds refunded and the \$49,224,928.65 demanded by the obligations of the sinking-fund act, it becomes apparent that the matured national indebtedness now aggregates \$140,077,615.25.

Mr. Speaker, in the presence of this fiscal exhibit, an actual Treasury deficiency is apparently imminent and inevitable. Indeed, sir, the officials of the Treasury have been compelled to tax their ingenuity to the utmost in order to avert such a disaster, pending the Presidential contest.

It was the lavish appropriations, Mr. Speaker, of the last Congress, coupled with the anticipated reduction of revenues by prohibitory tariff duties, which compelled the Republican party to wrest from the holders of the national-bank notes \$54,207,975.75 and cover it into the general Treasury. Of this enforced loan \$32,679,299.25 is yet an outstanding liability. It was augmenting expenditures and dwindling revenues which coerced the Administration into a suspension of the sinking fund, and the refunding of \$25,364,500 of the bonded indebtedness maturing September 1, 1891. It was the same fiscal exigency confronting the Secretary of the Treasury which induced him to change the old form of stating the national debt so that the "chips and wheatstones" of the public Treasury, with its trust and reserve funds, should be made to take the place of the people's money, which had been wasted in prodigal and partisan extravagance.

The condition of the Treasury, Mr. Speaker, may be briefly summarized in the statement that the available surplus is now but \$20,465,142.95; current expenditures surpass current revenues; appropriations aggregating \$65,488,186.56 are unpaid; the Administration has been constrained to ask an extension upon \$25,364,500 of the bonded indebtedness of the Government; whilst actual default is made in \$49,224,928.65 required by the provisions of the act establishing the sinking fund.

Now, Mr. Speaker, having concisely stated the Treasury situation, I am constrained to enter an earnest protest against the contribution of \$100,000 proposed by the Senate joint resolution.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, I desire to offer an amendment.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Does the gentleman from Missouri withdraw his *pro forma* amendment?

Mr. DOCKERY. I do.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman from Massachusetts offers an amendment, which the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Add at the bottom of the resolution the following words:

"It is the sense of the Government of the United States, in the passage of this bill for the relief of the sufferers by famine in Russia, that no discrimination shall be made in the distribution of these supplies against the citizens of that Empire known as Israelites or Jews."

[Applause.]

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Does the Chair understand that this is offered as an amendment to the amendment? If not, it will not be in order at this time.

Mr. MORSE. I do so offer it, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. BLOUNT. Mr. Speaker, I desire to reserve the point of order upon it.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman from Georgia reserves all points of order upon the amendment. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MORSE. I desire to say, Mr. Speaker, that I am entirely in sympathy with the bill now under consideration.

Mr. BLOUNT. Do I understand that the point of order is reserved?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair stated that the gentleman from Georgia had reserved all points of order.

Mr. BLOUNT. I would as soon make it now, or hereafter, as the gentleman from Massachusetts may prefer.

Mr. MORSE. I will occupy my five minutes, if I am allowed to, at this time, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized.

Mr. MORSE. I desire to say, Mr. Speaker, that I am heartily in sympathy with this bill. I believe that it ought to pass. I am opposed to the reference of this resolution to any committee and am in favor of its immediate consideration. However cruel or wrong the Russian Government may be in the treatment of its subjects that is no reason why this grain and these supplies contributed by the benevolent people of the Northwest should not be forwarded to the starving people of Russia. But it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, since it is a fact well known to the people of the United States that 5,000,000 citizens of Russia, known as Israelites or Jews, are subjected by the Russian Government at this time to the most cruel and relentless persecution, I think that no harm can arise from coupling these words of mine to this bill and to this contribution from our Government, or from our citizens, for the relief of those starving people.

The wrongs done these Jews can only be known by reading the Russian laws and edicts with reference to them. I may refer to simply one of them. Whenever a Russian family for any cause is banished from the country in which they lived, the Russian law provides that if there is a daughter in the family she may remain if she will take out a license as a woman of the town. I think that any government that will be guilty of such a damnable law as this and other similar laws directed against 5,000,000 of its subjects deserves to have it made known, and no harm can come from telling the Russian Government that we are cognizant of the facts; and no harm can come from my suggestion that even-handed justice shall be done these people in the distribution of these supplies in the manner I have indicated in my amendment.

Mr. CHIPMAN arose and was recognized.

Mr. BLOUNT. Mr. Speaker, I desired to be heard on the point of order.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized.

Mr. BLOUNT. If the gentleman desires to go on now I will suspend action on the point of order.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The point of order will be considered as reserved, and the gentleman will have the benefit of it.

Mr. CHIPMAN. Mr. Speaker, this is one of those occasions which are frequent in the history of men, when a proposition is made to be generous with money which does not belong to them. I am very well aware that there may be a certain amount of odium attached to opposition to this joint resolution; yet to my mind there are a hundred reasons why it should not pass, or at least why it should not pass without the most careful consideration. I was forcibly struck by the remarks made by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BRYAN], who adverted to the fact that when the people of his section were in distress we in our seats here could find no way to aid them. A strict constitutional construction was invoked, and no gentleman then arose to announce that the tie of misfortune made us all akin. I remember it very well. No such sentiment as that was indulged in upon that occasion, but an ironclad construction of the Constitution was enforced, and the necessities of our own flesh and blood went unaided, unrelieved.

I have been struck, too, by the remarks of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DOCKERY] as to the condition of the Treasury, and without going into that subject at length, I simply say that it behooves us, under the circumstances which bring us here in so great a majority, to scan every item of expense with regard to its necessity as well as to its constitutionality.

I for one am very glad that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE] has proposed his amendment. It is a serious question in my mind whether Russia, treating the Israelites and the Poles of that country as she is treating them, is entitled to the comity which prevails among civilized nations. I have, I say, strong doubts upon that question, while she is pouring into our midst hundreds and thousands and tens of thousands of these famine-stricken people; not only driving them out from their homes

by lack of food, but by civil and religious persecution, and throwing them upon the hands of the people of this country to be taken care of.

I am ready, sir, to perform that work generously and to receive those people with open arms; but at the same time it occurs to me that a nation that can cast its people forth, its bone and sinew, so prodigally, as that nation is doing, that can be guilty of the oppression which that nation is guilty of, has no claim upon the sympathy of a republic like the United States. And for that reason alone, sir, if for no other, I for one would refuse to vote for this joint resolution here to-day.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. Does the gentleman from Michigan draw no distinction in such a matter as this between the government which may be guilty of the acts of which he has just spoken and the suffering poor who have no voice in the commission of those acts, but only share in the suffering?

Mr. CHIPMAN. I have thought of that, and my thought takes this shape, that it would be well for the people of that country to understand that their Government is outlawed from human sympathy; that it can expect no comity so long as it continues these oppressions; and I believe that that would be one means of stimulating them to rise and throw off the fetters which bind them.

Mr. PENDLETON. Does not the gentleman from Michigan know also that the very people who are forcing the Russian Government to persecute the Hebrews and Poles there are the Russian peasantry themselves?

Mr. CHIPMAN. I understand so. It is said that their ignorance, their prejudice, their bigotry, their hatred of the Jewish and Polish peoples in a religious way are such that they are foremost in leading on that crusade, which simply shows that they are under a government which makes slaves of them all.

Mr. PATTERSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I have listened with much interest to the discussion of this question. I listened with very great interest to the eloquent remarks submitted by the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BRECKINRIDGE], but the questions with me are these: First, has this Government, under the Constitution, the right to appropriate money for any purpose except it be a governmental purpose; and, second, is this a governmental purpose? Has this Government the right or power to engage in the distribution of charity out of the public Treasury? That, sir, is the difficulty with me. Notwithstanding the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from Alabama, as I read the organic law of the land, we have no power to appropriate, for any such purpose the money which is paid into the Treasury as taxes by the people.

Another question, Mr. Speaker. What has produced, in a large measure, this condition of affairs in the Empire of Russia? It has been the conduct of the Russian Government itself, which has shocked the moral sensibilities of the Christian world; and, so far as I am concerned, I am not disposed to make that Government the instrumentality for the distribution of American charity. These, Mr. Speaker, constitute the reasons which control me in my opposition to the passage of this joint resolution. So far as the suffering Israelites of Russia are concerned, I am one of those who feel a profound sympathy for them. Their kindred constitute a part of the constituency I represent, and I am rejoiced that their sufferings have shocked the moral sensibilities of the American people.

But let the charity of our people go out to the sufferers through their own instrumentalities, and not through the Russian Government.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. PATTERSON of Tennessee. Yes, sir.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. Does the gentleman from Tennessee think it at all possible that the fact that there are a good many Jews in his constituency, and no other Russians, may cast some light upon the constitutional question as he has been studying it? [Laughter.]

Mr. PATTERSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, in reply to the suggestion of the gentleman from Kentucky I take the position that this Government has no right or power to distribute charity in Russia either to the Israelites or to any other portion of the Russian poor. It is conceded by the gentleman from Alabama, who seems to have examined this question, that we have not the constitutional power to distribute charity to our own deserving poor; and if we have not that power, I submit to this House the question, have we the power or the right to distribute charity to the people of foreign countries? The Government of the United States is not an eleemosynary institution; and I desire here and now to enter my protest against the appropriation of money for any purpose, charitable or otherwise, that is not governmental and clearly within the limitations of the Constitution. [Applause.]

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, I favored immediate action upon

this resolution, not because I favored the resolution, but because I believed it was our duty to act promptly in this matter one way or the other. It was a source of great pride to me to know that my own State of Iowa was first among those that raised these contributions for the suffering people of Russia. But it was a matter of greater pride that they were contributions and not appropriations. The people of Iowa, the people of Minnesota, the people of Nebraska, did not appropriate of the public funds, but they gave from their private pockets. I have observed here to-day that not one gentleman from the States that have contributed these amounts have said one word in regard to the matter of transportation; but it is the people who have not furnished one cent by way of contribution who are willing to vote out of the Treasury of the Government money which they would not give out of their own pockets. [Applause.]

For myself, I believe in charity. It is one of the graces that adorn true character and noble manhood; but it is not true charity on my part to give money from another's pocket instead of my own.

I oppose this resolution from beginning to end, so far as it proposes to make use of public funds. Nor is it so much a question of constitutional power as it is a question of moral right. No course of reasoning can in reality justify the use of public moneys for other than purely governmental purposes.

In regard to the amendment presented by the gentleman from Massachusetts, it would be received as a studied insult to the very Government it is proposed to aid. Supplies sent to Russia, labeled with a notification that the contributors demand that the distribution be so made as to meet the American idea of governmental duty, thus reflecting on the Russian policy of government, such supplies, I believe, would be returned, accompanied by the declaration that the Russian Government proposed to act in the matter, if at all, without advice or direction from other powers as to the manner of the distribution.

I oppose both the amendment mentioned and the resolution so far as it provides for the appropriation of money or the chartering of ships, and shall therefore vote to strike out the clause providing for such chartering and such appropriations.

Mr. BLOUNT. Mr. Speaker, the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts, against which I have raised a question of order, is in the following language:

It is the sense of the Government of the United States, in the passage of this bill for the relief of the sufferers by famine in Russia, that no discrimination shall be made in the distribution of these supplies against the citizens of that Empire known as Israelites or Jews.

Now, sir, we have before us in this resolution of the Senate a proposition to distribute or transport supplies which have been raised by contributions on the part of the people of several of the Northwestern States. Those people have not only done this, but they have appointed their agents to follow these supplies and make the distribution amongst the suffering people.

I repeat that the supplies to which this resolution refers are voluntary contributions of many citizens of the Northwestern States, which it is proposed shall be distributed under the direction of their own agents in certain districts in Russia. The resolution simply proposes that the Government shall lend the use of naval vessels, or shall expend not exceeding \$100,000, in order to transport those supplies. That is the only question here involved. Now, I submit that upon a single proposition such as this to aid our own citizens in the distribution of supplies, it is not pertinent, it is not germane, to raise another question, and to place upon this joint resolution a declaration that it is the sense of this Government that there should be no discrimination in the distribution against persons known as Jews or Israelites.

Mr. MILLIKEN. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. BLOUNT. Yes, sir.

Mr. MILLIKEN. These supplies, as I understand, are not supplies furnished by the Government of the United States?

Mr. BLOUNT. Not at all.

Mr. MILLIKEN. They come from the people of the Northwest?

Mr. BLOUNT. Certainly.

Mr. MILLIKEN. Then does not the proposition of the gentleman from Massachusetts amount to this: that the Government should undertake to direct how the supplies furnished by somebody else shall be distributed?

Mr. BLOUNT. Unquestionably that is the effect of the proposition. These people have raised supplies for a certain purpose; they are simply asking, or we are proposing, that they be transported to Russian territory through the agency of the Government; and on arriving there they are to be taken charge of by agents of those States, and distribution made by them. I submit that it is not germane upon a proposition like this to make a declaration in regard to the mode of distributing these supplies. That is a matter with which we have nothing to do, because this is not the donation of the Government at all.

I will not say anything as to the merits of the proposition until the Chair shall have ruled upon it; but I submit that it is entirely out of order, treating this as a donation from these people to be distributed to persons in the famine-stricken districts of Russia; it is entirely out of order for us to undertake to annex to the donations of these private individuals a declaration as to how they should be distributed. If the people of Minnesota or Nebraska or any other of the Northwestern States want to extend charity to Israelites or to any other class of persons, that is a matter to be directed by themselves, not by this House. I urge upon the Chair the point that under the rules it is not germane to attach to this resolution an amendment of this character.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. This resolution embraces a proposition to transport certain supplies from the United States to a foreign country. It makes provision that vessels of the United States, and, if need be, the money of the United States, shall be used in such transportation. The amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts proposes to couple with this provision for transportation the expression or declaration that when these supplies reach their final destination there should be no discrimination made in the distribution between different classes of people supposed to be worthy recipients of the donations. The Chair is of opinion that it is not out of order for this House in making an appropriation to couple with it such a condition as that proposed in the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts. The position taken by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BLOUNT] may be a very good argument to show that the amendment should not be adopted, but the Chair thinks that it is in order to allow the House to act upon the amendment, and overrules the point of order made by the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BLOUNT. Mr. Speaker, I trust, as the question is now before the House, that it will see fit to reject the proposition. There is not in the whole history of this magnificent charity on the part of these people of the great Northwest the slightest intimation, the slightest suggestion from any quarter or of any character that the relief given to the people of the famine-stricken districts of Russia shall not be equal and uniform and without discrimination as between all races of men found there.

Mr. HOLMAN. Will the gentleman indulge me in a question?

Mr. BLOUNT. Certainly.

Mr. HOLMAN. Does my friend from Georgia believe, assuming that the reports we have received through the press are correct as to the condition of affairs in Russia, and the attitude of the Russian people, as a people, towards the Hebrews, and the Russian Government, as a government, towards the people—does he think that that very considerable portion of the population of that country who may stand in need of relief under the present circumstances are likely to receive any benefit whatever from this munificence on the part of our people?

Mr. BLOUNT. I will answer the gentleman's question, which might as well be called an argument interjected here, by saying that I not only suppose it, but I believe that these kind people in the Northwest who organized this relief and made these contributions, and who propose to distribute the charity by agents of their own, already appointed by the governors of the different States, will make the distribution in accordance with the necessities of the people of the country whom they seek to relieve.

Mr. HOLMAN. But does the gentleman not know that under the despotic system of Russia we have got to take into account its police powers, a power which is manifested everywhere; and in the districts occupied by the Hebrew people we can not organize a movement strong enough to secure justice in the distribution of these supplies?

Mr. BLOUNT. My friend from Indiana has many ways of making his attacks. Now he comes up and raises the question as to what the Russian Government will do in relation to a matter of this sort; and the gentleman from Indiana, venerable as he is in the public service, respected as he is by the people of this country, with the authority of his great name, is raising now in this House a question which is not creditable to him, nor prudent to be raised in the Representative Hall of the American people. It is, to say the least, not proper for this House by any legislative declaration to assume towards any friendly power a purpose to do that which would be contemptible in the eyes of any man on earth. There is no necessity for it, and there is nothing, except in the brain of the gentleman from Indiana, to warrant it. I scarcely think the thought exists that the agents of the governors of these several States, when they shall reach that country, will fail to see that this charity shall be delivered to every starving family within their reach, and with such a suggestion it would be, I think, competent for the Russian Government to guard itself against the assumption which such a remark implies.

I think we may well trust to the Russian Government to guard itself and its own good name in this regard. I know so well the methods of my friend from Indiana in this House that I can not

believe this is a candid suggestion on his part. From the beginning he has fought this measure in every form in which it has been presented.

Mr. HOLMAN. No; I am in favor of the proposition to do just what we have done heretofore and use our Navy for a very proper purpose.

Mr. BLOUNT. Well, let us do it, and do not come and obstruct the doing of it by putting a proposition here which, if you are correct, is an insult to a foreign government.

Mr. HOLMAN. Well, my friend is assailing me without any reference to my friend over yonder from Massachusetts. [Laughter.]

Mr. BLOUNT. I will take care of both gentlemen in due time.

If the gentleman from Indiana is the interpreter of the gentleman from Massachusetts, and I take it that he is—if he is the interpreter of that gentleman in this suggestion, which is but a declaration on the part of the House of Representatives of the United States that the Government of Russia is acting cruelly and inhumanly towards a portion of its people—

Mr. HOLMAN. Is it not true?

Mr. BLOUNT. I would like to know of the gentleman from Indiana, as an American citizen, what he would think of the passage of such a measure towards this country on the part of any foreign government?

Mr. HOLMAN. Has not the whole civilized world denounced the conduct of Russia towards a portion of its own people?

Mr. BLOUNT. That is not the question. I care nothing about it. Let public opinion have its way. Let us, when we exercise the limited powers conferred upon us, and which we are entitled to exercise under our form of government, pursue those methods which prudence and dignity prescribe, and not attack one of the great friendly nations of the world in a manner such as the gentleman suggests. If the gentleman from Indiana thinks it is right and the duty of this House to make this declaration, perhaps he would not hesitate to go further and make even a declaration of war against any government that was not republican in form and protected the rights of its citizens according to his own notions.

I say that if the gentleman from Indiana interprets correctly the proposition of the gentleman from Massachusetts, and I believe he does, for I think it is the purpose of the gentleman from Massachusetts to do exactly what the gentleman from Indiana has suggested, then I submit that this House of Representatives will not, without very much more careful consideration by some committee, make a declaration here which is calculated to disturb the good relations between this country and the Russian Government, and to affect our intercourse with them politically, commercially, or otherwise. Especially, Mr. Speaker, I trust that we will not take occasion to breed discord when we have before us a proposition to relieve suffering humanity by donations made by our own charitable fellow citizens of the great Northwest. If I believed that there was any purpose anywhere to use this fund for making a discrimination against the Israelites or any other class of people I would not consent to the use of a single vessel of this Government or a single dollar of its money.

This Government and the American people would recognize no distinctions of that sort nor justify it on our part. Let us not belittle this splendid action by this little, mean suggestion in relation to the possibility of the Russian Government, the Czar with his police power, taking up the representatives of our Government going on this friendly mission. If they shall be incarcerated, if our agents shall be imprisoned while in the performance of this act, then I expect to hear from the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE] and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HOLMAN] in the matter of a declaration of war.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. BOUTELLE. I would suggest to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE] that he withdraw his amendment.

Mr. MORSE. I am not going to withdraw it, and in reply to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BLOUNT] who has seen fit to characterize this amendment which I have offered as mean. I will append to my remarks what I have not in my desk, but which I have at my hotel, a copy of several of the laws of the Russian code, and if the gentleman can find anything on God's green earth that is meaner than some of these laws, enacted against the Israelites, the Jewish citizens of that empire, I would like to have him tell me what it is. To say that they are mean does not describe it.

I say, Mr. Speaker, that 5,000,000 citizens of the Russian Empire are subjected to the most cruel, relentless, and heartless persecution. These poor men are driven from their homes, houseless, homeless, and friendless, to strange lands, without any trade or occupations. Thousands of them are coming to these shores, and charitable people throughout the length and breadth of our country are being compelled to support these starving and

destitute people who are coming here. If the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BLOUNT] thinks my amendment is mean, I want him to turn to the RECORD to-morrow morning and read some of these Russian edicts against the Israelites; and then if he can find anything meaner than they are I want to know what it is. Now, Mr. Speaker, I say that any government that is guilty of such a crime as I have here described, that is guilty of enacting any such laws against any great portion of its people, as has the Czar's Government, has placed itself without the pale of sympathy and consideration of any civilized nation on the face of the earth, the United States included.

But while I entertain this view of the Czar's government and believe that no kindness shown to us in the day of our distress during the civil war, referred to by gentlemen, can atone for such crime against humanity, yet because the Russian people are suffering, because the innocent are suffering, I am in favor of this bill, and I was in favor of its immediate consideration, and I voted against referring it to any committee. But I fail to see, Mr. Speaker, what harm can arise from coupling this benefaction on the part of our Government (for that is what it is, because this Government proposes to send these supplies to the Russian people)—Mr. Speaker, I fail to see what harm can come to us or our dignity or what insult can be offered to that Government by coupling with this benefaction this suggestion that we desire these supplies distributed indiscriminately, without any discrimination against the Israelites or Jews of that empire.

Now, Mr. Speaker, once more I tell you that in the light of the Russian code appended, which I ask you to read, unless you couple my amendment to this bill, no Israelite in Russia will ever receive one single spoonful of that flour.

Below are appended the Russian laws with reference to Jews or Israelites. Especial attention is called to the last clause of No. 9:

A RÉSUMÉ OF THE CHIEF RESTRICTIVE LAWS.

RESTRICTIONS ON RESIDENCE.

1. The Jews of Russia have long been compelled—with certain exceptions only—to reside either in Poland or within the adjoining provinces known as the "Pale of Jewish Settlement," which contain comparatively few towns.

2. They may not live within fifty versts (about 33 miles) of the frontier. The effect is to prevent them carrying on trade with neighboring countries.

EXPULSIONS FROM VILLAGES.

3. Under the May laws, which prohibit Jews from settling "outside of cities and towns," those settled in villages since May, 1882, are expelled therefrom, and driven into the overcrowded towns of the Pale.

4. Under certain decisions of the Senate, Jews settled in villages before May, 1882, have the right of remaining there, but only provided they do not move therefrom. Many have been driven out who have settled there before because their names had not been inscribed as villagers, or because they had temporarily left the village, in some cases to perform their military duty.

5. Suburbs of towns and small towns have been in many cases declared villages, and the Jews have been expelled therefrom.

6. Under the May laws, Jews are prohibited from owning or holding on lease, or even managing land; nor can they take a mortgage of land. Those, therefore, who have the right to remain villagers, in consequence of settlement before 1882, can not find a livelihood, and must migrate to the overcrowded towns of the Pale.

EXPULSIONS.

7. Until lately Jews of all classes were allowed to reside in the Grand Duchy of Finland and in Courland. This year all who were not artisans or merchants of the first guild have been expelled and driven into the Pale.

8. Jews have lately been also expelled in large numbers from certain important commercial centers outside the Pale, such as Rostoff, on the Don, Tomsk, in Siberia, and other towns where, for commercial reasons, they had hitherto been allowed to settle; also from the transcasian provinces, and from Batoum and other Asiatic places formerly owned by Turkey.

9. In all these cases of expulsion the Jews have to find the means of removal by selling off their goods and chattels, as they can not collect debts when they are known to be under orders to leave. If they then are unable to find money enough to pay for removal, they are forwarded to the Pale of Settlement, however distant that may be, by *Uape*, i. e., in chains, by the side of condemned criminals, and under the guard of prison warders. Jewesses are, however, allowed to remain if they will apply for a yellow ticket and become enrolled as prostitutes.

10. The result of all these expulsions is not only to deprive of their livelihood the persons expelled, but also to injure the original inhabitants of the towns of the Pale, who have to sustain the competition of the new arrivals, to incur the burden of a crowd of pauperized people, and to find for them house space within limits that were already too contracted.

11. Besides expulsions from Russia proper into the Jewish Pale, a very large number of expulsions of foreign Jews have taken place, not only from Russia proper, but from the Pale itself. Any Jew unable to prove the place of his birth may be prosecuted, and, as registration was formerly a lax institution in Russia, prosecutions and expulsions of Jews as alien vagrants or as rogues and vagabonds (*brodyaga*) are of no rare occurrence.

RESTRICTIONS ON EDUCATION.

12. The attainment by a Jew of the highest degree in any university faculty entitles him to the privilege of residing outside the Pale. A large number of Jews have hitherto been candidates for university distinctions, but recent laws have limited admissions not only to the universities, but to the gymnasias, the proportion fixed being 10 per cent in the Pale, 5 per cent outside it, and 3 per cent in St. Petersburg and Moscow. The Jews are not allowed schools of their own. In the special technical schools built and endowed by certain rich Jews the proportion of Jews admitted is limited just as if they had been established by the Government.

13. Jewish children attending the public schools are required to be present on the Jewish Sabbath.

ARTISANS' PRIVILEGES RESCINDED.

14. Skilled artisans and their families have hitherto been allowed to reside outside the Pale of Settlement. Under recent rules, if Jewish artisans residing in Russia proper are found inefficient in their trade, are not actually in work, or past work by reason of age, they are expelled.

15. Skilled artisans who formerly held the right of permanent residence in Moscow and St. Petersburg have lately been deprived of that right by an arbitrary and summary administrative order.

16. The definition of "skilled artisan" has been contracted for the purpose of excluding Jews. It has lately been declared that bakers, vinegar-makers, glaziers, printers' compositors, and other workers in light occupations are not artisans, and Jews carrying on these trades have been expelled from towns in Russia proper.

RESTRICTIONS ON OCCUPATIONS.

17. Jews are not allowed to sell intoxicants except in houses which they own. Jewish waiters may be employed only by Jews.

18. Jews are not allowed to engage in any mining industry, or to hold mining shares, or to act as agents for persons engaged in mining.

19. Those Jews who, as high graduates of a university, or as merchants of the first guild (men paying at least 1,000 rubles taxation annually), are allowed to reside outside the Pale, may have no more than two Jewish employes in their service. (A privileged Jew, who wishes his aged parents to reside with him outside the Pale, frequently registers the one as his valet and the other as his cook.)

20. Jews are prohibited from forwarding goods, as agents or employes, from frontier custom-houses to localities outside the Pale.

PROFESSIONS AND PUBLIC APPOINTMENTS CLOSED.

21. Jews are not allowed to occupy any government or public appointment. They are accordingly been dismissed from railway and post-office service, from the posts of schoolmasters, and from notarial offices. They may no longer be appointed doctors, or even veterinary surgeons, in the army. No Jew may become an advocate, though fully qualified by examination, without the special sanction of the minister of the interior, which has not once been given. No dentist or apothecary of Jewish extraction is to receive a license to practice. No Jew may become an officer in the army, though bound to serve in the rank and file, like all other Russians. The penalty of evading military service is higher for the Jew than for others. No Jew may serve in the navy.

22. No Jew may be elected mayor, councillor, or police magistrate, nor may hold any other town office. The law says: "The duties of judges can not be entrusted to Jews with convenience or decency."

SPECIAL TAXES ON FOOD, ETC.

23. There is a special tax, called the "box tax," levied on the animals killed according to Jewish ritual law—a tax payable on the slaughter of the animal and another on its retail sale. There are also special taxes on house property owned by Jews, on business profits of Jews, on the skull caps used by Jews during domestic prayer, and on the Sabbath candles used by Jews.

DIRECT RELIGIOUS PERSECUTION.

24. Jews on reaching their fourteenth year may be received into the orthodox church, notwithstanding the objection of their parents. All Jews on conversion receive from the state a considerable subvention, and are thenceforth free from all disqualifications.

25. Synagogues are only allowed in places where there are no fewer than eighty Jewish houses. Jews holding divine worship in their houses without official permission are punished by law.

ALIENATED AND BLACKMAILED.

26. The Russian law declares all Jews "to be aliens whose several rights are regulated by special ordinances." This law and the mass of special ordinances cause the Jews to be regarded as a pariah caste.

27. The minute legal restrictions which hem in every action of the Jew, and compel him to obtain police sanction for everything he requires to do, renders him a ready subject for blackmail, and he can only live by bribing. The poverty of the bulk of the Jews has now reached that stage where bribery is impossible. Hence these restrictive laws are now enforced with all possible rigor.

For the further information of the House I also append to my remarks a few illustrations which have come to my knowledge of the practical working of these laws:

M. S., 37 years old, eleven years in Moscow, was a jeweler, belonging to the second guild, and paid £12 per annum for license. He was doing a good business in Moscow, and surrounding districts, but received notice to quit within seven months; and having a good deal of money standing out in the country left Moscow for a few days to collect it. On his return he was ordered to leave in seven days for going out of town without leave. He was obliged to leave behind him a good deal of money outstanding, and, in broken health and fortune, was thus forced to leave his native land.

Abraham Moses, Moscow, belonging to the first guild of merchants. He carried on an extensive business, had thirteen clerks in his office, all Jews, and had to dismiss them by order of the police, and not being allowed to employ Christian employes, had to realize on his property at a great loss and leave Moscow.

Moses Meyerowski, wife, no children, tailor. He had been fourteen years in Kremchuck (Poitava), was making a comfortable living, and had four assistants. He was employed by some of the *elite* of the district; most of his customers, however, taking credit. In answer to his demands for money, he was ordered to leave the place in seven days without being able to collect his debts. All he got for his belongings hardly sufficed to pay half his journey expenses.

Isaac Wolvchinski, 53 years, carpenter, eighteen years at Ikallet, has a wife and seven children. A hard-working man, he could pay his way when at home, but had nothing over; was ordered to leave in three days, and in the short time left him he could not get enough to buy sufficient provisions for the journey.

Here is a letter from a citizen of Edinburgh, describing a scene which he witnessed, which tells its own story. Volumes more of similar testimony might be appended.

Here is a sample of the most recent refugees. A few evenings ago, the Hamburg steamer arrived with its usual freight of exiles. On landing they formed into little family groups, each with its bundle for the inspection of the custom-house officers, and when this was completed the relief committee proceeded with its humane work, giving to each a substantial meal, and distributing clothes and a little money to the very needy. One of the most striking groups consisted of a respectable man and his wife, apparently in good circumstances. He was a watchmaker, P. L., from Moscow, of about 55 years. With tears he told us he was in business in that city for twenty-two years, employing several men, and in a good position; but the hand of the authorities fell on him, and he was hurriedly driven forth. He was now a homeless exile, and all he had in the world was in a basket at his feet. His wife seized both hands of a lady friend who was with me, and amidst her sobs, told that she had left her five children behind her in the grave at Moscow. It was the one touch of nature which makes the whole world kin. I could not say who wept the most, the listener or the speaker.

With some reluctance they partook of the charity of a cup of hot coffee. For the sympathy and the little kindness shown them, the husband took my hand and kissed it, and blessed me.

Your space will not admit of a description of the twentieth part of what I see any time at Leith—teachers, lawyers, students, manufacturers, and tradesmen, all at a sudden stroke rendered destitute, and driven out as homeless wanderers to face penury and cold in their efforts to begin life anew in a strange land. It is pitiful, above all things, to see the little children turned old with sorrow, while their parents are sunk in the silent, deep agony of despair. In the presence of such misery one asks the question, What evil thing have these people done to suffer such inhumanity? They only refuse to enter the Greek Church. The Christianity they are accustomed to is to see a rude, ignorant Russian kneeling before a wooden cross on the roadside and kissing an image, and then rising up to spit on the first Jew he meets and to curse him. Whatever the Jews may be, their ancient idolatry has been whipped out of them by ages of suffering, and rather than offend their conscience, they will become homeless and penniless wanderers on the earth. I lose sight of their poverty and poor clothing. I only see men and women of noble heroism, who, for conscience' sake will face cold and hunger and nakedness, and go out into the world to face the Atlantic and an unknown future with their children. I can not but look on these poor Jews with admiration, and loathe the fanaticism which drives them forth, and I feel it a privilege to do anything to cheer and encourage such brave and noble people.

WILLIAM PATERSON.

13 PITT STREET, EDINBURGH, November 6, 1891.

It is idle to deny or to attempt to palliate or excuse the horrible barbarity of the Russian Government, as gentlemen have attempted to do on this floor to-day. There is no question about the sentiment of the American people on this subject. Below are a few opinions of the American press which I have gathered.

The New York Herald has an article upon "Life with the Exiles," and says:

We find them to be a peaceable, prudent, patient, and painstaking people; they have all the qualifications for good citizenship, and they cultivate the soil without difficulty and without previous experience.

The New York World:

The policy of persecution which the Russian Government has adopted toward its Jewish subjects is engaging the attention of the civilized world. Whatever the motives which have prompted it, there can be no doubt about the relentless barbarity with which it is being carried out. Proofs of this are accumulating every day, and it is plainly seen that the persecution is nothing short of persecution to the death.

The New York Tribune:

This Jew-baiting is a purely religious persecution. The Czar so regards it, and so do his ministers and all Russian officials. The talk about the Jews being obnoxious for social or industrial reasons is nonsense, and when put forward by the Russian Press is intended merely to bamboozle the gullible. The Jews are hated simply because they are not, and will not become, members of the Greek Church.

New York Public Opinion says:

When any Government owing the force of international obligation undertakes to reduce several millions of its subjects to a choice between starvation and fight, the country is likely to become the asylum of multitudes of men, women, and children, reduced to the condition of hunted beasts, have not only the right but the duty of vigorous protest. Owing rather to ignorance of the precise character of Russian policy in this matter than indifference to it, the people of the United States have so far failed to express the sentiments which it naturally evokes. The American press may, we think, be trusted to do its entire duty in the premises.

The San Francisco Chronicle says:

The Jews are hated simply because they are not and will not become members of the Greek Church, and everyone else who persists in remaining outside the pale of orthodoxy is hated just the same. In proof of this one has only to observe the persecution that is being directed against the Stundists, Old Believers, Lutherans, and others. In the eyes of this fanatical and bigoted Government all Protestants and Roman Catholics are accused heretics, whom it is the duty of the orthodox believers to persecute, despoil, and destroy.

Below is the opinion of an English statesman, who most undoubtedly voices the sentiment of his countrymen.

His Grace the Duke of Argyle has addressed the following letter to a member of the London Russo-Jewish Committee:

INVERARY, ARGYLESIRE,
September 3, 1891.

SIR: I have been in hopes that some authentic contradiction by Russian authorities might enable us at least to suspend our judgment on the terrible accusations brought against them in respect of the cruel persecution of the Jews.

No such contradiction, however, has yet appeared; and I am afraid we must accept it as a fact that one of the greatest empires in the world, calling itself not only Christian, but preëminently "Orthodox," is now acting toward the Jewish people in a spirit worthy of the darkest period of the Dark Ages.

I know of no resource except the public opinion of the Christian world. Let us all take part in crying "shame" on such conduct. It is thoroughly barbarous.

Yours obediently,

ARGYLE.

Below are opinions of the English press upon the subject under consideration.

The Yorkshire Herald says:

When President Harrison recently appealed to the Russian Government to show mercy to the Jews it was thought that reason at last had penetrated the cabinet of the Czar. It was supposed that the old policy of Russification of the alien race would be once more adopted. These hopes, however, have been grievously disappointed. It seems almost incredible that in the present state of our civilization one of the great powers of Europe should persecute a large section of its subjects because of their religious belief. Yet the fact is so; and it is for other powers, without interference which would prove offensive, to bring such pressure to bear upon Russian authority as is likely to produce a better state of things.

The Freeman's Journal says:

There is little likelihood that the vigor of the present policy will be lessened, or that the feelings of the civilized world will no more be outraged, by a repetition of the terrible episodes that have recently earned for the Czar and his Government the reprobation of humanity.

The Scottish Leader says:

It is neither right nor possible that the voice of civilized humanity should not be uttered in condemnation of such cruelties as have been inflicted upon the Russian Jews. In spite of the indignant protestations of almost every other civilized community, the expulsion of the Jews from Russia is being continued, with attendant circumstances of cruelty and injustice that could not be paralleled in the history of modern Europe."

The Odessa correspondent of the London Daily News gives the following, and when it is known that these outrages are privately winked at by the Czar's Government the crime grows black:

I have to-day been shown a letter from Starodub, the receiver of which vouches for the integrity and trustworthiness of the writer, stating that during the recent antisemitic excesses perpetrated in that town, five young Jewish girls were outraged and otherwise so barbarously maltreated that they have all since succumbed. The writer also states that, including these five victims to the brutal lust and fanatic barbarity of the mob, the attack on the Jewish quarters has resulted in twenty deaths. The local authorities at Starodub are, as might have been expected, doing their utmost to suppress the real facts of this wanton and infamous attack on the helpless Jews. A report reached Odessa last night that an anti-Jewish riot had with difficulty been suppressed at Balta, a place which earned a disgraceful notoriety during the excesses committed in 1882. The officially described "deplorable incident" at Starodub threatens to become an example to be followed by the fanatical and brutal elements in other Jewish centers. The provincial authorities are, or should be, perfectly cognizant of the threatened danger to the lives, honor, and property of the Jewish inhabitants under their protection, and there can be no excuse or palliation whatever for these responsible officials if, with the police and military forces always at their command and disposition, they do not take instant and rigorous measures for the prompt and exemplary punishment of the primary instigator of these inhuman excesses which are covering Russia with eternal disgrace.

Now I submit, Mr. Speaker, and gentlemen of the House of Representatives, once more, whether any past friendliness of the Czar's Government to our own can atone for such crimes against God and man as I have herein but partially set forth. Once more I repeat that any government that would enter upon such a systematic persecution of its subjects has placed itself without the pale of sympathy of any civilized nation upon the face of the earth.

The record shows, I am sorry to say, that the populace of Russia to some extent at least are parties to this persecution. I am not a prophet or the son of a prophet, but I believe there is a just God that rules on high and governs the affairs of men, and a cry of wrong and distress, unheard by mortal ear, may be heard in heaven; and as He sent plagues to the ancient Egyptians to punish them for their sins against his people, so He may send famine to the people of Russia for the same cause. It is no wonder that the royal family travel in secret and look under every seat for a dynamite bomb.

Mr. Speaker, I am not an Israelite or a Jew. I believe, as the Jews do not, that the Messiah, the Immanuel, the Prince of Peace came in the person of the lowly Nazarene, who walked beneath the palm trees of Judea eighteen centuries ago; that he died on the cross for you and me, Mr. Speaker; that he has been "wounded for our transgressions and bruised for our iniquities;" that he was "brought as a lamb to the slaughter, and as a sheep dumb before her shearer, so he opened not his mouth." But I believe that with all their faults the children of Israel are still the chosen people of God, and finally, when He who sits upon his people "as a refiner and purifier of silver," when the dross is removed, and the Almighty's discipline of centuries shall be fulfilled, the children of Israel will be restored to his favor.

I seem to hear the voice of the Hebrew prophet saying to his chosen people, "For a small moment have I forsaken thee, but in great mercies will I gather thee. In a little wrath I hid my face from thee for a moment; but with everlasting kindness will I have mercy upon thee, saith the Lord thy Redeemer."

Under the call of States on yesterday, I introduced resolutions expressing the sentiment of our people in regard to this persecution, unequalled, I believe, since the children of Israel groaned beneath the taskmaster of Pharaoh in Egypt; unequalled since Moses cried to God in their behalf and the Almighty answered "I have heard their groanings and have come down to deliver." If our people are not moved, Mr. Speaker, upon this subject, what means it that the President of the United States thought it of sufficient consequence to call the attention of Congress to this cruel and relentless persecution, and to advise the representatives of the people that, moved by dictates of humanity, he had offered his good offices to the Czar's Government to secure amelioration and surcease of the same.

What means it that numerous Representatives besides myself, from remote sections of the country, yesterday, under the call of States, offered resolutions upon this subject? Then, once more, the United States has a selfish and pecuniary interest to stop this persecution. If these 5,000,000 subjects of the Russian Government are to be driven from their homes, are compelled to sacrifice their belongings, they must go to some other country, and

already the advance army of these people is being landed on these shores, houseless, homeless, friendless, without trade or occupation in this country whereby they may earn their bread, and at present and for a long time dependent upon the charity of our people. I shall vote for this bill with or without my amendment, because I believe that the mass of the peasantry of Russia can not, do not sanction or approve the acts of the Czar's Government which I have described towards the Israelites or Jews. I venture to close these remarks by appending to the same a copy of a preamble and resolution which I offered in the House on yesterday, and which was referred by you, Mr. Speaker, to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, as follows (and I trust that this important matter will receive the early consideration of that committee):

Whereas it has come to the knowledge of our people that 5,000,000 subjects of the Czar of all the Russias, known as Israelites or Jews, are at present subject to the most cruel and relentless persecution, banished from their homes on the most trivial pretext, without opportunity to sell their belongings, thus often driven into exile into strange lands destitute and penniless; and

Whereas the exodus of so large a people is impossible and impracticable:
Resolved, That the Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled, recognizing the Fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man, desire to express our sympathy for these unfortunate people in this hour of their dire distress.

Resolved, While it is against the policy of this Government to interfere in the affairs of other nations, yet, in view of the appalling facts recited above, and considering the friendly relations that have always existed between the Czar's Government and our own, we ask the President of the United States to continue to use his friendly and good offices to secure from the Czar's Government an amelioration of the condition and a surcease of persecution of these unfortunate people, and that the honorable Secretary of State be requested to forward to our minister at St. Petersburg, and through him to His Majesty's Government, a copy of these resolutions.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I certainly hope that this House will reject the amendment to strike out the appropriation of \$100,000, offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HOLMAN]. In 1848, when our Government was comparatively feeble and poor, we joyfully commissioned the Navy to carry bread to the people of Ireland. Mr. BOUTELLE, former chairman of the Naval Committee, tells us that the modern war vessels now owned by the Government are not suitable for such a purpose. And to refuse the necessary appropriation to carry these supplies to the starving people of Russia—Jews and Gentiles—while it may be in harmony with Democratic "retrenchment and reform," yet it is an act of niggardly parsimony that the Government of the United States of America can not afford to make. To adopt the amendment of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HOLMAN] is to emasculate and destroy the bill.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. LIND. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Debate on the pending amendment is exhausted.

Mr. LIND. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. That is the pending amendment.

Mr. LIND. I will ask the gentleman who made it to withdraw it, and then I will renew it.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. By unanimous consent it will be considered as withdrawn, and as renewed by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LIND].

Mr. LIND. I desire to say just one word, and that is this: If gentlemen would stop a moment to consider, they would see the absurdity of undertaking to attach a condition to a gift from the people of my State and other Northwestern States. My little town alone, of only 4,000 inhabitants, contributed 10 tons of flour. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE] has offered an amendment which is not only an insult to the Russian Government, but to our own people. Our own people say that out of our sufficiency, out of our abundance, we are willing that the starving Russians should be fed. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE] proceeds on the theory that I have often heard, from him and from other gentlemen from his section, that it is always in season to preach to a man to reform.

Our idea is different: it is that when a man is hungry and starving we want to feed him and let that act of humanity do the preaching, and the reformation will come in the course of time. I simply want to emphasize what has been so well expressed by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BRECKINRIDGE], that no gentleman would send a gift to another and have the express charges on it collected on delivery.

Mr. FORNEY. Sent C. O. D.

Mr. LIND. If the American people and if this Congress are not of the opinion that our Treasury is in a condition to justify it, if we do not feel that our nation is able to stand the expense of forwarding this flour, for God's sake do not do it. I believe that there is enough generosity in the people of the Northwest who contributed this flour and this corn to send it over, if the great American people are not able to do it in their capacity as a nation.

We have contributed the flour, and can send it over without begging you to do so, and we certainly should consider it an insult to us to have any objection of the character suggested by the

gentleman from Massachusetts attached to it. [Cries of "Bravo!" and applause.]

Mr. COOLIDGE. So far as this matter is concerned, as a Representative from Massachusetts I know no distinction in race, of Jew or Greek, or bond or free. I only know that where human suffering exists it should be relieved as soon as known. I do not ask any gentleman on this floor, I do not ask any constituent of mine to exercise more charity in a matter like this than I would exercise myself; and that the McKinley bill, as has been stated here, has caused great suffering I do not doubt, but what good that does to the suffering Jew of Russia I fail to see.

Then, again, as to the transportation of this gift to the suffering people of Russia, let me say that I would hardly consider it an advantage for a gift to be sent by express, the charges on which were more than the value of the gift itself. I am certainly in favor of this resolution as it came from the Senate without any amendment whatever.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HOLMAN].

The question was taken, and the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The amendment is rejected, and the question recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. Speaker, some misunderstanding may arise as to the words proposed to be stricken out. I therefore ask that the amendment be read.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. If there be no objection the amendment of the gentleman from Indiana will be again reported.

The amendment was again reported.

Mr. HOLMAN. Then I ask further that the measure as it would be, in the event the amendment be adopted, be reported.

The resolution as it would read when amended was again reported.

Mr. KILGORE. Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire further about that amendment of the gentleman from Indiana. If it be adopted and if the resolution should pass and become the law of the land, would it not become incumbent on Congress, and is it not his understanding of it that, as chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, he would have to report an appropriation on some appropriation bill to carry out the purposes of this resolution? Now, that is the effect of it, and if the gentlemen from Indiana—

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. Will the gentleman allow me to add a piece to his interrogatory? What is the constitutional difference between paying money out of the public Treasury to charter a vessel and paying it to send a vessel of the Navy?

Mr. KILGORE. Now, one moment more. I say, if the gentleman from Indiana will substitute some words in there and say that Congress shall not make any appropriation for the purposes included in this resolution, then it will be complete, and will serve the purposes this House understands is intended by that resolution.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I trust I will be indulged a moment. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILGORE] takes a very extraordinary view of this matter—very extraordinary. Here are two propositions before the House. One is to employ the vessels of the Navy in shipping to Russia the gifts of our people to the starving people of that country. That is one proposition. That proposition is to remain as it is in the bill if the amendment is adopted. I, for one, am distinctly in favor of that. It is the best use you can put your Navy to.

Mr. KILGORE. Under your amendment?

Mr. HOLMAN. Yes, sir.

The other proposition is to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to charter vessels in addition to using, or without using, any naval vessels, to the extent of \$100,000 for transporting these contributions of our people to the famishing people of Russia.

Now, if the latter proposition be stricken out, it leaves the matter exactly as in a former instance in our history; for we have a precedent for the employment of our Navy in the noble work of humanity and charity, a precedent already mentioned. It is a very proper purpose in which to employ the Navy. I say further, there is no excuse for appropriating this \$100,000 or any other sum. I hope we will all agree that the Navy shall be employed in this work of humanity. It can be done by the vessels of the Navy of the United States. It requires no statement of experts or official reports to prove this.

Mr. KILGORE. Without any additional appropriation?

Mr. BOUTELLE. I beg the gentleman's pardon at that point. He is mistaken.

Mr. HOLMAN. I feel sure that if the House will strike out this \$100,000 that will be the end of that.

Mr. KILGORE. That will be the end of the \$100,000.

Mr. HOLMAN. That will be the end of any appropriation unless it be put back in a conference between the two Houses. What expense can be incurred if you strike out the \$100,000? The cost of your Navy is the same whether the ships are employed or not, if they are in commission.

Mr. KILGORE. I understand the purpose of the amendment, and that is, it is in the interest of economy and to get rid of that \$100,000 appropriation.

Mr. HOLMAN. Certainly.

Mr. KILGORE. Now, sir, we can not anticipate what will be done by a conference committee; but I am sure that a conference committee would try to put this \$100,000 back; but I can not understand how this expense that will be incurred under this bill to transport these provisions can be met unless there is an appropriation made either on this or some other bill.

Mr. BLOUNT and Mr. BOUTELLE addressed the Chair.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Debate on the amendment is exhausted.

Mr. BLOUNT. I wish to support the amendment of the gentleman from Indiana for reasons which I desire to state.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Debate on the amendment is exhausted.

Mr. BLOUNT. I move to strike out the last word. Always, heretofore, Mr. Speaker, in the consideration of propositions of this sort they have come into the House of Representatives after examination by a committee. In this case there has been no such examination by the Senate, and none by the House. I was eager that this joint resolution should be referred to a committee of this House, with the right to report at any time, because there are some questions connected with it that are in dispute. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HOLMAN], long a member of this House, has made the declaration that there are sufficient transports belonging to the Navy of the United States to convey these supplies.

The gentleman from Maine [Mr. BOUTELLE], who, during the last Congress, was chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs, and who has been for several years a member of that committee, declares that the vessels of the Navy are not adapted to any such purpose.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Will the gentleman permit me to interrupt him briefly?

Mr. BLOUNT. There is so much brevity in this five-minute discussion that I fear I shall not have time to say all I want to say.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Well, as the gentleman was quoting from me, I thought he might permit me to make a remark.

Mr. BLOUNT. Well, I withdraw the quotation. [Laughter.]

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is a dispute in relation to this fact, and of course the House is entitled to have full information upon the subject. The House has had no communication with the Navy Department about this matter; it has resorted to no means of information as to whether or not the naval vessels can supply the amount of transportation that is required. As I have already stated, in 1847, when relief was to be furnished to the suffering Irish and Scotch people, the Congress of the United States provided that naval vessels of the United States, designating a certain number, might be used for the purpose of transportation. That was during the period of our war with Mexico, when there was a great demand upon our naval resources, but that resolution was adopted and the transportation was effected. Again in 1880 a similar joint resolution was offered in the Senate and was reported back with a provision allowing vessels to be chartered; that was done without reason stated, without debate, without any question being raised as to whether or not the Government had vessels of its own which would answer the purpose.

Now, anxious as I am to have these supplies sent, I am perfectly willing to pause for a moment, in accord with gentlemen who are making suggestions here of economy in the public expenditures, to inquire into the question whether it is necessary to go beyond permitting the use of our own naval vessels and appropriate money to charter others. There is a reasonable desire on the part of the House to have full and accurate information upon that question. Let this amendment be agreed to, and the joint resolution goes back to the Senate of the United States, and opportunity, time, the situation, will furnish us additional information upon this subject.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILGORE], or some other gentleman, has indicated that it is uncertain what a conference committee may do. Sir, we are safe in that regard. When the Senate, if it shall not see fit to concur in this amendment, returns the joint resolution to the House of Representatives, it will be for the House to say whether it will recede from its amendment, or whether it will consent to any committee of conference or not. The whole subject will be in our power then, as it is to-day, and I trust that the amendment will be agreed to and that we shall now dispose of this matter.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last two words. It seems desirable that the House should not act upon a resolution of this kind under a misconception. Many of the new members would naturally be likely to place a great deal of dependence upon the positive statement made by so experienced a legislator as the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations [Mr. HOLMAN] that the Navy Department is amply supplied with transports to perform this work. Nevertheless, sir, the fact is that the Navy of the United States has no transports whatever.

The United States Government does not own a transport ship. There is also a great misapprehension in the minds of many people in regard to the services that a naval vessel can properly perform. Gentlemen will remember the old story of a Secretary of the Navy from an interior State who was said to have expressed great astonishment when he looked down the main hatch of a ship of war and discovered that "the durned thing was hollow." [Laughter.] A modern naval vessel, however, is hollow only to a very limited extent, and the fact is, as everybody knows who has ever inspected the interior of one of our modern war ships, that the problem is not to find something to load them with, but to find room in them for their crews, provisions, mechanical appliances, and the necessary munitions of war. Now, so far as our modern war ships are concerned it is utterly frivolous to talk of using them to carry cargoes of wheat or flour to Russia or anywhere else.

I suppose my venerable and honored friend from Indiana [Mr. HOLMAN] may have been misled by the fact that naval ships have been used for such purposes as the conveyance of the remains of Ericsson to Sweden, etc., but you can not carry cargoes of freight on board of these modern naval vessels. Among the old vessels of the Navy there is, so far as I know, only one that would be available for this purpose at all, and that is the old frigate Constellation. She is now laid up at Annapolis as a school ship or training ship on which the cadets go out on their annual cruise. She could carry, I understand, only about 6,000 barrels of flour. She is a sailing vessel, and how long it would take her to reach Russia, after fighting the storms of midwinter under sail on the Atlantic, I should not wish to prophesy. But I do know that in order to send that portion of these provisions upon the Constellation it would be necessary to put her in proper condition, to fit her out thoroughly for an ocean voyage, to man her with a full crew of officers and men; and my impression is that by the time we had balanced the books we should find that this attempt at economy had "petered out" to a very small point.

That is the situation; and I simply want the House to understand it. I have no particular personal or political interest in this resolution, except as it appeals to me as an American citizen. I want the House to understand, as a matter due to its own dignity, that if it adopts this amendment authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to assume the responsibility for transporting these provisions and then cuts off from the resolution all authority for him to secure suitable vessels in which to transport the goods, it places upon him the duty of putting these tons upon tons of provisions on board of ships of war, when the House ought to know, and I trust now, accepting my word for it, does know, that he has no steam war vessels that can perform that service. It seems to me that would be very remarkable and very frivolous legislation.

Further, as a member of this body I do not think that upon a measure of this kind, involving considerations broader than State lines, broader than our own country, as broad as humanity itself—I do not think the House of Representatives ought so far to abdicate the functions it ought to exercise as the popular exponent of the sentiments of the American people—their sentiments of honor, their sentiments of national pride, their sentiments of liberality and generosity, as to feel compelled to send back this resolution, simple as it is in its character, to be again indorsed by the Senate of the United States, before we rise to the dignity of our duty and of the occasion.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. Speaker, during this discussion there have been made several suggestions in which I thoroughly concur. One of those is that we should not send a gift to anybody under such conditions that the express charges will eat it all up before it gets to its destination. Another is that when we know of persons who are hungry, our first duty is, as our first impulse should be, to feed them. And if I may suggest an additional consideration, it seems to me equally important that we should endeavor to feed them before they die. I do not believe that the resolution before the House is calculated to effect that, in my mind, benevolent end. As I understand it, the situation is about this: The famine in Russia occurs in inland wheat-raising districts, very far from the seaboard. The reason in great part of that famine, and the reason in most part for its bitterness and continuance, is the fact of the utterly inadequate, I might almost say utterly lacking, facilities for transportation in those districts and from other districts to them. There is no actual stripping

of that country of grain. There is grain there now; but on account of the lack of facilities for communication that grain is very high in price—so high that the poor peasantry whose crops have failed can not get the money to buy it and therefore must starve unless food be given them.

Not merely is there grain in these districts, but there is no famine in Austria-Hungary; there is no famine in Asia Minor; there is no famine in a great many of the districts of Russia which are comparatively near the famine-stricken regions. Now, to attempt to take these provisions contributed by our people and to transmit them for use in the famine-stricken districts of Russia, means this: It means in the first place that as the Baltic ports are now closed, we must transport these provisions to the ports on the Black Sea, with a delay of at least a month, and more, probably six weeks. It means that after these provisions arrive at those ports they must not merely be distributed by government agency, with all that that implies, but must be distributed under conditions which involve a transportation as appallingly expensive as would have been that from Omaha to San Francisco before we had the Pacific Railroad. It means that practically six months must elapse in a great many cases before even the remnant of provisions that would reach the famine-stricken regions could be utilized for the benefit of the people there.

Now, if there is anything to be done for those starving people it can be done in this way, and I respectfully submit in no other way—by selling the contributions of our people, turning them into cash, and cabling the proceeds, if necessary to-morrow, so trustworthy sources of distribution upon the spot—to such agencies, for instance, as the Red Cross Association. In this way the famine-stricken people of Russia could be the immediate recipients of our bounty and the sharers in the salvation we hold out to them.

I am not in favor of indiscriminate charity. I am not in favor of stretching the prerogatives of Government in order to give vent to our charitable feelings. But even that consideration would not have stood in the way of my support of this resolution. I believe my constituency would not simply have pardoned me, but would have lauded me for supporting a proposition in the form I have indicated. But they, sir, the very ones who understand this matter thoroughly, would pardon me least of all, and I tell you the charity of the world will pardon you least of all, for failing to adopt the means and the only means to give instant relief to these suffering people, and supporting instead a measure whereby, after the offerings of our beneficence are landed in Russia there will be required more than they are worth to transport them to where they are to be used, necessitating that the relief shall arrive only after the green grain of the new year shall be growing over the graves of the poor creatures who have died from famine. [Applause.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. HERBERT. I move to strike out the last two words for the purpose of addressing myself briefly to the effect of this amendment if it shall be adopted. If the amendment is carried, the effect of the resolution as amended, it seems to me, would be simply this: That the Secretary of the Navy would be authorized to use any vessel—that is the language of the resolution—which is suitable and proper for the transportation of these provisions. As I understand it, he has communicated to the Senate the fact that the Constellation is the only vessel now at his command suitable for this purpose. The Constellation is an old-fashioned sailing ship and has a freight capacity of about 6,000 barrels of flour.

Now, there is no other vessel, as the gentleman from Maine [Mr. BOUTELLE] has said, in the Navy fit for this purpose. Our modern war ships are unfitted for commercial purposes because of the method and manner of their construction. All of them have horizontal engines below the water line, extending more or less from stem to stern, and all are cut up into compartments of various kinds, coal bunkers, which would not hold freight because they are only accessible through manholes, and quarters for men. The vessels also carry immense armaments, much heavier guns than the old ones. For these reasons, and because the hold of the vessels would be always heated to such a degree as to injure, if not destroy, the flour which has been donated, neither of them would be fit for the transportation of such supplies.

The effect, therefore, of the passage of the amendment would be that the Secretary of the Navy would feel himself empowered to use that vessel, the Constellation, which he has heretofore notified the Senate was fit for that purpose, and to that extent I am willing to vote for the resolution. It would show the sympathy of the United States with the suffering poor of Europe, while it would be practically no increase of expenditures, or very little, if any, for the reason that the crew to be employed must be men already enlisted. As I understand it, the Secretary has already enlisted the full number of men authorized by law, so that the crew detailed to go in this ship are already in the employ of the Government, and if there be any increase because of sending

this ship abroad, it would simply be that coal would be required to make the voyage, which possibly would not otherwise be consumed. That is the whole of it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of the resolution, provided that we first adopt the amendment of the gentleman from Indiana. The simple question before us in the consideration of that amendment is whether we shall undertake to perform a duty which, in my opinion, is primarily the duty of the Russian Government, of transporting these provisions across the ocean for the benefit of the Russian poor. Russia has an immense amount of money provided and carefully kept for the purposes of war. Why, if her people are poor and suffering, can she not use some of that money, I am unable to see. I wish, also, to call attention to another point.

[Here the hammer fell.]

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HERBERT. I should like to have just two minutes more. The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Without objection, the gentleman from Alabama will be permitted to proceed for two minutes longer.

There was no objection.

Mr. HERBERT. I desire simply to call the attention of the House specially to the facts stated by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DOCKERY], a member of the Committee on Appropriations, who has made a study of this question, and what he has stated was not controverted on this floor. The sum and substance of it is that instead of there being an abundance of money in our Treasury, as the gentleman from Kentucky said in his speech, we are confronted with the fact that there is to-day, if all of the expenditures of the Government were paid up to date, a Treasury deficiency. Now, in that condition of affairs is the Democratic party here on this floor, that came into power on the promise of retrenchment, economy, and reform, prepared, as its first step, with that deficiency staring them in the face, to vote away \$100,000 of the people's money in this charitable—I may say this extravagant—generosity towards the people of a Government amply able of itself to perform that duty? That is the proposition presented by the amendment of the gentleman from Indiana, which I hope will receive the approval of the House.

Mr. MILLIKEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

So far as the cry of a deficiency in the Treasury is concerned, which has just been raised by the gentleman from Alabama and other gentlemen on the floor to-day, I am not particularly frightened, for I have heard it on the floor of the House so many times during the last eight years that I have been in Congress, by gentlemen who wanted to beat one proposition or another, that it has become like the cry of the boy who shouted "Wolf!" "Wolf!" so many times that at last nobody would believe him at all.

Now, what condition, according to the gentleman's own statement, is the Government to be left in if this proposition of the gentleman from Indiana shall prevail? Why, we are told that the naval vessels are not fit to transport these provisions. I have no doubt that is true. I believe it to be true. And we are also told that there is only one vessel, the Constellation, an old sailing ship, available for such a purpose. She would get to Russia after she leaves here, the Lord only knows when; but most likely after the starving people are all dead and gone, or, as somebody on the other side has just said, when the green crops may be growing over their graves. That is the only vessel available. When it will get there, after it starts, no man can prophesy. She can carry about 12,000 barrels of flour.

Now, the gentleman wants this great Government, as he says, to show its sympathy for the starving and suffering poor of Russia by sending in that vessel only a small part of the flour and grain which has been so generously contributed by the people of the Northwest, and let the rest remain here, unless somebody else, by private contributions, will undertake to send it across. I submit, sir, that such a proposition is worse than doing nothing at all. The people of the great Northwest, representing, as I believe they have done, the great heart of their own countrymen in their generosity, have come forward and answered the demands of suffering humanity across the ocean in a Government that has been friendly to us always and at all times. They have not only brought out of their granaries and storehouses a large part of the fruits of their labor and contributed to this noble purpose, but have also provided the means to transport their donations across one-half of the continent to the edge of the sea. They have no vessels to carry it across the ocean, and the Government is simply asked now to provide transportation to take it to its destination on the shores of Russia where the suffering exists.

Now, sir, let us do it or let us say that we will not do it. Let us not present a gift in a halfway manner. Let us not do it in a way which will show our meanness a thousand times more than as

if we did not purpose to do it at all. The gentleman's own statement is that if the amendment is adopted these supplies will not be transported, only a part of them, and those only in an old sailing vessel that, as I said before, will get there the Lord only knows when. Let us pass the resolution and provide the means of transporting these supplies or let us say we will not do it at all. Why, suppose the Secretary of the Navy should come to the conclusion that under this resolution, with the amendment of the gentleman from Indiana, it was his duty to send those supplies across in the naval vessels. Of course they can carry a little. Suppose he furnishes a fleet large enough to carry all these supplies across. Does not the question then arise whether it will not cost this Government much more to send such a fleet of naval vessels as would take all these supplies across than to pay for transports to take them?

Mr. HEARD. Mr. Speaker, I offer, as an apology for my adding anything to the debate that has already gone on so long, the statement that I shall favor the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HOLMAN], not because I have faith that it contains much in the way of economy, but for the very excellent reason given by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BLOUNT], the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, when he said that thus sending it to a conference committee would give some time for examination, and I think he might have added very properly that such course would give the time and opportunity necessary to ascertain the facts in the case.

I am told by the gentleman from Maine [Mr. BOUTELLE], the ex-chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs, and doubtless very correctly, if he is not misinformed, that there is now no vessel in the United States Navy, except perhaps the Constellation, that is fit for this transportation; while my distinguished friend from Indiana [Mr. HOLMAN], with a length of service here so long that the memory of man runneth not to the contrary, informs me with absolute positiveness that we have no less than twenty-two vessels or transports fit for this service. I do not know which of these distinguished gentlemen is in error as to his information. I know they are both usually correct in their statements of fact.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I should yield to the gentleman from Indiana on that point.

Mr. HEARD. Then my friend from Maine [Mr. BOUTELLE], as well as my friend from Indiana [Mr. HOLMAN], must concede that there are some reasons why we should have the means of ascertaining which of these statements is the correct one.

Mr. HOLMAN. I would like my friend to permit me to say that my statements on the subject were in quite general terms. I have insisted that these war ships could transport these supplies.

Mr. HEARD. You said there were twenty-two such vessels.

Mr. HOLMAN. My statement on the subject was in quite general terms. I believe that any of the seagoing war ships can transport supplies. I did not have occasion while on the floor of the House, I think, to mention the number, but I entertain no doubt of the fact that upon inquiry being made it will be found that out of this great mass of vessels we have now, the largest navy we have ever had in time of peace in our history, it will be found that there are ample vessels to transport these barrels and bags of provisions.

I concede that a great many of these vessels are so constructed that they will not carry full cargoes, and I am aware of the fact that the naval officers do not want to be bothered with the transportation of these supplies or with this kind of work. There is nothing war like about it; but your war vessels can transport these provisions to Russia, and will do it if Congress shall order it to be done.

Mr. HEARD. Now, Mr. Speaker, just a moment further. As to the question of economy, the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HOLMAN] admits, in reply to the interrogatory put to him by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILGORE], that if this amendment is adopted it shuts the door to the specific appropriation of the \$100,000 contemplated by the original resolution, but that it does not, of course, and can not provide against the necessity for making whatever appropriation is necessary, or may become necessary, from the Treasury to meet whatever expenditures it may be the duty of the Secretary of the Navy to make to carry into effect this resolution. It occurs to me, therefore, Mr. Speaker, that it is a question first as to whether it will be more expensive to send over the vessels we have or charter others, and whether the amendment of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HOLMAN] has not the effect of removing a limitation upon an appropriation, instead of shutting the door to an appropriation which he admits may become necessary.

Mr. HOLMAN. Why, no, I did not admit any such thing. I stated exactly the contrary, that there is no power to expend a dollar.

Mr. HEARD. I beg the gentleman's pardon if I have misun-

derstood him. I understood him to say, and I think the notes of the stenographer will bear me out, that an appropriation would have to be made for the expenses of the Navy Department, and if a part of that money is appropriated to this purpose of course it is part of a general appropriation made.

Mr. HOLMAN. My friend misapprehends me entirely, because these men are already in the employment of the Government.

Mr. HEARD. I understand that, and that they will have to be subsisted and paid by the Government.

Mr. HOLMAN. They would be paid anyhow. [Cries of "Vote!" "Vote!"]

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Debate on the pending amendment is exhausted. If there be no objection the *pro forma* amendment will be considered as withdrawn. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HOLMAN].

Mr. BLOUNT. Mr. Speaker, before that is taken I desire to move the previous question upon all the amendments.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The question is on ordering the previous question. Does the gentleman move the previous question upon the resolution and all amendments, or does the gentleman's motion embrace only the amendments?

Mr. BLOUNT. If the Chair will put the motion so as to cover the amendments, I think the House is prepared to take action on the question.

The question being taken, the previous question was ordered on the amendments.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HOLMAN] to strike out.

The question being taken, the Speaker *pro tempore* announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. BOUTELLE and others demanded a division.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 133, noes 60.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Yeas and nays. [Cries of "Oh, no!"]

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The House is considering the bill in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. BOUTELLE. What Committee of the Whole?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BOUTELLE. We have no rules authorizing anything of that kind.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. By unanimous consent of the House, which is a rule, the House went into the consideration of this bill in the House as in Committee of the Whole, it being well known that by the usages of this body there is no yeas-and-nays vote in the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Then the Chair holds that when the House is in Committee of the Whole, under general parliamentary law, the yeas and nays can not be demanded?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair holds this, that the House itself has consented to that method of business.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Mr. Speaker, I understood a moment ago that the Chair entertained a motion for the previous question.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair did, and that has been customary.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Was that in order.

Mr. SPEAKER *pro tempore*. That was in order?

Mr. BOUTELLE. Under parliamentary law?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Yes, sir.

Mr. BOUTELLE. In Committee of the Whole?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Not in Committee of the Whole, but when the House is considering a bill in the House as in Committee of the Whole. It is one of the advantages in considering a measure in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Mr. Speaker, I submit, for the decision of the Chair in his wisdom, whether, if it is competent to make a motion for the adoption of the previous question in this stage of procedure, is it not equally in order for me to call for the yeas and nays?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Maine when the House—

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. Will the Speaker allow me to make a suggestion?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. With pleasure.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. In a former case, decided by Speaker CARLISLE, when we had rules, of course, it was decided that this was an anomalous course, for which there were no rules, and therefore he would have to assimilate the proceedings, as far as possible, to the rules; and that a motion for the previous question was in order, because there was a right in the House to limit debate, and that that was only a mode of limiting debate; but he has never decided, and the Speaker will ascertain that on examination, that the yeas and nays could not be called, because that would be to decide that the Constitution was overridden—

Mr. BOUTELLE. The gentleman anticipates the point that I was about to make.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. It is a constitutional provision that the yeas and nays shall be called whenever demanded by a sufficient number on any proposition.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair will look into the matter, but remembers no circumstance under which they have been ordered.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I was about to call the attention of the Chair to the fact that the right to call for the yeas and nays is a constitutional one and can not be abrogated.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. That is in the House. There is no question but that the gentleman is correct in that statement.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I insist on my motion for the yeas and nays.

Mr. BLOUNT. Has the Chair decided that the demand for the yeas and nays is not in order?

Mr. BOUTELLE. I think the Chair is considering his decision now.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair will look to it in a moment.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. The consent of the House to consider a matter as if we were in the Committee of the Whole is consenting to liberalize the rules and not to straighten them. It is to increase the flexibility of the rules and not an impairment of the rules of the House; and therefore to hold that anything that can be done in the House, if we were in the House, could not be done if we were considering it in the House as in Committee of the Whole would be to hold exactly contrary; and therefore I suggest that it would not invalidate a call for the yeas and nays under the constitutional provision.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the gentleman from Maine will not insist on his demand for the yeas and nays. It is quite evident that those of us who, like him, are in favor of this motion, are in the minority.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I understand the Chair is looking up the question. I think, as was well suggested by the gentleman from Kentucky the other day, we ought to start right.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair will now state that he had not heretofore looked into the question; and the Chair was for a moment in doubt, but on reflection is satisfied the right to demand the yeas and nays exists, and so holds unhesitatingly. [Applause.] The gentleman from Maine demands the yeas and nays, the Chair having announced that the ayes had it.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 165, nays 72, not voting 94; as follows:

YEAS—165.

Abbott,	Compton,	Houk, Ohio	Pierce,
Alderson,	Cooper,	Johnstone, S. C.	Richardson,
Alexander,	Covert,	Jones,	Rockwell,
Andrew,	Cox, N. Y.	Kem,	Rusk,
Arnold,	Cox, Tenn.	Kendall,	Sayers,
Babbitt,	Crawford,	Kilgore,	Scott,
Bailey,	Crosby,	Kribbs,	Shell,
Baker,	Culbertson,	Lane,	Shively,
Bankhead,	Davis,	Lanham,	Simpson,
Barwig,	De Armond,	Lapham,	Snodgrass,
Beeman,	De Forest,	Lester, Ga.	Snow,
Beltzhoover,	Dickerson,	Lewis,	Sperry,
Bentley,	Dixon,	Little,	Springer,
Blanchard,	Dockery,	Livingston,	Stevens,
Blount,	Dungan,	Long,	Steward, Ill.
Boatner,	Elliott,	Mallory,	Stewart, Tex.
Bowman,	English,	Mansur,	Stone, Ky.
Branch,	Enloe,	Martin,	Stump,
Brawley,	Epes,	McClellan,	Tillman,
Breckinridge, Ark.	Everett,	McCreary,	Tracey,
Bretz,	Fellows,	McKaig,	Tucker,
Brookshire,	Forney,	McKeighan,	Turner,
Brunner,	Gantz,	McMillin,	Van Horn,
Bryan,	Geary,	Meredith,	Warner,
Buchanan, Va.	Geissenhainer,	Miller,	Washington,
Busey,	Gillespie,	Mitchell,	Watson,
Bushnell,	Goodnight,	Moore,	Weadock,
Butler,	Grady,	Moses,	Wheeler, Mich.
Bynum,	Greenleaf,	Newberry,	Whiting,
Cable,	Hall,	Oates,	Wike,
Cadmus,	Hallowell,	O'Ferrall,	Willcox,
Carnetti,	Halvorsen,	O'Neill, Mass.	Williams, N. C.
Caruth,	Hamilton,	O'Neill, Mo.	Williams, Mass.
Catchings,	Hare,	Otis,	Williams, Ill.
Cate,	Harries,	Outwaite,	Wilson, Ky.
Causey,	Haynes,	Page, Md.	Wilson, W. Va.
Chapin,	Heard,	Page, R. I.	Winn,
Chipman,	Hemphill,	Patterson, Tenn.	Wolverton,
Clarke, Ala.	Henderson, N. C.	Paynter,	Youmans.
Clover,	Herbert,	Pearson,	
Cobb, Ala.	Hoar,	Peel,	
Cobb, Mo.	Holman,	Pendleton,	

NAYS—72.

Amerman,	Broderick,	Clark, Wyo.	Dingley,
Atkinson,	Brosius,	Coolidge,	Doan,
Bingham,	Buchanan, N. J.	Cummings,	Dunphy,
Boutelle,	Caldwell,	Curtis,	Enochs,
Bowers,	Campbell,	Dalzell,	Fitch,
Breckinridge, Ky.	Clancy,	Daniell,	Fitch,

Griswold, Grout, Harmer, Haugen, Henderson, Ill. Hermann, Hitt, Hooker, N. Y. Hopkins, Ill. Hull, Hull, Johnson, Ind.	Johnson, N. Dak. Jolley, Lind, Lodge, Loud, Magner, McGann, McKenna, Milliken, Morse, O'Donnell, O'Neill, Pa.	Owens, Patton, Perkins, Pickler, Powers, Quackenbush, Raines, Scully, Seerley, Shonk, Smith, Stahnecker,	Stephenson, Stewart, Pa. Stone, C. W. Stone, W. A. Storer, Taylor, Ill. Townsend, Wadsworth, Walker, Waugh, White, Wilson, Wash.
--	--	---	---

NOT VOTING—94.

Allen, Bacon, Bartine, Belden, Belknap, Bergen, Bland, Brickey, Brown, Bullock, Bunn, Bunting, Burrows, Byrnes, Capehart, Castle, Cheatham, Coburn, Cockran, Cogswell, Combs, Cowles, Crain, Cutting,	Dolliver, Donovan, Durborow, Edmunds, Ellis, Fithian, Forman, Fowler, Funston, Fyan, Gorman, Harter, Hatch, Hayes, Henderson, Iowa Hooker, Miss. Hopkins, Pa. Houk, Tenn. Johnson, Ohio Ketcham, Kyle, Lagan, Lawson, Va. Lawson, Ga.	Layton, Lester, Va. Lockwood, Lynch, McAfee, McDonald, McKinney, McRae, Meyer, Mills, Montgomery, Mutchler, Norton, Parrett, Pattison, Ohio Payne, Post, Price, Randall, Ray, Rayner, Reed, Relly, Reyburn,	Rife, Robertson, Robinson, Russell, Sanford, Stackhouse, Stockdale, Stout, Sweet, Tarsney, Taylor, Tenn. Taylor, E. B. Taylor, J. D. Taylor, V. A. Terry, Turpin, Warwick, Wever, Wheeler, Ala. Wilson, Mo. Wise, Wright.
--	--	--	--

So the amendment of Mr. HOLMAN was adopted.

The following-named members were announced as paired until further notice:

Mr. ALDERSON with Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee.
Mr. FITHIAN with Mr. WRIGHT.
Mr. LAYTON with Mr. REYBURN.

The following were announced as paired for this day:

Mr. HARTER with Mr. HOPKINS of Pennsylvania.
Mr. MILLS with Mr. HENDERSON of Iowa.
Mr. HOOKER with Mr. BELKNAP.
Mr. PATTISON of Ohio with Mr. BELDEN.
Mr. ALLEN with Mr. BERGEN.
Mr. HATCH with Mr. RIFE.
Mr. GORMAN with Mr. HOUK of Tennessee.
Mr. WILSON of Maryland with Mr. ROBINSON of Pennsylvania.
Mr. TARSNEY with Mr. RANDALL.
Mr. NORTON with Mr. PAYNE.
Mr. DONOVAN with Mr. E. B. TAYLOR.
Mr. CRAIN with Mr. V. A. TAYLOR.
Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio and Mr. MCKINNEY were announced as paired on this question.

Mr. DOCKERY. Mr. Speaker, I desire to state that my colleague, Mr. TARSNEY, is detained from the House by illness, and also that my colleague, Mr. BLAND, is kept from the Capitol by sickness in his family.

Mr. HENDERSON of North Carolina. I wish to state, Mr. Speaker, that my colleagues Mr. BOND and Mr. COWLES are detained at home by sickness.

The result of the vote was then announced as above recorded.

Mr. BLOUNT. Mr. Speaker, I move the third reading of the joint resolution.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. My inquiry is whether, under our present condition as to rules, it would be in order to move to lay this joint resolution, which has now been emasculated, upon the table?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The equivalent motion of that is the one which is usually applied to Senate bills, the motion to postpone indefinitely. It has the same effect.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. Then, is it in order at this time to move to postpone indefinitely?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. It is.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. It is perfectly clear, Mr. Speaker, that we have not the ships for this purpose, and therefore the joint resolution in its present form is useless, so I move to postpone it indefinitely.

The question was taken on the motion of Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky, and the Speaker *pro tempore* declared that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. BLOUNT. I ask for a division.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 83, noes 65.

Mr. BLOUNT. I ask for tellers.

Mr. DICKERSON. I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused, only 14 members voting in favor thereof.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Is the demand for tellers insisted upon?

Mr. BLOUNT. It is; but I wish first to make a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BLOUNT. If the House shall postpone this joint resolution indefinitely will not that be the end of the matter?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. That will be the effect.

Mr. BLOUNT. Then I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered.

The House again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 93, noes 87.

So the motion of Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky was agreed to, and the joint resolution was indefinitely postponed.

Mr. DOCKERY. Mr. Speaker, I desire to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The call of the House at the adjournment yesterday was with the State of Ohio.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. SPRINGER. I ask the gentleman to withhold that motion for a moment while I make a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SPRINGER. My inquiry is this: Will the call be continued to-morrow as if it had gone on to-day?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair is of opinion that it would not be amiss to have a unanimous agreement extending the operation of the rule adopted yesterday to the session of to-morrow, because it is not certain that the terms of the rule would otherwise be sufficient to cover the case.

Mr. SPRINGER. Then I ask unanimous consent that the call be continued for the introduction of bills to-morrow under the rule heretofore adopted.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER] asks unanimous consent that to-morrow the call of the States for the introduction of bills shall be continued under the rule adopted yesterday.

Mr. BUCHANAN of New Jersey. With the further understanding that gentlemen who have been absent heretofore may be called at the end.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. That will be understood as a part of the rule.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows: To Mr. HATCH, indefinitely, on account of important business. To Mr. WRIGHT, for two weeks, on account of sickness. To Mr. NORTON, indefinitely, on account of important business.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

Mr. EDMUNDS, by unanimous consent, obtained leave to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, the papers in the case of Charles G. Eddy, filed in the Forty-seventh Congress.

The motion of Mr. CAMPBELL was then agreed to; and the House accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 36 minutes p. m.) adjourned.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and resolutions were laid on the Clerk's desk, and referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDREW (by request): Remonstrance of the Evangelical Alliance of Roxbury, Boston, Mass., against opening the Columbian Exhibition on the Lord's Day—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

Also, petition of Lawrence Rotch and others, praying that the metric system of weights and measures be used exclusively in the customs service of the United States—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

Also, petition of Francis A. Walker and 27 other citizens of Boston, Mass., for the same purpose—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

My Mr. BINGHAM: Petition of the Messiah Methodist Episcopal Church of Philadelphia, asking Congress to appropriate \$5,000,000 for the Columbian Exposition and prohibiting the opening of the said Exposition on the American Sabbath—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

By Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Arkansas: Petition of Young People's Society of Christian Endeavor of Little Rock, Ark., in favor of Sunday closing of Columbian Exposition—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

Also, petition of 59 citizens of Pope County, Ark., in favor of

an increase of pension to John D. Brown—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of Rev. J. W. G. Spurgeon, J. I. Ford, Helen Williams, M. S. Johnson, Chas. A. Fountain, committee of "pressed hands" of Kentucky, for relief—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BRICKNER: Petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Milwaukee, Wis., praying for the building of additional light-houses, fog signals, etc., on the Great Lakes—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, of the same body, for the building of a revenue cutter to take the place of the Andrew Johnson—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petition of James Bell and 75 others of the city of Sheboygan, Wis., to allow keepers of life-saving stations a salary of \$1,000 per year and the crews \$75 per month—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BOWERS: Petition and papers in claim of L. J. T. Jaeger—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of citizens of California, for refund of moneys paid for public lands in excess of \$1.25 per acre—to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, for conference of governments in interest of arbitration—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BUCHANAN of New Jersey: Petition in behalf of increased pay for the Life-Saving Service—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Florence Iron Works, Florence, N. J., for metric system—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. BURROWS: Petition of 17 citizens of Benton Harbor, praying an increase of salary to the keepers and crews of life-saving stations—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. CADMUS: Petition of 133 citizens of New Jersey; of members of the Methodist Church of Boonton, N. J.; of members of Asbury Methodist Episcopal Church of Hackensack, N. J., and of members of the Baptist Church of Passaic, N. J., against opening the World's Fair on Sunday—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

By Mr. CATCHINGS: Petition of William P. Montgomery, of Washington County, Miss.; of Bernard McCosker, of Madison County, Miss.; of Ann R. Robb, of Washington County, Miss.; of Priscilla W. Gregory, of the same county; of Ann B. Finley, of the same county, and of the heirs at law and next of kin of William Hunt, deceased, of the same county, asking for reference of claim for stores and supplies to the Court of Claims, under the Bowman act—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CLOVER: Petition of —, praying that his claim for property taken by the Army during the late war be referred to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. COOLIDGE: Petition of citizens of Worcester, Mass.; of citizens of Westhampton, Hampshire County, Mass.; three petitions of citizens of Hawley, Franklin County, Mass.; of citizens of Gill, Franklin County, Mass.; of citizens of Hampden, Hampden County, Mass.; of citizens of Amherst, Hampshire County, Mass.; of citizens of Orange, Franklin County, Mass.; of citizens of Heath, Franklin County, Mass.; of citizens of Dana, Worcester County, Mass.; of citizens of Southampton, Hampshire County, Mass.; of citizens of Hadley, Hampshire County, Mass.; of citizens of New Salem, Franklin County, Mass., and of citizens of Fitchburg, Worcester County, Mass., for the free delivery of mail in country districts—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of citizens of Bernardston, Mass., and of citizens of Greenfield, Mass., favoring national aid to the Columbian Exposition, provided the Sabbath is observed during the same—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

Also, two petitions numerous signed by citizens of Massachusetts, against any appropriation for the World's Fair unless the same be closed on Sunday—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

By Mr. COOPER: Papers in the case of Col. Daniel McClure—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CUMMINGS: Memorial and petition of United States shipmasters, praying an amendment of section 2809 of the Revised Statutes—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DANIELL: Petition of citizens of New Hampshire; of certain citizens of Whitefield, Coos County, N. H.; and of certain citizens of Fitzwilliam, Cheshire County, N. H., and of certain citizens of Whitefield Township, Coos County, N. H., for free delivery of mails in country districts—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. DE FOREST: Petition of Miles Tomlinson and other citizens of the towns of Plymouth and Thomaston, Litchfield County, Conn., and of James C. Colt and other citizens of the towns of Harwinton and New Hartford, Litchfield County, Conn.,

for legislation to secure free delivery of mail matter—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads

Also, petition of Samuel Scoville and other citizens of Stamford, Conn., in favor of loan to the Columbian Exposition—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

Also, petition of Sereno G. Allen and other citizens of Westford, Conn., for an appropriation for the improvement of the harbor of Westford, Conn.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. DINGLEY: Petition of the Baptist Church of Turner, Me., for aid to the Columbian Exposition at Chicago, and that said Exposition be closed on the Sabbath—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

Also, petition of the board of managers of the National Temperance Society, officially signed, asking for a national commission of inquiry concerning the alcoholic liquor traffic—to the Select Committee on the Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

Also, petition of citizens of Maine, to increase the salaries of keepers of life-saving stations—to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. DUNGAN: Petition of the Oakfield Presbyterian congregation of Oakfield, Perry County, Ohio, to pass the bill prohibiting the opening of any exhibition or exposition on Sunday where appropriations of the United States are expended—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

By Mr. EDMUNDS: Petition of Berry Brothers, of Bedford County, Va., in reference to dealers in leaf tobacco or retail dealers in leaf tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ELLIOTT: Petition of the heirs of Jesse Fish, jr., of Florida, for the formal confirmation of a royal grant from the Crown of Spain made and confirmed to him and his father before him prior to the cession to the United States of East and West Florida—to the Committee on Private Land Claims.

By Mr. ENLOE: Petition of Jim Grisson Post, No. 72, Grand Army of the Republic, of McNairy County, Tenn., asking that a pension be granted to John T. Stansel—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of M. M. Palmer, D. D. Dumas, and 74 other citizens of Henry County, Tenn., in favor of amending the pension laws so as to include teamsters of the war with Mexico—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GILLESPIE: Two petitions numerous signed by citizens of Pennsylvania, against any appropriation for the World's Fair unless the same be closed to visitors on Sunday—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

By Mr. HALLOWELL: Petition of citizens of Bucks County, Pa., praying for the enactment of a law by Congress subjecting oleomargarine to the provisions of the laws of the several States—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HARTER: Petition of United Presbyterian Church of Hayesville, Ashland County, Ohio, against opening the World's Fair to visitors on the Lord's Day—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

By Mr. HAUGEN: Petition of certain citizens of Wisconsin against any appropriations for expositions unless the same be closed on Sunday—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

Also, of 32 citizens of Buffalo County, Wis., in favor of the so-called Butterworth bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, resolutions of the Chamber of Commerce of the city of Milwaukee, asking that a steel propeller revenue cutter be built for service on the lakes, vice the present revenue cutter Andrew Johnson—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, resolutions adopted by the Military Order of the Loyal Legion of the United States (Headquarters Commandery of the State of Wisconsin), favoring ample coast defenses—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, protest of the Military Order of the Loyal Legion of the United States (Commandery of Indiana), against the desecration of the American flag by using it for advertising purposes—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Military Order of the Loyal Legion of the United States (Commandery of the District of Columbia) in favor of a military chapel in the national cemetery at Arlington, Va.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Chamber of Commerce of the city of Milwaukee Wis., in favor of legislation under which a complete record of the lake tonnage and commerce of every point on the Great Lakes, all to be kept at the custom-house of said port—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the Chamber of Commerce of the same city, asking adequate appropriations for light-houses and fog signals in aid of navigation—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HENDERSON of Illinois: Petition of Frank W. Dana and 84 other citizens of Whiteside County, Ill., praying for the passage of the antiopium bill (H. R. 5353) introduced in the Fifty-

first Congress by Mr. Butterworth—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of C. Crouch and 26 others of Whiteside County, Ill., upon the same subject—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of 89 citizens of Sterling, Ill., asking for action of Congress, inviting a conference by governments, to sit during the Columbian Exposition, to consider the advisability of incorporating in treaties measures for arbitration of differences between nations—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of A. C. Crouch and 27 others; and of Frank W. Dana and 88 others, citizens of Whiteside County, Ill., praying for the passage of a pure-lard bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Mrs. T. S. Andrews, praying for the passage of an act granting pension for patriotic service—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOOKER of New York: Three petitions, numerous signed by citizens of New York, for an appropriation for the Columbian Exposition at Chicago, provided the same is closed on Sunday—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

By Mr. HUFF: Petition of citizens of the Twenty-first district of Pennsylvania, representing Clarksburg Church, urging Congress to grant to the directors of the World's Columbian Exposition a loan conditioned upon the closing of the Exposition to visitors on Sunday—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

By Mr. HULL: Petition of A. A. Cole and 19 other citizens of Story City, Iowa, in favor of the passage of so-called Butterworth option bill, and the bill known as the Conger lard bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of 14 citizens of Warren County, Iowa, in favor of the Conger lard bill and the Butterworth bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of W. C. Crusinberry, of Des Moines, Iowa, for the metric system—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

Also, petition of the United Presbyterian Church of Knoxville, in favor of closing the World's Fair on Sunday—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

Also, petition of Friends' Church of Iowa, relating to the liquor traffic—to the Select Committee on the Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. JOHNSON of North Dakota: Memorial of settlers on lands claimed by the St. Paul, Minneapolis and Manitoba Railway Company in North Dakota, asking relief—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. JONES: Petition of J. E. Johnson and others; of James T. Tracy and others; of Charles H. Crumb and others; of W. M. Upshur and others; of T. S. Dishoroon and others; of James H. Fletcher, jr., and others, and of Peter D. Carbin and others, for favorable consideration of a bill to promote the efficiency of the Life-Saving Service—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KETCHAM: Petition of Henry B. Warring and 41 others, of Armenia, N. Y., against any Congressional appropriation for the World's Fair unless the same be closed on Sunday—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

Also, petition of Mary Sherwood and 33 others, of Pawling, N. Y., for the appointment of an international court to settle by arbitration disputes between nations—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of M. D. Andrews and 18 others, of Dutchess County, N. Y., for free delivery of mails in the country districts—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. LANHAM: Petition of David C. Haynes, of Weatherford, Parker, County, Tex.—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LAYTON: Petition for settling international controversies by arbitration—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition for uniforms for mail carriers—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. LIND: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, urging Congress to pass the necessary legislation to prevent the so-called dealing in options of agricultural products—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, joint resolution asking that the 12th day of October, the day on which America was discovered, be made a day of national thanksgiving—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

By Mr. LODGE: Petition of George H. Brown and 7 others, for increase of pay to Life-Saving Service—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McALEER (by request): Petition of citizens of the United States, representing Zion Protestant Episcopal Church, Philadelphia, asking an appropriation for the Columbian Exposition, providing the same will be closed on the Lord's Day—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

By Mr. MCKAIG: Petition of trustees of United Brethren

Church of Boonsboro, Md.; of trustees of Methodist Episcopal Church of Frederick County, Md.; of trustees of Methodist Episcopal Church of Boonsboro, Md.; of trustees of German Lutheran Church of Boonsboro, Md., praying for compensation for use of church buildings during the late war—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of George R. Rice, executor of John W. Hall, deceased, late of Montgomery County, Md.; of Samuel Stone Street, late of the same county; of estate of Jane M. Rice, of same county; of the estate of Benjamin Philpott, of Frederick County, Md.; of estate of Theophilus Barnett; of David Smith estate; of Andrew Rowland estate; of John H. Myers, of John W. Miller, of A. H. Suman, of Esther E. Knode, executors; of the estate of Samuel Houser; of estate of George Line; of Josiah Hill; of estate of Joseph Gron; and of John D. Davis, all of Washington County, Md., praying the reference of their war claims to the Court of Claims under the provisions of the Bowman act—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MEREDITH: Petition of Charlotte V. Davis, for heirs of Josiah Davis, late of Alexandria, Va.; of trustees of Mount Holly Baptist Church, of Fauquier County, Va.; of Thomas Rector, for the estate of Susan Y. Oliver, late of the same county; of John Gregg, executor of Daniel Homes, deceased, late of the same county, and of John Shumate, for the estate of Lewis Shumate, deceased, late of the same county, praying that their war claims be referred to the Court of Claims under the provisions of the Bowman act—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. O'FERRALL: Petition of George R. Mayhew, for removal of the charge of desertion—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Isaac W. Canter, administrator of the late Margaret McCauley, of Frederick County, Va.; of Julia A. Corbin, of Rappahannock County, Va.; of Phoebe A. E. Dear, of the same county; of Benjamin Bowman, of Rockingham County, Va., and of F. L. Entsler, for the estate of Winfield S. Bangner, late of the same county, praying that their war claims be referred to the Court of Claims under the provisions of the Bowman act—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Missouri: Resolution urging creation of an efficient navy, adopted by Missouri Commandery Military Order of the Loyal Legion of the United States—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Pennsylvania: Statement of Mrs. Caroline V. English, relative to her bill for an increase of pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of Ellen McNamee, for a pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. OTIS: Petition of the Church of God, Topeka, Kans., asking for prohibition in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of J. F. Grennan and other citizens of Coffey County, Kans., asking for the passage of a law against dealing in futures and speculating in agricultural staples—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of L. M. Benedict and others, of Wabaunsee, Kans., asking that Columbian Exposition have financial aid upon condition of the grounds being closed upon Sundays—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

Also, petition of J. F. Grennan and others, of Coffey County, Kans., asking that a duty be imposed upon compound lard—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of D. C. Lah and other members of the First Presbyterian Church of Osage City, Kans., in relation to the World's Fair—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

By Mr. OWENS: Petition of Reformed Presbyterian Church of New Concord, Ohio, to close the Columbian Exposition on Lord's Day—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

By Mr. PATTERSON of Tennessee: Petition of Mrs. W. F. Privett, for the estate of Mrs. E. T. Horney, late of Shelby County, Tenn.; of Julia Elliott; administratrix, etc., and of Alice E. DeGrout, etc., praying that their war claims be referred to the Court of Claims under the provisions of the Bowman act—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. PEEL: Petition of G. W. Gordon, for an increase of pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of Green W. Smith, for removal of charge of desertion—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition to grant a pension to Jacob Sage, of Company A, Seventy-first Indiana Volunteers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of citizens of Little Rock, against opening the World's Fair on Sunday—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

By Mr. POWERS: Petition of the Congregational Church of

Salisbury, Vt., praying that a loan be made to the Columbian Exposition on condition that the Exposition be closed to visitors on the Sabbath—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

Also, petition of the Congregational Church of Wallingford, Vt., upon the same subject—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

Also, petition of citizens of Bennington, Vt., upon the same subject—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

Also, petition of citizens of Readsboro, Vt.; of citizens of North Hero, Vt., and of citizens of Fairfax, Vt., praying for free delivery of mails in country districts—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. RAINES: Petition of citizens of Bellona, N. Y., and of citizens of Rushville, N. Y., to grant a loan of \$5,000,000 to the World's Fair, provided it be closed on Sunday—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

Also, petition of Charles Parthall, late of Company B, Thirty-sixth Wisconsin Volunteers, for relief—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of Oliver C. Castle, late of Company D, One hundred and twenty-sixth Regiment New York Volunteers, for a change in his record of discharge—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RUSK: Petition of Amelia Eckes, widow of Henry Eckes, late of United States Quartermaster's Department, for a pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition for the relief of George W. Lowrey—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Illinois: Protest of the Sabbath schools of the Western Presbytery of Reformed Presbyterian Church, against keeping the World's Fair open Sundays—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

Also, petition from Sparta, Ill., against keeping open the World's Fair on Sunday—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

Also, petition favoring the keeping of the World's Fair open on Sunday—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

By Mr. STAHLNECKER: Petition of the society of Old Brooklynites, favoring tablets to the memory of those who died in British prison ships at Mallabout—to the Committee on the Library.

Also, resolutions of the National Farmers' Congress in convention at Sedalia, Mo., November 10, 1891, favoring harbor and river improvements at Savannah, Ga.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, copy of memorial of American Peace Society, favoring conference of the Governments of the world at the Columbian Exposition in 1893, favoring arbitration of international troubles—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, favoring appropriation to aid in repairing Sturgeon Bay and Lake Michigan Ship Canal and Harbor—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. STONE: Petition by First Synod of the West of United Presbyterian Church of North America, for closing the World's Fair on the Sabbath, and for the prevention of the sale of liquors—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

Also, petition of Eighth United Presbyterian Church, requesting that the World's Fair be closed on the Sabbath—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

Also, petition of Lydia Underwood, widow of Wilbur A. Underwood, for relief on account of death of her husband in sinking of steamer I. N. Bunton—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TOWNSEND: Petition of the Ministerial Association of the United Brethren Church of Colorado, in favor of granting aid to Columbian Exposition—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

By Mr. TRACEY: Petition of Young People's Society of Christian Endeavor of the First Methodist Episcopal Church of Albany, N. Y., favoring the closing of the World's Fair on Sunday, and opposing sale of liquors at the Fair—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

Also, petition numerous signed by citizens of Albany, N. Y., favoring free delivery of mails in country districts—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. WADSWORTH: Four petitions numerous signed by citizens of New York, praying that no appropriations be made to aid the World's Fair unless the same be closed on Sunday, and also praying for the prevention of the sale of liquors at the Fair—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

By Mr. WALKER: Five petitions of citizens of Hampden County, Mass., and also two petitions of citizens of Worcester County, in the same State, for the extension of the free-delivery system to country districts—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of certain citizens of Massachusetts, for the establishment of the metric system of weights and measures in the customs service of the United States—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

Also, petition of citizens of the town of Upton, Mass., against any appropriation for the World's Fair unless the same be closed on Sunday—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

By Mr. WARNER: Petition of Eliza Holmes, widow of John Holmes, late of Company A, Seventy-ninth Regiment New York Infantry, for a pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WEADOCK: Petition of Erasmus L. Wentz, for a pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, resolution of the common council of Detroit, Mich., in aid of bill to increase the efficiency of the Life-Saving Service—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WEVER: Petition of citizens of the Twenty-first district of New York, for a conference of nations at the World's Fair with reference to the settlement of international troubles by arbitration—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

By Mr. WRIGHT (by request): Memorial of eight societies of the Young People's Society of Christian Endeavor of Pennsylvania, praying that Congress shall prevent Sabbath-breaking and liquor-selling in Columbian Exposition—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, January 7, 1892.

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

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

SENATOR FROM NEW YORK.

Mr. HISCOCK. Mr. President, David B. Hill, a Senator elect from the State of New York, whose credentials have heretofore been presented, is now present and ready to take the oath of office.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator elect from New York will please come forward and receive the oath of office.

Mr. Hill was escorted to the Vice-President's desk by Mr. HISCOCK, and the oath prescribed by law having been administered to him, he took his seat in the Senate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATION.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs relative to the necessity of Congressional action for the disposition of timber on certain Chippewa reservations in the State of Wisconsin; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. WILSON presented a petition of the Iowa Yearly Meeting of Friends, praying for certain specified amendments of the revenue laws of the United States; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. MCMILLAN presented a petition of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Tekonsha, Mich., praying for the closing of the World's Columbian Fair on Sunday, for the prohibition of the sale of liquor within the grounds, and that the art department be conducted according to the American standard of purity in art; which was referred to the Committee on the Quadro-Centennial (Select).

Mr. DAVIS presented a memorial of the Chamber of Commerce of St. Paul, Minn., remonstrating against setting apart certain public lands in Minnesota as a public reservation; which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. QUAY presented a petition of citizens of Bucks County, Pa., praying for the enactment of a statute by Congress subjecting oleomargarine to the provisions of the laws of the several States; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented a petition of the Woman's Christian Association of Germantown, Pa., praying for the ratification of the so-called Brussels treaty; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. DOLPH. I present sundry petitions signed by citizens of Washington, and also of Oregon. I think—one of them indorsed by Mohawk Grange, No. 147, of the Patrons of Husbandry, of the State of Oregon—the signers being settlers who have located upon and improved lands in the odd-numbered sections of public lands within the limits of the Northern Pacific Railroad Company's general route from Wallula to Portland, Oregon. The petitioners allege that said limits included the odd-numbered sections for 40 miles on each side of the line of the road up to ter-