

By Mr. STONE: Petitions of Peter Arp and 18 citizens of Warren County, B. F. Hall and 39 citizens of Northampton County, George W. Bollinger and 26 citizens of Rockspring, H. J. Brown and 19 citizens of Flemington, C. L. Shantz and 40 citizens of Berks County, John O. Jones and 13 citizens of Wyoming County, A. E. Foster and 37 citizens of McKean County, J. W. Keisel and 41 citizens of Pike County, J. W. Kepler and 19 citizens of Clinton County, S. L. Snyder and 9 citizens of Millerstown, J. A. Mossman and 37 citizens of Mercer County, Mrs. W. L. Graham, J. W. McIlwain and other citizens of Lycoming County, Mrs. H. Hulings and 14 citizens of Cheswick, W. J. Griffin and 14 citizens of Sullivan County, J. H. Witmer and others, of Dauphin County, R. B. Kirchner and others, of Westmoreland County, all in the State of Pennsylvania, favoring postal savings banks—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. TERRY: Resolution of the Commercial League of Fort Smith, Ark., favoring the speedy connection of the Port Arthur Canal with the Gulf of Mexico—to the Committee on Railways and Canals.

By Mr. WEYMOUTH: Papers to accompany House bill granting an increase of pension to William B. Paul—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. YOUNG: Petition of the Credit Men's Association of Philadelphia, Pa., urging the passage of the Caffery national quarantine bill—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE.

SATURDAY, February 11, 1899.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

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

HEALTH OF SOLDIERS IN THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 20th ultimo, a letter from the Surgeon-General of the Army, submitting a report and tabulated statements concerning deaths and sickness of soldiers in the Philippine Islands; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed the following bills:

A bill (S. 831) to increase the pension of Thomas J. Haughey;
A bill (S. 1827) granting an increase of pension to Stephen M. Davis;
A bill (S. 2616) granting a pension to Harriette F. Hovey;
A bill (S. 4231) granting an increase of pension to Millie A. Berry; and
A bill (S. 5186) to amend an act entitled "An act to amend the statutes in relation to immediate transportation of dutiable goods, and for other purposes," approved June 10, A. D. 1880, by extending the privileges of the first section thereof to the subport of Miami, Fla.

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

A bill (S. 4775) granting a pension to Flora Stanton Kalk; and
A bill (S. 5343) granting a pension to John M. Palmer.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills, each with an amendment; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

A bill (S. 1776) to increase the pension of Mrs. Letitia Tyler Semple;
A bill (S. 4630) granting an increase of pension to Chauncey A. Bradley;
A bill (S. 4854) granting a pension to Isom Gibson; and
A bill (S. 4982) granting an increase of pension to Amanda F. Jumper.

The message also announced that the House insists upon its amendment to the bill (S. 1964) for the erection of a public building for the use of the custom-house and post-office at Newport News, in the district of Newport News, Va., disagreed to by the Senate; agrees to the conference asked for by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. MERCER, Mr. HICKS, and Mr. BANKHEAD managers at the conference on the part of the House.

The message further announced that the House insists upon its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (S. 4936) for the allowance of certain claims for stores and supplies reported by the Court of Claims under the provisions of the act ap-

proved March 3, 1883, and commonly known as the Bowman Act, and for other purposes; agrees to a further conference asked for by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. MAHON, Mr. OTJEN, and Mr. RICHARDSON managers at the conference on the part of the House.

The message also requested the Senate to furnish the House with a duplicate copy of the engrossed bill of the Senate (S. 3256) in reference to the civil service and appointments thereunder, the same having been lost or misplaced.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

A bill (H. R. 1417) for the relief of Thomas Mullen;
A bill (H. R. 2293) granting an increase of pension to Andrew J. Snowden;
A bill (H. R. 2412) to amend the military record of James Roche;
A bill (H. R. 2574) granting an increase of pension to Lavinia M. Payne;
A bill (H. R. 3155) granting a pension to Kitty Ann Patterson;
A bill (H. R. 3804) for the relief of James McKenzie;
A bill (H. R. 5209) granting a pension to Belle Shumard;
A bill (H. R. 5328) granting a pension to Patrick O'Shea;
A bill (H. R. 5758) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of James Geissinger;

A bill (H. R. 6631) granting an increase of pension to Jere Smith;

A bill (H. R. 7046) granting an increase of pension to Arba Capron;

A bill (H. R. 7632) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Robert Flower;

A bill (H. R. 7902) granting a pension to Albert Putnam;

A bill (H. R. 8179) granting a pension to Levi M. Truit;

A bill (H. R. 8503) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of John P. Henderson, and to grant him an honorable discharge;

A bill (H. R. 8568) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. Susan Stedman;

A bill (H. R. 8749) granting a pension to James J. Marcher;

A bill (H. R. 9059) granting a pension to Catherine Eakin;

A bill (H. R. 10241) granting a pension to Nancy Shaley;

A bill (H. R. 10355) granting an increase of pension to Catharine C. Goodrich;

A bill (H. R. 10385) granting a pension to George Brown;

A bill (H. R. 10605) to increase the pension of Annie Cusack;

A bill (H. R. 10803) granting an increase of pension to James Porter;

A bill (H. R. 10858) granting an increase of pension to Amanda Willmarth;

A bill (H. R. 11420) granting a pension to Emily McLain;

A bill (H. R. 11615) removing the charge of desertion from the record of William Moore, Company I, Twenty-third Regiment Kentucky Volunteers; and

A bill (H. R. 11899) granting a pension to Judith Doherty.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

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

A bill (S. 2673) for the relief of William A. Cowles;

A bill (S. 3684) for the relief of Joseph Tousant, alias Touzin;

A bill (S. 5088) to amend section 27 of the Revised Statutes, relative to the apportionment and election of Representatives; and

A bill (H. R. 5019) for a light vessel off Tail of Horse Shoe, Chesapeake Bay.

CREDENTIALS.

Mr. VEST. Mr. President, I present the credentials of my colleague [Mr. COCKRELL] for his fifth term in the Senate.

The credentials of FRANCIS MARION COCKRELL, chosen by the legislature of Missouri a Senator from that State for the term beginning March 4, 1899, were read and ordered to be filed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. TELLER presented the memorials of M. Newman and 53 other citizens, of F. S. Brown and 18 other citizens, of W. J. McNamara and 18 other citizens, E. J. Fort and 18 other citizens, M. Storms and 18 other citizens, Douglas Patullo and 18 other citizens, the Marx Merchants Company and 18 citizens, L. T. Boutwell and 18 other citizens, George J. Ribber and 18 other citizens, Henry Small and 19 other citizens, H. Stein and 19 other citizens, H. S. Deane and 19 other citizens, J. M. Lomery and 19 other citizens, H. G. Smith and 19 other citizens, J. F. Meyer and 19 other citizens, H. Jackson and 19 other citizens, H.-F. Stringfeller and 19 other citizens, Charles Horan and 19 other citizens, Louis Zimmerman and 19 other citizens, A. T. Levy and 19 other citizens, P. A. Wagner and 19 other citizens, Hamilton & Kendrick and 19 other citizens, R. Le Bert and 19 other citizens, C. L. Thompson and 19 other citizens, W. W. C. Hyde and 19 other citizens, E. E. Sommers and 19 other citizens, W. W. Andrews and 19 other citizens,

E. J. Casey and 19 other citizens, B. A. Bios and 19 other citizens, W. G. Smith and 19 other citizens, J. W. But and 19 other citizens, H. Bishop and 19 other citizens, H. C. Worthington and 19 other citizens, A. F. Carlson and 19 other citizens, George E. Green and 19 other citizens, O. B. Marble and 19 other citizens, S. B. McClusken and 19 other citizens, William Hutchinson and 19 other citizens, A. G. Stephens and 19 other citizens, G. H. Cherry and 19 other citizens, and of Forbes & Stormberg and 19 other citizens, all in the State of Colorado, remonstrating against the passage of the anti-scalping ticket bill; which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. MURPHY presented the memorials of L. W. Stevens and 17 other citizens, J. D. Shields and 17 other citizens, E. Heath, jr., and 17 other citizens, Julius I. Block and 17 other citizens, E. B. Meyer and 17 other citizens, A. P. Heine and 17 other citizens, Spencer L. Jackson and 18 other citizens, Cecil L. Saunders and 18 other citizens, I. Lewin and 18 other citizens, M. C. Robinson and 18 other citizens, H. T. Sheldon and 18 other citizens, Will Fairbank and 18 other citizens, C. C. Greenlee and 18 other citizens, Hampton Shay and 18 other citizens, J. P. Moore and 18 other citizens, W. Davidson and 18 other citizens, J. W. Dooley and 18 other citizens, J. Breckwoldt and 18 other citizens, W. W. Robertson and 18 other citizens, Fred W. Morlock and 18 other citizens, Theodore Auerhahn and 14 other citizens, Peter Abels and 5 other citizens, E. A. Schuman and 6 other citizens, S. U. Nelson and 6 other citizens, E. M. Goldsmith and 16 other citizens, J. Cook and 16 other citizens, F. R. Might and 16 other citizens, I. Guntzberger and 16 other citizens, F. Luckenbach and 16 other citizens, Charles Miller and 16 other citizens, P. H. Bragdon and 16 other citizens, J. Brown and 16 other citizens, Peter Grace and 16 other citizens, Edward F. Reynolds and 16 other citizens, C. C. Rout and 12 other citizens, J. Henry Giles and 15 other citizens, Julius Hoertz and 10 other citizens, Charles C. Hattmeyer and 25 other citizens, J. W. Ullman and 51 other citizens, J. G. Price and 53 other citizens, S. J. Bogan and 53 other citizens, Louis Converse and 53 other citizens, T. N. Bigling and 53 other citizens, B. J. Mann and 52 other citizens, W. G. Gordon & Co. and 52 other citizens, W. W. Baker and 53 other citizens, B. B. Usher and 53 other citizens, David J. Stein and 52 other citizens, C. A. Leffermann and 52 other citizens, M. S. Crawford and 52 other citizens, F. T. Somers and 52 other citizens, A. H. Stebbins and 52 other citizens, Sinton Pedlow, Lee Gideon and 19 other citizens, W. B. Marx and 19 other citizens, E. Milspaw and 19 other citizens, H. S. Jerome and 19 other citizens, M. M. Marshall and 19 other citizens, A. T. Johnson and 19 other citizens, A. C. Hartwell and 19 other citizens, L. Salo & Son and 19 other citizens, Joseph Callahan and 19 other citizens, L. J. Marks and 19 other citizens, A. P. Dutton and 19 other citizens, H. Jarmouth and 19 other citizens, H. C. Chambers and 19 other citizens, John E. Valck and 19 other citizens, M. C. Grant and 19 other citizens, M. Toney Heyman and 19 other citizens, Samuel B. Newman and 19 other citizens, J. S. Bowman and 19 other citizens, A. L. Hatch & Co. and 19 other citizens, E. L. Browne and 19 other citizens, Paul Reineman and 19 other citizens, B. S. Fletcher and 19 other citizens, E. M. Scott and 19 other citizens, S. J. Epstein and 19 other citizens, J. H. Kissam and 19 other citizens, Norwood D. Plummer and 19 other citizens, C. L. Kenpow and 19 other citizens, William Patterson and 19 other citizens, James J. Worthington and 19 other citizens, S. J. Epstein and 19 other citizens, P. A. Konen and 19 other citizens, C. A. Forker and 19 other citizens, E. H. Elliott and 19 other citizens, Felix B. Lippman and 19 other citizens, John E. Hogeman and 19 other citizens, H. N. Woodbury and 19 other citizens, A. F. Allen Brown and 19 other citizens, D. S. Bacon and 19 other citizens, E. C. Davis and 19 other citizens, F. O. Graham and 19 other citizens, A. Nestler and 19 other citizens, R. S. McMahon and 19 other citizens, Samuel B. Hiller and 19 other citizens, E. C. Peck and 19 other citizens, Charles T. Sprague and 19 other citizens, Charles H. Gray and 19 other citizens, M. H. Selkirk and 19 other citizens, D. MacRorie and 19 other citizens, C. W. Baldwin and 19 other citizens, W. R. Shute and 19 other citizens, and of John H. Sutliff and 293 other citizens, all in the State of New York, remonstrating against the passage of the anti-scalping ticket bill; which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut presented petitions of the congregations of the First Congregational Church, the Second Congregational Church, the Advent Church, and the Baptist Church, all of Winsted, in the State of Connecticut, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the sale of liquor in canteens of the Army and Navy and of Soldiers' Homes, and in immigrant stations and Government buildings; which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. NELSON presented memorials of Crookston Council, No. 88, United Commercial Travelers of America, of Crookston; of Frank Weyhart and 35 other citizens, of C. M. Burton and 37 other citizens, of R. M. Martin and 34 other citizens, of A. F. Brayton and 57 other citizens, of C. M. Burton and 19 other citi-

zens, of H. A. Olson and 13 other citizens, of J. Crowley and 19 other citizens, of G. R. Laybourn and 19 other citizens, of J. E. Willcutt and 19 other citizens, of C. L. Smiley and 19 other citizens, of W. L. Parsons and 19 other citizens, of H. C. Johnstone and 19 other citizens, of G. P. Ryuck and 19 other citizens, of C. C. Marsh and 19 other citizens, of A. D. L. Johnstone and 19 other citizens, of Charles D. Bentley and 19 other citizens, and of Charles Schumann and 19 other citizens, all in the State of Minnesota, remonstrating against the passage of the anti-scalping ticket bill; which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. McENERY presented the memorials of F. W. Courtney and 39 other citizens, of A. B. Winford and 20 other citizens, of Charles Kaiser and 14 other citizens, J. N. Young and 17 other citizens, Charles F. Melchert and 17 other citizens, William Bassett and 31 other citizens, S. Leopold and 18 other citizens, J. P. Snyder and 18 other citizens, A. B. Kennedy and 18 other citizens, James Henry and 18 other citizens, E. Leberman and 18 other citizens, M. Kauffman and 18 other citizens, F. Fletcher and 19 other citizens, Watson E. Johnston and 19 other citizens, C. F. Simmons and 19 other citizens, E. E. Colell and 19 other citizens, R. F. Curtin and 19 other citizens, A. C. Antrim and 19 other citizens, Alec Anderson and 19 other citizens, E. D. Moulin and 19 other citizens, Eugene Brazier and 19 other citizens, Willis X. Hackett and 19 other citizens, W. J. Lester and 19 other citizens, Victor E. De Long and 19 other citizens, G. P. Wilson and 19 other citizens, C. A. Kaiper and 19 other citizens, C. B. Ayers and 19 other citizens, J. E. Sharp and 19 other citizens, John Behrend and 19 other citizens, M. W. Humphrey and 19 other citizens, W. Williamson and 19 other citizens, G. F. Kleinberger and 19 other citizens, L. D. Buy, sr., and 19 other citizens, John T. Whiteley and 19 other citizens, Robert Hand and 38 other citizens, Charles A. Bujac and 19 other citizens, John Palmer and 19 other citizens, Watson S. Johnson and 19 other citizens, Louis F. Anaya and 19 other citizens, A. Goodpastor and 19 other citizens, J. E. Eakina and 19 other citizens, A. P. Purcell and 19 other citizens, G. M. Alexander and 19 other citizens, L. S. Meyers and 19 other citizens, and of Joe Stormberg, jr., and 19 other citizens, all in the State of Louisiana, remonstrating against the passage of the anti-scalping ticket bill; which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. BURROWS presented the memorials of James P. Judge and 57 other citizens, of Michael Hogan and 52 other citizens, of J. M. Halloway and 22 other citizens, W. J. Griffin and 17 other citizens, E. J. Harris and 20 other citizens, J. W. Westcott and 18 other citizens, Walter L. Cree and 18 other citizens, A. L. Rogers and 18 other citizens, P. B. O'Brien and 18 other citizens, H. Jackson and 18 other citizens, J. B. Wilkins and 19 other citizens, M. B. Allen and 19 other citizens, F. O. Rossman and 19 other citizens, James Spencer and 19 other citizens, N. McAuliffe and 19 other citizens, W. H. Harrison and 19 other citizens, J. R. O'Grady and 19 other citizens, J. B. Colvan and 19 other citizens, L. Jacob and 19 other citizens, A. H. Bacon and 19 other citizens, William C. Spietz and 19 other citizens, C. W. Perry and 19 other citizens, G. H. Gale and 19 other citizens, A. Marx and 19 other citizens, L. A. Tabor and 19 other citizens, William H. Halstead and 19 other citizens, W. T. Bailey and 19 other citizens, George B. Hall and 19 other citizens, A. Van Deusen and 19 other citizens, C. W. Wagner and 19 other citizens, J. W. Lyon and 19 other citizens, C. A. Hendrick and 19 other citizens, F. E. Logan and 19 other citizens, J. E. Hanna and 19 other citizens, N. W. Cheever and 19 other citizens, H. G. Prettyman and 19 other citizens, Truman Hubbard and 19 other citizens, J. W. Brooks and 19 other citizens, F. E. Dunster and 19 other citizens, C. G. Thomas and 19 other citizens, and of J. O. Banks and 19 other citizens, all in the State of Michigan, remonstrating against the passage of the anti-scalping ticket bill; which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President, I do not think there is a quorum in the Chamber.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from South Carolina suggests the absence of a quorum of the Senate. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aldrich,	Elkins,	Lodge,	Pettigrew,
Allen,	Faulkner,	McBride,	Pettus,
Allison,	Frye,	McEnery,	Platt, Conn.
Bacon,	Gear,	McMillan,	Pritchard,
Bate,	Hale,	Mallory,	Rawlins,
Berry,	Hansbrough,	Mantle,	Ross,
Burrows,	Harris,	Martin,	Shoup,
Caffery,	Helfeld,	Mason,	Stewart,
Carter,	Hoar,	Mills,	Teller,
Chandler,	Jones, Ark.	Murphy,	Thurston,
Chilton,	Jones, Nev.	Nelson,	Tillman,
Cockrell,	Kenney,	Pasco,	Vest,
Cullom,	Kyle,	Penrose,	Warren,
Deboe,	Lindsay,	Perkins,	Wellington.

Mr. WARREN. I desire to state in behalf of my colleague [Mr. CLARK], who is absent, that he is at the bedside of a very

sick father. I make this observation now so that the cause of his absence hereafter may be known.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Fifty-six Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. LODGE presented the memorials of J. W. Frank and 12 other citizens, of A. C. Higgins and 17 other citizens, and of C. H. Osuhm and 13 other citizens, all in the State of Massachusetts, remonstrating against the passage of the anti-scalping ticket bill; which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented petitions of the congregations of the Methodist Episcopal and the Protestant Episcopal churches of Watertown, Mass., and of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Berkley, Mass., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors in Government buildings; which were referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also presented petitions of the congregations of the Methodist Episcopal and Protestant Episcopal churches of Watertown, Mass., praying for the enactment of legislation to raise the age of protection for girls to 18 years in the District of Columbia and the Territories; which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the Central Labor Union of Adams, Mass., and a petition of Local Division No. 22, Amalgamated Association of Street-Railway Employees, of Worcester, Mass., praying for the passage of the eight-hour bill; which were referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Strafford Corner, N. H., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit interstate gambling by telegraph, telephone, or otherwise; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. COCKRELL presented a petition of the Board of Trade of Kansas City, Mo., praying for the enactment of legislation to facilitate and expedite the speedy connection of Port Arthur Canal with the waters of the Gulf of Mexico; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented the memorials of E. M. McKee and 10 other citizens, of E. M. Whitson and 11 other citizens, B. F. Black and 15 other citizens, E. F. Hogan and 36 other citizens, A. J. Byington and 14 other citizens, G. B. Fox and 12 other citizens, James Montague and 13 other citizens, W. E. Sharp and 14 other citizens, R. Carson and 14 other citizens, R. E. Lee Bailey and 16 other citizens, J. J. Devine and 16 other citizens, A. G. Bolms and 17 other citizens, W. W. Burge and 17 other citizens, Charles Hogle and 17 other citizens, D. Rankin and 17 other citizens, W. H. Roberts and 18 other citizens, M. H. Brown and 18 other citizens, Finley Rock and 18 other citizens, the Klemine Realty and Financial Company and 18 citizens, J. Miller and 18 other citizens, O. K. White and 18 other citizens, D. T. Smith and 18 other citizens, R. S. Anderson and 18 other citizens, E. E. Wilson and 18 other citizens, Claude McCheeley and 19 other citizens, George Radell and 19 other citizens, George Speer and 19 other citizens, Owen J. O'Brien and 19 other citizens, E. F. Hohmes and 19 other citizens, B. Kaufman and 19 other citizens, H. F. Wheeler and 19 other citizens, R. T. Wolf and 19 other citizens, Alexander J. Campan and 19 other citizens, William J. Langdon and 19 other citizens, A. D. Bauer and 19 other citizens, Virgie L. Johnson and 19 other citizens, L. H. Smith and 19 other citizens, and of Robert Alexander and 19 other citizens, all in the State of Missouri, remonstrating against the passage of the anti-scalping ticket bill; which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a memorial of Local Union No. 95, Cigar Makers' International Union, of St. Joseph, Mo., remonstrating against the annexation of the Philippine Islands; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a memorial of the Ministers' Evangelical Alliance, of St. Louis, Mo., remonstrating against any appropriation being made for sectarian schools; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. CULLOM presented the petition of Dr. S. J. Jones, president of the National Pure Food Association, of Chicago, Ill., praying for the appointment of a pure-food commission; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented a petition of the Baptist Young People's Association of the Baptist Church, of Clinton, Ill., and a petition of the congregation of the College Church, of Wheaton, Ill., praying for the maintenance of the prohibition law in the Territory of Alaska; which were referred to the Committee on Territories.

He also presented the petition of Edward T. Lee, of Illinois, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution of the United States repealing the thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth amendments thereto; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the Moline Club, of Moline, Ill., and a petition of the Winter Wheat Millers' League, of Indianapolis, Ind., praying for the enactment of legislation to increase American shipping; which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented memorials of the Hyde Park Saloon Keepers' Union, of Chicago; of the Macon County Liquor Dealers' and Personal Library Association, of Decatur; of the Duetschur Wirths Verein, of Chicago; of the Northwest Chicago Wirths Verein, of Chicago; of the Liquor Dealers' Association of Peru; of the Liquor Dealers' Protective Association of Danville; of the Liquor Dealers' State Protective Association, of Rock Island; of the De Kalb Liquor Dealers' Association, of Sycamore; of the Liquor Dealers' Protective Association of Streator; of the Saloon Keepers' Association of Kankakee, and of the Liquor Dealers' Protective Association of Blue Island, all in the State of Illinois, remonstrating against additional restrictions being placed on the retail liquor dealer having distilled liquors in jugs, bottles, etc.; which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented the memorial of Harry C. Gano, State president of the American Protective Association, of Chicago, Ill., remonstrating against the appropriation of any money for sectarian schools; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Canton, of the managing committee of the Amalgamated Society of Carpenters and Joiners of Chicago; of the Tri-City Labor Congress, of Rock Island; of Federal Labor Union, No. 7110, of Galva; of Walter J. Torney Lodge, No. 6, Amalgamated Association of Iron, Steel, and Tin Workers, of Joliet; of Local Union No. 15, Coopers' International Union, of Chicago; of the Carpenters' District Council of Chicago; of Local Union No. 237, Machinery, Agricultural, and Bench Molders' Union, of Moline; of Local Union No. 10, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners, of Chicago; of the International Society of Machinists of Chicago; of Local Union No. 2, Journeymen Bakers and Confectioners' Union, of Chicago; of Local Union No. 7129, Printers and Operators' Union, of Chicago; of the Elgin Cooperative Society, of Elgin; of Local Union No. 174, Cigar Makers' International Union, of Joliet; of Hall of Gene City Lodge, No. 317, International Association of Machinists, of Quincy; of Local Union No. 44, Iron Molders' Union, of Quincy, and of Local Union No. 6, Metal Polishers, Buffers, Platers, and Brass Workers' International Union, of Chicago, all in the State of Illinois, and of Local Union No. 529, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners, of Galveston, Tex., praying for the passage of the eight-hour bill; which were referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a petition of the Political Equality Club, of Jamestown, N. Y., praying that the right of suffrage be granted to women in Hawaii; which was referred to the Select Committee on Woman Suffrage.

Mr. McMILLAN presented a petition of the congregation of the Scotten Avenue Baptist Church, of Detroit, Mich., praying for the enactment of legislation to protect State anti-cigarette laws by providing that cigarettes imported in original packages on entering any State shall become subject to its laws; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented petitions of the congregations of the United Presbyterian Church of Martin, of the Congregational Church of Cooper, and of the Scotten Avenue Baptist Church, of Detroit, and of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Cooper, all in the State of Michigan, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors in all Government buildings; which were referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also presented a petition of the State Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Michigan, and a petition of 83 citizens of Detroit, Mich., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the sale of liquor in canteens of the Army and Navy and of Soldiers' Homes, and in immigrant stations and Government buildings; which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a petition of the Summer School of Social Problems, of Saratoga, N. Y., praying for the enactment of a Sunday-rest law for the District of Columbia; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented petitions of the congregations of St. Mark's Lutheran Church and the McKendree Methodist Episcopal Church and of the Washington Preachers' Meeting of the Methodist Episcopal Church, all in the city of Washington, D. C., praying for the enactment of legislation to raise the age of protection for girls to 18 years in the District of Columbia and the Territories; which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. RAWLINS presented the memorials of H. T. Roberts and 13 other citizens, of W. J. Moore and 19 other citizens, Rev. B. F. Clay and 19 other citizens, and of J. W. Clark and 24 other citizens, all in the State of Utah, remonstrating against the passage of the anti-scalping ticket bill; which were ordered to lie on the table.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. McMILLAN, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 10222) to authorize the extension of the Metropolitan Railroad, reported it with amendments and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. MARTIN, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to whom was referred the bill (S. 5374) for the relief of Christiana Dengler, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. HANSBROUGH, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to whom was referred the bill (S. 5418) for the relief of John A. Narjes, reported it without amendment.

Mr. TELLER, from the Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 321) for the relief of the Berdan Firearms Manufacturing Company, asked to be discharged from its further consideration, and that it be referred to the Committee on Patents; which was agreed to.

Mr. WARREN, from the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands, to whom was referred the amendment proposing to appropriate \$50,000 for preliminary surveys or examinations to be made of one or more reservoir sites in each arid and semiarid State, etc., submitted by himself on the 10th instant, intended to be proposed to the river and harbor appropriation bill, reported favorably thereon, and moved that it be referred to the Committee on Commerce, and printed; which was agreed to.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the amendment proposing to appropriate \$5,000,000 for continuing the improvement of reservoirs and canals to conduct water thereto from streams in the respective arid and semiarid land States and Territories, submitted by himself on the 8th instant, reported favorably thereon, and moved that it be referred to the Committee on Commerce, and printed; which was agreed to.

Mr. CAFFERY, from the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 11440) to locate the office of the deputy collector of the port of East Pascagonia, Miss., at Scranton, Miss., reported it without amendment.

Mr. SHOUP, from the Committee on Territories, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 8571) to define and punish crimes in the district of Alaska and to provide a code of criminal procedure for said district, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. PERKINS. I am instructed by the Committee on Education and Labor, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 11247) to extend the anti-contract labor laws of the United States to Hawaii, to report it back. I introduced a similar bill some weeks since, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration. That committee has that bill under consideration and is prepared to make a report on Monday morning next. I therefore report this bill back, and ask that it may be referred to the Committee on Immigration.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. That change of reference will be made, in the absence of objection.

COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS.

Mr. HAWLEY. I am instructed by the Committee on Military Affairs to ask that that committee may have leave to sit during the sessions of the Senate—a mere formal request.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request made by the Senator from Connecticut? The Chair hears none, and that order is made.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. HOAR. I introduce a bill relating to the election of Senators. I do not expect that the bill can get attention during the present Congress, but I desire to have it introduced; and I should like to have the first part, which shows the purpose of the measure, read and then the whole bill published in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 5489) relating to the election of Senators was read the first time by its title, the second time as requested, and referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That chapter 1, section 15, of the Revised Statutes of the United States, relating to the election of Senators, is hereby amended by adding at the end of section 15 the following words: "If no person shall have received such majority after seven separate ballots in such joint assembly, one of such ballots at least having been taken on each of seven separate days, the person who receives a plurality of all the votes cast on the next ballot, or, if there be no plurality, on the first subsequent ballot where any person shall have a plurality, a majority of all the members of both houses being present and voting, shall be declared duly elected;" so said section will read as follows:

"SEC. 15. Such election shall be conducted in the following manner: Each house shall openly, by a viva voce vote of each member present, name one person for Senator in Congress from such State, and the name of the person so voted for, who receives a majority of the whole number of votes cast in each house, shall be entered on the journal of that house by the clerk or secretary thereof; or if either house fails to give such majority to any person on that day the fact shall be entered on the journal. At 12 o'clock meridian of the day following that on which proceedings are required to take place as aforesaid, the members of the two houses shall convene in joint assembly and the journal of each house shall then be read, and if the same person has received a majority of all the votes in each house he shall be declared duly elected Senator. But if the same person has not received a majority of the votes in each house, or if either house has failed to take proceedings as required by this section, the joint assembly shall then proceed to choose, by a viva voce vote of each member present, a person for Senator, and the person who receives a majority of all the votes of the joint assembly, a majority of all the members elected to both houses being present and voting, shall be declared duly elected. If no person receives such majority on the first day, the joint assembly shall meet at 12 o'clock meridian of each succeeding day

during the session of the legislature and shall take at least one vote until a Senator is elected. If no person shall have received such majority after seven separate ballots in such joint assembly, one of such ballots at least having been taken on each of seven separate days, the person who receives a plurality of all the votes cast on the next ballot, or if there be no plurality, on the first subsequent ballot where any person shall have a plurality, a majority of all the members of both houses being present and voting, shall be declared duly elected."

Mr. McMILLAN introduced a bill (S. 5490) to regulate licenses for theaters and other entertainments in the District of Columbia; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. FRYE introduced a bill (S. 5491) to extend the privileges of section 4216 of the Revised Statutes to the yacht *Andria*; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. MCENERY introduced a bill (S. 5492) for the relief of Amire R. Hertzog, of Natchitoches, La., for stores and supplies taken from her by the military forces of the United States during the war for the suppression of the rebellion; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 5493) for the relief of Eliza M. Parrott, of St. Landry Parish, La., for supplies taken from her by the military forces of the United States for their use during the war for the suppression of the rebellion; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. NELSON introduced a bill (S. 5494) to authorize the Grand Rapids Water Power and Boom Company, of Grand Rapids, Minn., to construct a dam and bridge across the Mississippi River; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. THURSTON (by request) introduced a bill (S. 5495) to authorize the Secretary of War to purchase for governmental and industrial use at Rock Island Arsenal, Rock Island, Ill., a testing machine for tension and compression; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

AMENDMENTS TO APPROPRIATION BILLS.

Mr. PETTIGREW submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$434,305.71, to be expended by the Secretary of the Treasury in paying the balance of awards made to the loyal Seminole Indians under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, with interest thereon, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the general deficiency appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

He also submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$10,000 for a psycho-physical laboratory and for the collection of sociological and abnormal or pathological data and for necessary printing, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

He also submitted an amendment relative to the claims of all persons who may have heretofore or may hereafter settle upon that portion of the Great Sioux Indian Reservation which was opened up to settlement under and by virtue of the act of March 2, 1889, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. HANSBROUGH submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$6,000 to defray the expenses of a commission to negotiate with the Devils Lake Band of Sioux Indians in North Dakota, for the cession and relinquishment to the United States of whatever right or interest they may have in and to any and all land in that State, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. TILLMAN submitted an amendment proposing to increase the appropriation for vegetable pathological investigations in the Department of Agriculture from \$22,500 to \$27,500, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the agricultural appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed.

REORGANIZATION OF THE ARMY.

Mr. KENNEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the Army reorganization bill; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

PERSONNEL OF THE NAVY AND MARINE CORPS.

Mr. STEWART submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the Navy personnel bill; which, with the accompanying statement, was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. TILLMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the Navy personnel bill; which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED.

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs:

A bill (H. R. 1417) for the relief of Thomas Mullen;

A bill (H. R. 2412) to amend the military record of James Roche;
 A bill (H. R. 3804) for the relief of James McKenzie;
 A bill (H. R. 5758) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of James Geissinger;

A bill (H. R. 7632) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Robert Flower;

A bill (H. R. 8506) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of John P. Henderson and to grant him an honorable discharge; and

A bill (H. R. 11615) removing the charge of desertion from the record of William Moore, Company I, Twenty-third Regiment Kentucky Volunteers.

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (H. R. 2293) granting an increase of pension to Andrew J. Snowden;

A bill (H. R. 2574) granting an increase of pension to Lavinia M. Payne;

A bill (H. R. 3155) granting a pension to Kitty Ann Patterson;

A bill (H. R. 5209) granting a pension to Belle Shumard;

A bill (H. R. 5328) granting a pension to Patrick O'Shea;

A bill (H. R. 6681) granting an increase of pension to Jere Smith;

A bill (H. R. 7046) granting an increase of pension to Arba Capron;

A bill (H. R. 7902) granting a pension to Albert Putnam;

A bill (H. R. 8179) granting a pension to Levi M. Truit;

A bill (H. R. 8568) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. Susan Stedman;

A bill (H. R. 8749) granting a pension to James J. Marcher;

A bill (H. R. 9059) granting a pension to Catherine Eakin;

A bill (H. R. 10241) granting a pension to Nancy Shaley;

A bill (H. R. 10355) granting an increase of pension to Catharine C. Goodrich;

A bill (H. R. 10385) granting a pension to George Brown;

A bill (H. R. 10305) to increase the pension of Annie Cusack;

A bill (H. R. 10303) granting an increase of pension to James Porter;

A bill (H. R. 10858) granting an increase of pension to Amanda Willmarth;

A bill (H. R. 11420) granting a pension to Emily McLain; and
 A bill (H. R. 11899) granting a pension to Judith Doherty.

THE CIVIL SERVICE.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the request of the House of Representatives to be furnished a duplicate copy of the engrossed bill of the Senate (S. 3256) in reference to the civil service and appointments thereunder, the same having been lost or misplaced; and by unanimous consent the request was ordered to be complied with.

ELECTION OF SENATORS BY THE PEOPLE.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution coming over from yesterday, introduced by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. ALLEN. The joint resolution (S. R. 243) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of United States Senators by a direct vote of the people I should like to have lie over until Monday, when I shall ask to address the Senate in support of it. I should like to have the Senate resolution laid before the Senate this morning as unfinished business.

DOCTRINE OF THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the resolution submitted yesterday by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. ALLEN], and which was laid over until this morning. The resolution will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution submitted yesterday by Mr. ALLEN, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate of the United States unhesitatingly approves and reaffirms the doctrine of the Declaration of Independence, "that all men are created equal," and "that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness," and "that to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed; that whenever any form of government becomes destructive to these ends, it is the right of the people to alter or abolish it, and to institute new government, laying its foundation on such principles and organizing its powers in such form as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness;" and be it further

Resolved, That said doctrine is not, in its application, to be confined to the people of the United States, but is universal and extends to all peoples, wherever found, having a distinct and well-organized society and territory of their own.

Mr. CHANDLER. What is the request of the Senator from Nebraska in reference to this resolution, the consideration of which I objected to yesterday?

Mr. ALLEN. The resolution comes over this morning for consideration as unfinished business, and it is now properly before the Senate for disposition, I suppose.

Mr. CHANDLER. There are many resolutions of this kind before the Senate. The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. McENERY] made a request that the resolution offered by him should be acted upon on Monday next, and I now renew that request in this form: That on Monday, at 3 o'clock, the Senate take up for consideration the resolution of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. McENERY], the resolution offered by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. SULLIVAN], the resolution which the Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST] offered and on which there has been so much debate; that all these resolutions be acted upon seriatim, and that the Senate remain in session until they are disposed of, beginning at 3 o'clock on Monday next.

Mr. CULLOM. What is the resolution referred to?

Mr. CHANDLER. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution offered by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. McENERY] and all the resolutions of a similar character be taken up on Monday next at 3 o'clock in the afternoon, and acted upon seriatim and disposed of before adjournment.

Mr. CULLOM. I hope the Senator will put the date off a little further, so that we can get rid of at least two or three of the appropriation bills, that they may go to the other House for consideration and we may make some progress in getting rid of them. We shall have time after that, perhaps, to consider these outside questions. That can be done between times, I might say, and not interfere with the appropriation bill.

Mr. CHANDLER. I was opposed to acting upon any resolutions of this kind before the treaty was ratified. I thought it extremely proper that as soon as the treaty was ratified the Senate should make a declaration if a majority of its members desired to do so. I so said always; I so say now; and in furtherance of this purpose, which I know many Senators have at heart, I make this request. The resolution of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. BACON] I ought not to have forgotten. There are, however, so many of these resolutions laying down principles for the guidance of the United States in the future that I may be excused for not remembering them all. But I include them all in my request. I ask that at 3 o'clock on Monday all be taken up and acted upon before the adjournment of the Senate; and I will say—

Mr. BACON. What does the Senator mean by "acted upon?"

Mr. CHANDLER. That they be debated and—

Mr. BACON. That they be voted upon?

Mr. CHANDLER. And voted upon before adjournment.

Mr. HALE. Without debate, I suggest.

Mr. CHANDLER. With such debate as may be consistent with final action before adjournment. I will say to the Senator—

Mr. CULLOM. Can not the Senator postpone the date one or two days?

Mr. CHANDLER. I do not think we shall expedite the business of the Senate by postponing the disposition of those resolutions any further.

Mr. CULLOM. I am not expressing any opposition to the resolutions, but I do think, in the interest of carrying on the business of the Senate, that which has to be done to a successful conclusion before the 4th of March, it would facilitate the transaction of business if we should put off the consideration of the resolutions for another day or two.

Mr. CHANDLER. The Senator from Illinois will see that if we begin at 3 o'clock on these resolutions we shall dispose of them before midnight, and then the Senator can go on with the appropriation bill, if, indeed, we do not pass it to-day. I see no reason why we should not pass the pending appropriation bill to-day.

Mr. CULLOM. I fully expect the Senate to pass the bill now under consideration to-day, but there is another one that ought to be considered after the pending bill is taken care of.

Mr. ALLEN. If I can—

Mr. CHANDLER. I will not put off my request for any appropriation bill. I ask that at 3 o'clock on Monday we may go on with these resolutions.

Mr. ALLEN. If I can be permitted to wedge in a word between the Senator from New Hampshire and the Senator from Illinois, I should like to ask the Senator from New Hampshire what has become of the agreement that is said to have been made with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. McENERY] that his resolution should be taken up and voted on immediately after the treaty was ratified.

Mr. CHANDLER. I did not know that there had been any agreement, Mr. President.

Mr. ALLEN. I observe the continued absence of one of the chieftains of that evening who was leading the Republican forces, and I did not know but that possibly our friends on the other side were waiting for his return.

Mr. HOAR. Will the Senator speak a little louder? I do not hear him very distinctly.

Mr. ALLEN. I am doing the best I possibly can.

Mr. HOAR. I rise, then, to a question of order, and I ask for order in the Senate Chamber. The Senator from Nebraska certainly has a voice that ought to be heard. Yet I can not hear him.

Mr. ALLEN. I have a severe cold.

Mr. HOAR. I do not think the difficulty is with the Senator's voice, but it is on account of the noise in the Chamber.

Mr. BACON. We can not hear the Senator from Massachusetts. We do not know on this side what he said.

Mr. ALLEN. It ought not to take long in the Senate of the United States to reenact the Declaration of Independence, especially when it is quoted literally in the pending resolution.

Mr. ALLISON. Then the Senator would be willing to have an immediate vote, I take it?

Mr. ALLEN. I would be willing to have an immediate vote. I do not want to debate the resolution.

Mr. ALLISON. Then why ask for a prolongation of time?

Mr. ALLEN. The Declaration of Independence has been debated so often that it strikes me it does not need much elucidation at this time.

Mr. CHANDLER. I will state to the Senator from Iowa that my request is in the interest of the other resolutions as well. I do not think that we should distribute the votes upon these resolutions along from time to time through the rest of the session, but that we should dispose of them all at once. That is the reason why I made the request I did.

Mr. ALLISON. Then let us have a vote on them all at once.

Mr. CHANDLER. Let us have a vote on them all at once, beginning at 3 o'clock on Monday. That is what I ask the Senate to agree to.

Mr. ALLEN. I ask unanimous consent for a present vote on the pending resolution, without debate.

Mr. CHANDLER. I ask first that the Vice-President submit to the Senate my request, that all the resolutions be disposed of, beginning at 3 o'clock on Monday.

Mr. ALLEN. Will not the Senator from New Hampshire withdraw his request for the time being and let us take a vote on the pending resolution?

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, if there is to be a vote on the Declaration of Independence, I should like to hear some reason stated why there is a necessity for such a vote. If it is asked to be preserved by being voted for, I want to know the reason for that. Has the Declaration of Independence been abolished?

Mr. BACON. I suggest to the Senator from Nevada that possibly the Senator from Nebraska thinks the vote we took the other day was in conflict with the Declaration of Independence, and consequently it is necessary to renew our allegiance.

Mr. ALLEN. No, Mr. President.

Mr. STEWART. The Declaration of Independence, it is said, must be renewed. If we are going to renew that and repromulgate it, there ought to be some reason given for it, or the people will think we are fooling away the time that should be devoted to their interests.

Mr. MASON. Mr. President, I wish to interrupt the Senator, with his permission.

Mr. ALLEN. How did I get off the floor, Mr. President?

Mr. MASON. Will the Senator from Nebraska yield for a moment? I should like to answer the suggestion of the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. STEWART. I shall not yield for an answer to my suggestion. To give a good reason for reenacting the Declaration of Independence the Senator from Illinois would have to take several days before the country would be satisfied that there is a necessity for such action. I can not yield that much time.

Mr. MASON. No; I will give it all in half a minute. It is merely for the purpose of convincing the Filipinos that when we kill them we are simply giving them the blessings of liberty and that we are still for the Declaration of Independence.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Nebraska has the floor.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, I desire to say in reply to the suggestion of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. BACON], which I fully appreciate, that I was not moved to present this resolution because of the vote on the treaty had in this Chamber the other day. I see no conflict whatever between that vote and the Declaration of Independence. I gave my vote to ratify the treaty; and I am a believer in every principle of the Declaration of Independence.

But, Mr. President, so much has been said in this branch of Congress and in the other, so much agitation has been indulged in by the press of the country, that I thought it not an unwise course to present the substance of the doctrines of the Declaration of Independence by quoting the language of that great charter literally, and asking the Senate of the United States, by a quiet vote, to declare the allegiance not only of the Senate, but of the people to the doctrines therein contained. I did not have the faintest conception when I presented this resolution that the Senate would hesitate for a moment to discuss the contents of the resolution or to reexamine the doctrines of the Declaration of Independence, but I thought that it would adopt the resolution without any controversy.

Mr. BACON. Will the Senator from Nebraska permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. ALLEN. Yes, sir.

Mr. BACON. The Senator from Nebraska said that he noted the absence of one of the chieftains who led the Republicans the other day. I presume that he referred to the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH]. I wish to ask the Senator from Nebraska what was the particular contest to which he alluded in which he said the Senator from Rhode Island led the Republicans?

Mr. ALLEN. The Senator to whom I referred and whose name I have not called—nor shall I call it or refer to the State he has the honor to represent in this Chamber—was very active upon the floor, so far as I could observe, in rallying the forces in support of the ratification of the treaty. In his efforts I fully concurred, and with him I heartily sympathized.

Mr. HOAR. May I make a suggestion to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. ALLEN. Yes, sir.

Mr. HOAR. It is that the Senator from Rhode Island now absent moved one of the resolutions—the one known as the McEnery resolution. I think it was moved by that Senator immediately upon the ratification of the treaty.

Mr. ALLEN. I have made no reference whatever to the Senator from Rhode Island. I had supposed, or did suppose at the time, and my belief in that fact was strengthened by what the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. MASON] said a few days ago, that there was a distinct understanding among our Republican friends that the resolution of the Senator from Louisiana should be taken up and voted upon without any hesitancy and without delay. I was not a party to that understanding. I do not know, in fact, that it exists except as I infer that it exists, and I conclude from what the Senator from Illinois [Mr. MASON] said that there was such an agreement.

Mr. President, if there was any understanding, express or implied, with the Senator from Louisiana that his resolution should be voted upon and he was induced to vote for the ratification of the treaty with a distinct understanding that his resolution, expressive of certain doctrines, should be passed almost concurrently with it, then it occurs to me that good faith requires the taking up of that resolution without delay and submitting it to the Senate for a vote.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Will the Senator from Nebraska allow me to interrupt him?

Mr. ALLEN. I will.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. I have heard a great deal said in this Chamber about some agreement made with the Senator from Louisiana by some one. I desire to say that, so far as I am concerned, I knew of no such agreement and I know of no such agreement. If anything of that sort happened I was not consulted, and I know that numerous other Republican Senators were not consulted any more than myself. I do not know anything about the fact charged. I want to say that, so far as I am concerned, I am not a party to any agreement, I am not bound by any agreement.

Mr. ALLEN. I am not making any charge against the Senator from Connecticut. Knowing him as I do, I would be bound to acquit him in my own mind without any protest on his part. I have every reason to believe that if he had been a party to the agreement he would insist upon its being lived up to in good faith. But it was charged in this Chamber a few days ago, and it has not been contradicted or denied, that there was an understanding upon the Republican side of this Chamber that the resolution of the Senator from Louisiana should be taken up and considered. Mr. President, all the evidence is to that effect. There is nothing to contradict it.

Now, I was not a party to that agreement. If there was such an agreement, I knew nothing about it. I am not bound by it. I am not a Republican, thank God, and I am not bound by its caucuses or decrees. But if such an agreement exists, good faith among men requires its observance.

I am not specially interested in the passage of the resolution of the Senator from Louisiana, although I heartily concur in its declarations and in its doctrines. Mr. President, in the light of the agitation that has been going on, and in the light of the circumstances under which the treaty of Paris was ratified here a few days ago, I am concerned only in having the Senate of the United States once more, without any lengthy debate, declare that the doctrines of the Declaration of Independence are still in force in this country.

Mr. STEWART. I should like to make an inquiry of the Senator from Nebraska, if he knows. This agreement is new to me. I know nothing about it. What was the date of it with reference to the war now raging in the Philippine Islands?

Mr. ALLEN. The date of what?

Mr. STEWART. Of the agreement, if there was an agreement.

Mr. ALLEN. I suppose it was made here the day we voted on the treaty.

Mr. STEWART. Was it made before or after hostilities broke out in the Philippine Islands?

Mr. ALLEN. I do not know anything about that.

Mr. STEWART. War might abrogate an agreement of that kind. War abrogates laws and changes conditions.

Mr. ALLEN. I do not know anything about that.

Mr. STEWART. If there was an agreement, I should want to know the date.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, there is no war in the Philippine Islands.

Mr. STEWART. Is there no war when 4,000 people were killed in one battle?

Mr. ALLEN. Very well; it is not a war within the legal definition of war. It is a rebellion, if it is anything, at this time.

Mr. STEWART. It is a state of hostilities.

Mr. ALLEN. I know nothing about this agreement, as I said to the Senate a moment ago, and which I suppose the Senator from Nevada heard, except such evidences as I found existing on this floor the day we voted upon the treaty and such revelations as were made by the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. MASON] a day or two after that. I understood that Senator to say that there was such an agreement. I have yet to hear a Senator on the other side of the Chamber or on this side deny it, and when a reputable witness testifies to a fact and it is uncontradicted by any other evidence, I take it for granted that the statement must be taken as true. But I am not concerned, as I said, in that matter at all, further than to observe that there seems to be a disposition to get away from the McEnery resolution as rapidly and as quietly as possible.

I have presented this resolution. It quotes the substance of the Declaration of Independence literally. There is no change in its language. There is an absolute embodiment by quotation of the great doctrines of the Declaration of Independence in the resolution.

Now, if the Senate of the United States, under those circumstances, wants to vote it down, or wants to send it into the caverns of this great Capitol to remain throughout the ages with millions of other valuable documents that have gone there, I am perfectly willing it shall do so.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, we do not wish to send into the tomb of the Capulets, to which the Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST] so frequently alludes in this Chamber, either the resolution of the Senator from Missouri or the resolution of the Senator from Nebraska, or that presented by the Senator from Louisiana, or the resolution offered by the Senator from Georgia. We wish a vote upon them.

Mr. MASON. Or even my little resolution.

Mr. CHANDLER. Or even the mild and moderate, tender and affectionate resolution of the Senator from Illinois, which I came so near forgetting. Mr. President, we want them all disposed of. It is appropriate that the Senate should dispose of them.

The Senator from Nebraska speaks of an agreement. I made no agreement with anybody. The remark needs qualification. I made no agreement with anyone except that I did state I had been endeavoring for ten days to secure a vote upon the resolution offered by the Senator from Georgia. I thought, as the Senator from Georgia well knows, that after unanimous consent had been given to vote upon the treaty on Monday it would be courteous and wise to agree to preliminary votes upon these resolutions, and I so stated.

Mr. President, if the Senator from Nebraska wants confessions, I will say that I had informed Senators that I myself was willing to vote for the resolution offered by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. LINDSAY]. There is another series of resolutions that I had forgotten. I had expressed a willingness to vote for the resolution as finally offered by the Senator from Kentucky. I had expressed a willingness to vote for the resolution offered by the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. SULLIVAN] and for the resolution offered by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. McENERY]. I thought the best way to dispose of the whole question, instead of passing upon all of the resolutions separately, would be to take up some one of them and, by means of motions to amend, dispose of the whole series of propositions.

Mr. RAWLINS. Mr. President—

Mr. CHANDLER. And I said to the Senator from Louisiana, and I said to other Senators, that immediately after the ratification of the treaty, as I had been willing to vote to do before the ratification of the treaty, I would vote to go on to dispose of these declaratory resolutions. I now yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. RAWLINS. May I ask the Senator from New Hampshire if his request for unanimous consent goes to the point of having all of these resolutions voted upon at one and the same time, in order that all our bargains may be fulfilled by one vote?

Mr. CHANDLER. I do not know what bargain the Senator made, I am sure. I would not advise him to make bargains in reference to matters pending in the Senate, and I hope he has not made any.

Mr. RAWLINS. I have not made any.

Mr. CHANDLER. Unless he should tell me what one he refers to, I could not answer.

Mr. RAWLINS. I do not know; but reference has been made to the fact that somebody has made bargains in relation to some of these resolutions; as to which one or how many of them, I do not know.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, I made no bargains. I have stated a purpose, and I propose to carry out the purpose which I stated to the best of my ability. If the Senator has made any bargain, I hope—although he ought not to have made it—that he will carry it out and make no other.

Mr. RAWLINS. To whom does the Senator refer as having made any bargain?

Mr. CHANDLER. I only referred to the bargain to which the Senator alluded.

Mr. RAWLINS. I did not allude to any bargain except that to which other Senators have alluded.

Mr. CHANDLER. I beg pardon of the Senator. When he spoke of "all the bargains which we had made" or "all our bargains," I supposed he meant that he himself had been connected with some bargain, and I wish to disclaim any connection with it myself.

Mr. RAWLINS. The point of my inquiry is this: Is it the proposition of the Senator to take a vote upon all these resolutions at one and the same time?

Mr. CHANDLER. All at one and the same time serially, and to dispose of them all, beginning at 3 o'clock on Monday.

Mr. ALLEN. As a bargain must have a consideration to bind it, will the Senator from New Hampshire be kind enough to state what the consideration was?

Mr. CHANDLER. Therein there was not a bargain, because there was no consideration for it.

Mr. ALLEN. I thought there was.

Mr. CHANDLER. And that is the distinction. I stated a purpose, Mr. President; other Senators stated the same purpose; and for one I am willing to do now as I was willing to do a week before the treaty was ratified in the Senate of the United States, to give an opportunity to vote upon all these questions. I think it is fair to do that, and I hope my request will be acceded to by the Senate.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I merely wish to say that a week ago the Foreign Relations Committee endeavored to get unanimous consent for voting on all the then pending resolutions, and they endeavored several times afterwards to get votes upon those resolutions. The reasons of our failure were perfectly obvious, and there is no need of going into it. I should now be very glad personally, as a week ago I should have been very glad, to vote on and dispose of all these resolutions. But I do not think it is quite fair to take what is certainly one of the latest resolutions offered and dispose of that first. Some of these resolutions have been long before the Senate. I think the only fair way is to agree upon a time, as proposed by the Senator from New Hampshire, when the Senate will take up all the resolutions and give a vote on each one of them. I think every Senator who offered a resolution on that important subject is entitled to have a vote upon it, and I think the only fair way to give unanimous consent is so that all the resolutions may be taken up, and not one apart from the others.

Mr. BERRY. Will the Senator from Massachusetts permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. LODGE. Certainly.

Mr. BERRY. Do I understand the Senator to say that the Foreign Relations Committee in the Senate made a request for unanimous consent, or that there is anything in the RECORD to show anything of that kind?

Mr. LODGE. I think the request was made in open Senate more than once by the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. BERRY. On last Friday?

Mr. LODGE. Before last Friday.

Mr. BERRY. I will state that in my opinion the RECORD will show nothing of the kind. It will not show that any such request was ever made in open Senate, either on last Friday or before last Friday.

Mr. LODGE. The Foreign Relations Committee met upon Wednesday. That is why I gave that date.

Mr. BERRY. I do not know what the Foreign Relations Committee did while in committee, but I am speaking about the record of the proceedings of the Senate.

Mr. LODGE. My recollection was that on that very day, before we went into executive session, the first attempt was made to get a vote on the resolution of the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. BERRY. My recollection is that an effort was made continuously, at least for several days, by the Senator from Georgia to get unanimous consent, and objection was made. The last objection, I think, was made by the Senator from Montana [Mr. CARTER]. I do not think the Senator from Massachusetts can find

anything in the RECORD to show that the Foreign Relations Committee or any one who was in favor of the treaty at any time, either on last Friday or before, ever made any request for unanimous consent to get a vote on the resolution.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from New Hampshire and the Senator from Massachusetts, who, I understand, are—well, I will not say "the managers of this matter," but they have the subject under control, and possibly represent the gentleman who made the pledges, the absent Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH], who, I understand, has gone to Europe—whether or not, in their knowledge, promises were made before the vote was taken on the treaty that if certain Senators would vote a certain way they would pass the resolution offered by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. McENERY]?

Mr. CHANDLER. In the first place, I will say as to the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH] that he is not in good health, and had arranged some time ago to go to Europe by the advice of his physician. He is not now here, and I can not answer for him. But, Mr. President, I know of no agreement whatever that Senators should vote in any particular way on any resolution.

I have stated before that I had reached the conclusion that I would vote in favor of three different resolutions, if any of them came up for a vote; and I have always said that I would endeavor to get a vote upon all those resolutions, beginning with the resolution of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. BACON]; but I know of no agreement made by any Senator as to how he would vote upon any particular resolution.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President—

Mr. CULLOM. If the Senator will allow me, I should like to know exactly what the question now before the Senate is?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. A request for unanimous consent for a vote upon the resolutions referred to on Monday next at 3 o'clock.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President, since the statement just made by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. CHANDLER] I feel called upon to ask the Senator from Illinois [Mr. MASON] to tell us to what pledges or promises or agreements he alluded to the day before yesterday that had been—well—not carried out; and that if they were not carried out, he would feel that he had been buncoed?

Mr. MASON. Mr. President, it is with some degree of reluctance that I take the witness stand; but I desire, before testifying in this case, to be granted immunity. I desire, however, an opportunity to see whether the Senate of the United States will give the unanimous consent asked for.

Mr. HOAR. May I ask the Senator from Illinois whether he means that he is going to turn State's evidence? [Laughter.]

Mr. MASON. That would answer the question which I have declined to answer.

Mr. President, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. CHANDLER] asked unanimous consent that we be permitted to vote upon these resolutions. I had a resolution that I spoke to more than a month ago—a month ago yesterday—and I have asked continually for unanimous consent that a vote might be had on it. I had no agreement that the Senate would give it. The friends of the treaty objected at first, and when the friends of the treaty got ready to vote, the enemies of the treaty objected; and so, between the upper and nether millstone, my resolution has gone in the usual way to the Senatorial graveyard and I have kissed it goodbye; but I have been led to believe by the friends of the treaty that we should have an opportunity to vote upon the resolution of the Senator from Louisiana.

I can not say that the bunco is continued until I find who objects and ascertain whether agreements that were made will be kept or not. The gentleman with whom I had the talk is not present in the Chamber, and I shall not testify in his absence. I will state that an agreement was had, so far as I understood it; and I am charging no gentleman upon this floor at that time with any breach of faith. I say now, however, if the request of the Senator from New Hampshire is granted, there can be no occasion for further discussion and no further occasion for the exchange of courtesies on either side.

I understand the position to be a simple position. Why thrash old straw? Why not pass upon all these questions now by agreeing to the request now made by the Senator from New Hampshire? If we can have unanimous consent, there will be no need of discussing this matter. In the presence of this great calamity, with our country at war with natives who have never injured us, at war with natives who have been our allies within the last six months, following the example set by the illustrious Weyler in the destruction of villages, I hope there will be no occasion to seek party advantage on either side. Let us be given at least an opportunity to express ourselves, and then let Senators vote on either side as they please. I ask that in fair play; and, so far as I am concerned, I believe there is a disposition in the Senate now to give us that opportunity, as requested by the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. BACON obtained the floor.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Georgia yield? Mr. BACON. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts if he desires to speak.

Mr. LODGE. I merely wish to say that I spoke of Wednesday last in referring to the Committee on Foreign Relations, the day that committee met. I was mistaken in supposing that the request for unanimous consent came from the chairman of the committee. I now find that the request for unanimous consent came from the Senator from Georgia [Mr. BACON]. The chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee then said:

Mr. DAVIS. So far as I am authorized to speak, there is no objection to a vote upon the joint resolution now—

That is, the joint resolution of the Senator from Georgia—

There has been no dilatory intention in anything which has been done.

That was the attitude of the Foreign Relations Committee last Wednesday, and has been their attitude ever since. They have interposed no objection to a vote on any of the resolutions. They were ready to vote then, and they are ready to vote now. As I said before, all I desire is that the resolutions shall have an equal and fair chance.

Mr. BERRY. If the Senator from Georgia will permit me, I wish to say that I stated a while ago that the Senator from Georgia had pressed consideration of his resolution during all of last week—not every day, but at different times—and that no proposition to allow a vote upon the resolution came from the friends of the treaty prior to a week ago yesterday; and the RECORD bears me out in what I say.

Mr. LODGE. I withdrew the statement as to where the proposition came from. The proposition came from the Senator from Georgia, and was consented to by the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, I do not desire to go into the question which was raised by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]. It is sufficient to say in reply to it that while that was stated by the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the vote was prevented on that day and on the succeeding day by Senators on the other side of the Chamber who favored the treaty and were not willing that there should be a vote upon the resolutions.

With reference to the request of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. CHANDLER], that we should have unanimous consent to vote upon these resolutions, I desire to say a word. In the first place, I desire to suggest to the Senate that whatever resolutions are passed now should be considered with very great care, because they will be the enunciation by the Senate of the permanent policy which it is understood and intended that this Government shall pursue relative to the Philippine Islands.

With reference to the various resolutions, if they are proposed to be taken up seriatim, there are some of them to which I would consent that there should be a vote without discussion, and there are others that I would not make such a consent about.

In reference to the resolutions which I had the honor to introduce, I am perfectly content now, as I have been for weeks past, that the Senate shall at any time vote upon them without discussion.

In the same way, with reference to the resolutions offered by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. ALLEN], I would be willing to take a vote without discussion, although I may be pardoned for suggesting that I think the resolutions which he has introduced would more correctly speak the truth if he would amend them by saying that "the principles embodied in the Declaration of Independence ought to be now binding upon the people of the United States;" for I very much question, in view of recent events, whether a declaration that they are binding would be strictly correct.

Mr. President, in reference to the resolutions offered by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. McENERY], I desire to say that, while I am ready to take them up for consideration at any time, I would not consent to a vote upon them without discussion.

Mr. TILLMAN. And amendment.

Mr. BACON. And amendment. My reason for that is that I think an analysis of those resolutions will show that they are the most vicious resolutions, the most objectionable resolutions which have been introduced here, and that they are not entitled to the support of anyone who does not believe in a permanent colonial policy with reference to the Philippine Islands. In other words, a discussion of those resolutions and an analysis of those resolutions will show that if strictly pursued, whether they require it or not, they will authorize and justify a permanent colonial policy in the Philippine Islands. Resolutions embodying such a proposition, of course, Mr. President, can not be allowed to pass the Senate without a discussion as to whether or not it is true that such is the effect of the resolutions.

Therefore, while I am ready to vote without discussion upon the resolutions introduced by myself, while I am ready to vote

without discussion upon the resolutions offered by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. ALLEN], while I am ready to vote without discussion upon the resolutions offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. MASON], while I am ready to vote, as the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. FAULKNER] suggests, also on the resolutions offered by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. LINDSAY], I am not ready to vote for them without discussion and without proposals of amendment, because I do not think they exactly express—

Mr. FAULKNER. If the Senator will permit me, I do not understand that the unanimous consent asked for by the Senator from New Hampshire involves the voting on any of these resolutions without amendment. They are all open to amendment by reason of the unanimous consent.

Mr. BACON. But not to discussion.

Mr. FAULKNER. But not to discussion.

Mr. BACON. I am not willing to vote upon the resolutions offered by the Senator from Kentucky without discussion, nor am I willing to vote on the resolutions offered by the Senator from Louisiana without discussion, and I do not see why there should be an effort made to embody so many of these resolutions in the unanimous-consent agreement. If the Senator desires to ask unanimous consent for each one of these resolutions, then we will give a response as to each of them. I have indicated the ones I am ready to vote upon without discussion and without amendment, if you please, but as to the others I shall claim the right both of discussion and of amendment.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. President, this résumé of the history of the few days just passed is but calculated to lead to the same mischievous results that have followed this discussion, or this feature of it, from the inception of the debate on the treaty with Spain. It has seemed to me at every hour of the debate unwise and impolitic to discuss in this forum the terms of a surrender for our Army assailed by the rebels at Manila. Those people, in arms against the authority of the United States, voluntarily appealed from the civil forum to the arbitrament of war. Let that appeal be first determined in the forum selected by the men who are firing on our flag to-day.

Mr. President, the people of the United States will, after due consideration and in due time, determine upon a policy humane in itself and in perfect harmony with the spirit of our institutions and Constitution for the final disposition of the Philippine Islands and the people who reside upon them. At this moment certain Senators desire to force the issue and compel our flag to be lowered on those islands in the presence of a vicious and apparently unrelenting foe. The people of this country will not submit to that course of procedure. It is not in harmony with the past action of the American people upon any question. They have never been driven and they never will be driven one inch upon any public question relating to either foreign or domestic policy.

The purposes, apparently, of presenting these resolutions at the present time may be considered as twofold—first, to pledge the people of the United States for all time in the future to be true to themselves, their traditions, their laws, and the Constitution of the country. That pledge is unnecessary. It is an insinuation in and of itself upon the integrity of purpose and the patriotism of the people of the United States.

The second purpose of the resolutions—they are all about the same—must of necessity be the holding out of a flag of truce and the begging of terms from the men who fired upon the line of American troops surrounding the city of Manila.

The way to impress the Oriental people is not to beg for terms. Our kindness has been construed to mean weakness. Our discussion has been construed to indicate a temporizing policy. Let these questions be settled in the forum selected by the insurgents on the island of Luzon. When settled there, they can trust, without doubt as to the ultimate result, the conscience, the intelligence, and the love of justice and liberty prevailing throughout these United States.

I would not pass any resolution offering terms or seeking consideration at the hands of any body of men who voluntarily flew in the face of the proclamation of the President and fired upon the flag of this country. Whosoever that flag may have been floating, or may float in the future, it must be treated with respect, and can not be fired upon with impunity.

Mr. President, this discussion about bargains, deals, and dickers does not comport with the dignity of this body, according to my conception of its true dignity. It does seem to me if any Senator desires the resolutions voted upon he has a perfect right to ask for the vote to be taken; and it is the right of any Senator here, in the exercise of the ordinary prerogatives of his office, to insist upon further discussion or upon reasonable delay. I am not prepared to-day to vote on any resolution. I am not prepared to object to the consideration of all of them.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, since the consideration of the resolution of the Senator from Louisiana has been objected to, there can not be unanimous consent for the taking of a vote upon

it without discussion; and I believe that is the only resolution with reference to which it is claimed that there is any kind of agreement. I know nothing of any agreement to vote upon any of the resolutions by unanimous consent.

I wish to say that, under the circumstances, before any resolution is voted upon I desire to make a few remarks. I want my position understood with regard to this matter. A vote on any one of the resolutions might greatly misrepresent me if I voted for it in its present shape, and if I voted against it my vote might be misunderstood. So, being at liberty, since objection has been made, to be heard upon the subject, I will now give notice that when the resolutions come up, I shall submit some remarks upon the whole subject of the expansion of our territory.

I do not think expansion has been fully discussed. There seems to be a cowardice in treating the subject. There does not appear to be perfect freedom in the discussion. Senators appear to be under restraint. I think it is premature to discuss the question now. It will be time enough in the next year or two to do that. I do not think we need any discussion upon the subject; but whenever there is an occasion for it, whenever we are to be committed upon any of these propositions, I think we ought to consider all sides of the question.

It may be possible that the people of the United States will be unwilling to give up what they have acquired by war; it may be that there will be what they consider some commercial advantages which they will want to retain. It may be that they will not deal entirely with the sentimental side of the question. They may want to take some practical view of it.

Let them have time to think the matter over. I do not think we should forestall them as to what we will do with these islands; I think it is entirely premature to do that now. Six months or a year or two or three years hence will develop the facts, and the American Government will be better able to deal with it when they have a full knowledge of the facts than they are now, with the limited knowledge they have.

I think the passage of these resolutions would forestall the action of the Government in the future, and it is entirely premature to do that. It is not certain that the fact that we secure sugar lands in those islands enough to supply ourselves and the world with sugar would be detrimental—

Mr. ALLEN. Will the Senator permit me to interrupt him a moment?

Mr. STEWART. No; not now.

It is not certain that having tobacco lands enough to have the monopoly of the tobacco and cigars of the world would be detrimental to this country; it is not certain that having coffee lands enough to supply our country with coffee would be detrimental to us; and it is not certain that if those islands were annexed they would disturb our political institutions, because certainly nobody would allow the people there to vote or to take part in the government of this country until they were qualified; and that would take considerable time. New Mexico has been a Territory for fifty years, and she is still kept out. She is still in a condition of pupillage, and not yet ripe for statehood. They have not understood the English language or our institutions sufficiently to justify us in admitting them, because we know that republican principles can not be expressed in any language but the English language; and we know that freedom is expressed in the English language, and in no other language.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President—

Mr. STEWART. I decline to be interrupted.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Nevada declines to be interrupted.

Mr. TILLMAN. But if the Senator will allow me, he has been here thirty years and he is no youngster here, so that he certainly can submit to an interruption.

Mr. STEWART. Certainly I can submit to an interruption greatly to my advantage, but probably to the disadvantage of the Senator from South Carolina. [Laughter.]

Mr. TILLMAN. Then the Senator does not object to having some of his propositions elucidated a little more fully than he is elucidating them?

Mr. STEWART. I do object to it in my speech—you can have your time later—because, in the first place, I do not think the Senator from South Carolina has got information enough to elucidate the subject.

Mr. TILLMAN. Let me prove that.

Mr. STEWART. No; I want to proceed. I am not going to be interrupted.

Mr. TILLMAN. You object to a man showing that he knows a little something about a proposition.

Mr. STEWART. It can not be allowed under the rules that two Senators shall have the floor at the same time.

Mr. TILLMAN. I thought I might enlighten the Senator, in view of the fact that he has been absent for some time and did not have anything to do with this matter.

Mr. STEWART. I have been reading the Senator's speeches,

and I am certain he can not give me any light on the subject [laughter], and I do not expect a great deal of information from those who have spoken most frequently on this subject, because, though I have been absent, I have been reading their speeches.

I do not think all the reasons for retaining what we have acquired by the war have been given, and the assumption that our institutions would be interfered with by people who can not participate in them for a century or two under any circumstances, however diligently we may go to work to educate them, I do not believe is well founded. Besides, whenever there is any danger of our system being disturbed by them it will be within the power of this Government to deliver itself from any such danger. The people of the United States are not going to have their institutions endangered by incorporating into the body politic sections of country inhabited by people who are incapable of maintaining republican institutions. That question can be met, and will be met, when it comes.

I have heard it suggested here that the Filipinos would interfere with our labor system. It seems to me that impression is founded in profound ignorance or want of investigation. There never has been in the history of the world emigration of laborers from the tropical to the temperate zone. I have heard the Chinese alluded to as if they had done it. That is not true. The Chinese who have come to this country come from a climate entirely similar to ours. You never see any of the Formosans or southern Chinese, who live in a tropical climate, coming here.

Such a thing never happened, and it never will. They do not go from India to England, nor from the tropical portions of Africa to England, although they are under the English Government. A case can not be cited where the inhabitants of the Tropics have gone to a temperate zone to labor, and they are not coming here to labor. The difficulty is they do not labor enough at home. It has frequently happened that men have gone from temperate to tropical zones to labor, but not with great success; they do not stay there long. So the labor question is eliminated by nature.

Then, again, if we have these islands with their tropical productions, which are our main imports, we shall have the balance of trade in our favor. Heretofore it has been against us, owing to the importations of tropical products, such as sugar, coffee, and tobacco. The balance of trade against us of two or three hundred million dollars a year, perhaps, has come from these tropical productions. I do not propose at this time to go into details. These products come from that source where we can be supplied, and if we are supplied by a part of our own country, we should not have to pay the money out to foreigners.

Besides that so far from being against American labor, it would be greatly in favor of American labor, for we would manufacture everything that those people require. Manufacturing is always done in the temperate zone, always has been, and always will be; and it will not be done elsewhere. We would have the exclusive trade, and we should have an enormous trade in supplying them with our productions and our manufactures. The American people, in view of these facts, may come to the conclusion that we want to keep all the islands when that question is open to consideration. It seems premature to preclude ourselves as to the question by any resolution when no action is required. Let us wait until action is required; and then act in view of the condition of things that may then be developed and understood.

I hope when these resolutions come up we shall have a fair and free discussion of them, not jump in the dark and pass vague resolutions committing the Government to propositions which we may want to repudiate hereafter.

I am glad that the resolutions are not going to come up by unanimous consent, although I should not have objected myself, because I was not here and did not know what arrangement had been made.

Mr. MASON. I desire to interrupt the Senator for a moment.

Mr. STEWART. Not now. I do not want to break any arrangement which anybody has made, and since the Senator from Georgia has objected to the resolution of the Senator from Louisiana, the whole thing is opened, and I give notice that the resolutions will be debated when they are called up.

Mr. MASON. I rose to ask the Senator from Nevada a question. I did not understand that anybody objected to the request for unanimous consent.

Mr. STEWART. Yes. The Senator from Georgia objected to the request for unanimous consent for a vote on the resolution of the Senator from Louisiana.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The request has not yet been put to the Senate.

Mr. MASON. That is the way I understood it.

Mr. MCENERY. Mr. President, referring to the criticisms of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. BACON] on the resolutions I introduced relative to the future policy of this Government toward the Philippines, I desire only to say a few words. They are in effect identical with the policy declared in reference to the island

of Cuba. The moment the Spanish troops left the island of Cuba, just at that moment the entire sovereignty of the United States passed over every inch of the soil of that island. Notwithstanding that there was a mere relinquishment of sovereignty by Spain, the actual sovereignty passed to the Government of the United States. There is not a community that does not owe allegiance to some government, and every Cuban owes allegiance to the Government of the United States. The Government of the United States has authority, has power, it has all the manifestations of sovereignty, internal and external, with reference to that island. If those people to-day commit an offense against any foreign power, who is responsible—the people of Cuba directly, or the Government of the United States? We control the courts, the revenues of the island, and we have in our hand the destiny of that people.

So it is with the Philippine Islands. The word "cede" has practically no significance so far as practical effects are concerned. In the Philippine Islands the Government of the United States would to-day exercise the same authority over all those islands were it not for the resistance now inaugurated against the authority of the Government of the United States. In reference to Cuba the resolution was that this Government pledged to the Cuban people a stable government. It went no further than that, promising to remit that island to them when a stable government should be established. Who is to judge of the stability of that government? The people of the United States. There is no limit given within which that discretion shall be exercised. It may be, as said by the Senator from Georgia with reference to the Philippine Islands, permanent and forever unless this Government, in its discretion, says that they have a stable government and that it is willing to turn the islands over to them.

These resolutions are not so strong as the resolutions in reference to the island of Cuba. They simply declare that the Government of this country intended by the ratification of this treaty of peace not to permanently annex those islands as an integral part of the territory of the United States. What objections can gentlemen on this side of the Chamber have to that declaration? Every utterance they have made has been against annexation. Now, here is a declaration committing this Government, at least for the present, against incorporating those people into the citizenship of the United States and of annexing their territory as an integral part of the territory of the United States. That is what they have been clamoring for. There will go probably into the next Democratic platform a declaration against annexation. What inconsistency! To proclaim against it here and put it in a platform and to go before their people and demand a policy of non-annexation!

Now, as to the latter part of the resolution, it gives this Government discretion just as it does in the case of the island of Cuba—a discretion to determine when those people have learned the principles of self-government and when they shall be able to take care of themselves. The resolution was left purposely open to give the Government of this country a wide discretion in the disposition of those islands. We can not tell what the future may bring forth. It may be a few years, it may be a quarter of a century, it may be a century before those people can learn the principles of self-government. If within that period or within the near future they develop that capacity, then we can turn those islands over to them. But, on the contrary, if they desire to become annexed to the Government of the United States, as in the case of Hawaii, then the discretion is left open for this Government to accept their proposition.

I see nothing in the resolutions that would authorize this Government to deal differently with these people than it is now dealing with the people of Cuba.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, so long as it is the intention to discuss this resolution, that it be considered next Tuesday at 2 o'clock, and that a vote be taken before adjournment on that day.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. CHANDLER] has asked for a unanimous-consent agreement, which the Chair will put first.

Mr. BACON. I understand the request of the Senator from Louisiana to be that the resolution be taken up at 2 o'clock on Tuesday.

Mr. MCENERY. On Tuesday.

Mr. BACON. And that it be voted on before adjournment. I have no objection to that request.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from New Hampshire made the first request of the Senate.

Mr. CHANDLER. In view of the suggestion of the Senator from Louisiana, I will change the day, putting my request in the same form, but substituting Tuesday instead of Monday.

Mr. ALLEN. I understand that the request of the Senator from Louisiana is in substance the request of the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. CHANDLER. There is one day's difference.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator changes the hour, also.

Mr. CHANDLER. I ask to have my request stated.

Mr. ALLISON. The request of the Senator from Louisiana embodies only his own resolution, while the request of the Senator from New Hampshire includes all resolutions.

Mr. CHANDLER. The Chair will kindly state my request as modified.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Unanimous consent is asked that on Tuesday next, at 2 o'clock p. m., the joint resolution, No. 240, introduced by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. McENERY], and all other resolutions on the same subject, whether joint resolutions or Senate declarations, be taken up for consideration and be disposed of before adjournment on that day. That is the request of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. CHANDLER]. Is there objection?

Mr. BACON. Which is the one we are to act upon now; that request or the request of the Senator from Louisiana?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from New Hampshire made the first request, then the Senator from Nebraska made another, and the Senator from Louisiana a third request.

Mr. VEST. Mr. President, I should like, with the permission of the Senate, to say a few words in regard to this request. I shall make no objection to the request, and have been too ready at any time to vote upon any or all of the resolutions, including the one submitted by myself. I am bound to say, however, that action upon any of these resolutions now seems to me very much like sending for an eminent physician after the patient is dead. I have been told that just after the last war a large convention was held in a certain State of the Union at which a prominent gentleman offered resolutions, some thirty days after the surrender at Appomattox, declaring that the colored people were entitled to their freedom. He supplemented the offering of the resolutions with the remark that thirty years before in another convention at another place he had offered the same resolutions. A ragged Confederate interrupted him by saying, "Mr. Chairman, it seems to me the first resolution was thirty years too soon, and I will swear the last resolution is thirty days too late." [Laughter.]

Mr. President, what can be a broader farce than our passing a resolution in regard to the policy of the United States when we have already declared that policy at the mouth of cannon, in the rattling of musketry, and are shooting our doctrine into the people of the Philippine Islands as fast as possible? Why shall we now, after we have put into practical operation our intention in this matter, declare by resolutions what we intend to do when we are already doing what we intend to do? When the peace treaty, as it is termed, the treaty of Paris, was ratified by the Senate, it followed logically and absolutely that if the people of the Philippine Islands resisted the terms of that treaty, which was a cession of their country to the United States, they must be coerced into submission. There was not an intelligent man who did not know that every one of us who dared to make any protest against the coercion of the Filipinos would be denounced, if not as a traitor, then, in the language of the Senator from Montana, as engaging in what was dangerously near to treason. There was not a single man in the United States of average intelligence who did not know that the logical result of the treaty would be that it should be carried out by such means as were necessary to the last extremity of the military power of this country.

All of us, possibly, have heard of that Irish nobleman, a very brilliant man, but who had the unfortunate faculty of becoming the debtor of every tradesman within reach. He was approached by one of his creditors with the request that he settle his bill. He said he did not have the money to settle it. "Well," said the creditor, "give me your note, and make it payable whenever you please." "With the greatest pleasure," said his lordship; and he immediately wrote a note for the full amount, payable one day after judgment. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. McENERY] proposes that we adopt a resolution declaring that whenever we think that the people of the Philippine Islands are fit for self-government we will give it to them. Is that the meaning of the Declaration of Independence, that all governments derive their just powers from whom and from what? From the consent of the governor, from the consent of the victor? As I have read it, it is from the consent of the governed; and I assert here to-day that the meaning of that Declaration is that there is not a people upon the face of the earth so poor, so ignorant, so degraded that they are not entitled to choose their own government, be it good or bad, republican or monarchical.

I put this question now to every Senator on this floor: If we are to determine when these people are to have the right of self-government, then what becomes of the declaration that the consent of the governed confers just power upon the government? Oh, it is said, but we did the same thing as to Cuba. We did nothing of the sort. We pledged ourselves to restore order in Cuba, so the people could determine upon their form of government. Have we done that as to the Philippines? On the contrary, we have changed the declaration and forced Spain to cede

to us the absolute ownership of the islands, and we are to pay \$20,000,000 ex gratia for that cession. We do not say that we will restore order, enforce law, or let those people choose their own government, but they are our property. They belong to us and we can do with them as we please.

Therefore, Mr. President, I shall make no objection to voting upon these resolutions, because they are simply brutum fulmen. They amount to nothing. We have already declared what we intend to do by what we are doing; and in my judgment it is a travesty upon legislation to ask to take the time of the Senate to attempt to cajole the American people by pretending that we intend to do anything else than what we are doing now.

Mr. TILLMAN. I wish to ask the Senator from Missouri, if he will be kind enough to answer before he sits down, if it is not apparent that the pressing of these resolutions to a vote now is merely to carry out a pledge made before the vote on the treaty came about?

Mr. VEST. I know nothing about any pledge. I have simply heard the statement of the Senator from Illinois, and I believe what that Senator says to be true. I have nothing to say in regard to any pledge, as I was not a party to it.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, this discussion is drifting away somewhat from the resolution before the Senate, but I shall not protract it to any extent, because I desire a disposition of the resolution before the morning hour expires. I can not resist the temptation to respectfully differ with the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST] as respects our attitude toward those islands. I voted for the ratification of the treaty, and I have no apology to make here or elsewhere for doing so. It was my honest conviction that to open up negotiations by a rejection of the treaty or an amendment of its terms might lead to dangerous complications and dangerous consequences; and I preferred to have the whole question within our jurisdiction, so that we might, in accordance with the Declaration of Independence, enable the Filipinos to set up a home government of their own.

Mr. President, our attitude in the Philippine Islands is a military attitude altogether. There is no civil power there. We have held those islands and will hold them by virtue of the military power of this Government until Congress, carrying out a duty imposed upon it by the Constitution, shall formulate and see that there is adopted a system of civil government for those people. I think that position can not be successfully contradicted.

Mr. President, the Senator from Montana [Mr. CARTER] finds some fault with the adoption of any resolution upon the subject of our attitude toward the Philippine Islands. The Senator from Montana manifests considerable hostility to the Filipinos, and with much of that I sympathize. He wants to use the Army and the Navy first to destroy them before any form of government is set up there. I draw the line at that. I thought, while listening to the honorable Senator from Montana in his ferocious assault upon the Filipinos here a few moments ago, that this Government ought to employ his services as a warrior and send him over to that country, that his plume, like that of Henry of Navarre, might wave in front of the battle. There is not the slightest cause to make sport or game of these resolutions. They embrace vital principles of government that must be settled; and no attempt to raise the flag of discontent in this Chamber, let me say to the honorable Senator from Montana, will ever obscure the money question as an issue in Montana or any of the intermountain States.

Mr. President, I wish to call attention to the remarkable attitude of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. STEWART], whom I have been led to believe in the years gone by was a Populist. To my utter surprise I find this morning that he has joined what an associate of ours in the House of Representatives called "plutugols." I do not know how it is spelled.

Mr. MASON. It is not spelled.

Mr. ALLEN. That is the way it is pronounced. The Senator from Illinois can spell it.

Mr. MASON. It is not spelled at all.

Mr. ALLEN. It is just spoken.

Mr. MASON. It is just spoken.

Mr. ALLEN. The Senator from Nevada, if he will permit me the expression, is inclined to be bloodthirsty this morning. He wants to array the Army and Navy against somebody. The Senator from Nevada says that possibly we will give these people a government in two or three years from now; possibly we may not; and I was wondering at the time whether it would be possible for the great gang of agents sent to the Philippine Islands, into Cuba, and into Porto Rico, by what my friend and I know as the money power, to search for gold mines and silver mines and copper mines and locate them within two or three years, so that we can change the form of government at the expiration of that time, would succeed. I am informed that these islands swarm to-day with the agents of this power, and that while certain gentlemen talk about holding the flag over those islands, in fact the purpose of holding the flag there is that they can get control of

the valuable property on those islands before it comes down and another flag goes up. I do not say that is true; I do not know whether it is or not; but I am told that it is true.

Mr. President, a duty is imposed upon us by our occupancy of the Philippine Islands that we can not escape. I would not incorporate those people into the body of our population or make citizens of them at this time. I fully concur in what I understand to be the policy of the President of the United States, to hold them for such reasonable time that the influences and education of this Government may prepare them in some slight degree for the duties of an independent republican form of government. That furnishes no excuse for their assault upon the duly constituted authorities in those islands. That comes from their lack of knowledge. It comes possibly from those who have given them bad advice. I think it does largely. But whether they be responsible or irresponsible, the first great lesson they must learn is obedience to the duly constituted authorities of the islands until the sovereignty changes from that authority to them.

It is to be regretted, it is to be deeply regretted, that there has been any necessity for the use of the Army or the Navy there; but out of it all, out of the struggle and out of the bloodshed that has taken place in the Philippine Islands, let us hope and pray that a new and better civilization may come and the blessings of civil liberty be in time extended to those people.

I ask for the adoption of the resolution.

Mr. CAFFERY. Mr. President, when the Senator from Nevada [Mr. STEWART] had the floor I attempted to ask him a question, which he very brusquely brushed aside. It was whether in his view the sugar from the Philippine Islands would come into the United States free of duty, as he stated that in his opinion it might not be unwise for the United States to take in islands which raise so much of that article. But the discussion took a broader range after other Senators took the floor.

I want to draw the attention of the Senate to the marked difference between the resolution adopted in regard to Cuba and the resolutions pending in regard to the Philippine Islands. In our declaration of war we acknowledged the people of Cuba as a free and independent people. We proceeded further to say that we would help those people organize a stable form of government. In the negotiations of the treaty with Spain we required the relinquishment of Spanish sovereignty over the island of Cuba. In my opinion, that sovereignty lodged in the people whom the United States declared to be free. We acknowledged the germ of government in Cuba by acknowledging the people of the island to be free and independent. We therefore sanctioned the principle that they were capable of government by an acknowledgment through a vote in this Chamber recognizing the belligerency of the Cubans in their war with Spain.

Mr. President, the whole fabric of our Government is based upon the idea that sovereignty lodges in the people and nowhere else. We acknowledged that principle in regard to Cuba. We have not, and, in my opinion, will not acknowledge it in regard to the Philippine Islands. We bought those people as so much merchandise. We have bought them and the territory that they inhabit for \$20,000,000. We have not done that with the island of Cuba. There is the most marked distinction between the two cases. We do not acknowledge that there is a germ of national life in the Philippine Islands. We have acknowledged that that germ exists in Cuba and we are assisting the Cubans to form a stable government.

Now, a government is nothing more than the organ of the sovereign will of any people. We have entirely disregarded any claim whatever of the Philippine people to any government whatever other than the government that we choose to impose upon them. There is a difference between the two cases. The statement of the Senator from Nevada raises, in my opinion, a very important question as to whether or not we will pursue in regard to the Philippine Islands what is termed the open-door policy or whether we must pursue the policy that obtains of free trade between each and every portion of the United States, including the Philippines, and closing the door to other nations, so far as our tariff laws can do so.

I believe the position is taken by some of the friends of the treaty that we can hold these islands perpetually as an appanage of the United States, without subjecting them or without their being subjected to the operation of our tariff laws; in other words, that we can impose a tariff upon the products coming from the Philippines to the United States, just as we do in regard to the products coming from foreign countries. It is a question, I think, of very great moment to the people of the United States whether we can alter the Constitution itself, which prescribes that all duties, taxes, and imposts shall be uniform throughout the United States; whether we can hold these islands perpetually, and place upon the products coming from them just such taxes as we please. I understand that to be the doctrine held by some of the members of the Senate and a great many on the outside of the Senate.

If that is the doctrine, it ought to be debated in these resolutions. We ought to know where we stand. We ought to know whether or not the sugar, the rice, the hemp, and other products coming

from the islands can come in with a duty or without a duty. That is a very material consideration for the people of my State. Some of them down there seem to be under the impression that the products of the islands can be taxed by the Congress of the United States as if they did not belong to the domain of the United States. I believe that is a wrong impression. I believe that taxation must be uniform. I know there are judicial precedents holding that view, and I believe that the precedents are in exact conformity with the Constitution of the United States.

I do not believe that there is any parallel whatever in the case of Cuba and the case of the Philippine Islands. The concluding clause of the resolution introduced by my colleague [Mr. McENERY] gives the United States ample power to dispose of these islands whenever the United States sees proper to do it. We are under no guarantee whatever to them. We have taken them. We do not propose to give them self-government. We only propose in the resolution offered by my colleague to prepare them for local government, and in due time to dispose of them according to the best interests of the people of the United States. That may be to sell them; it may be to alienate them. The term "dispose" would imply that we are to get rid of them. That is not a proper term to use if we are going to incorporate them. To "dispose" looks toward getting rid of them, selling them, alienating them, and not to incorporating them. But, Mr. President, interests will grow up and around the Philippines which will prevent us from letting them go.

The Senator from Nevada says that there is no danger of competition from these islands; that the labor of the Tropics does not come to the temperate zone, and vice versa. That may be true, but if there is a condition of free trade existing between the United States and the Philippine Islands, what is to prevent American capital from exploiting the resources of that country through Malay labor and bringing the product here to compete with American labor?

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President—

Mr. CAFFERY. I decline to be interrupted.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Louisiana will proceed.

Mr. CAFFERY. Now, Mr. President, there is the danger point for our labor. If a condition of free trade exists, and in my opinion it must exist, between the Philippine Islands and the United States, why could not that country be developed in its material resources through low-priced Malay labor, and the product of that labor be brought into the United States to compete with the product of our high-priced labor? Why not? There is the danger; there is the trouble; and nobody can sneer it down and pooh-pooh it away.

Given the conditions of free trade, given the conditions of a stable government, given the conditions of American capital and American ability to organize, why not make the Tropics flourish? Why not develop the resources of the Tropics in the Philippines to their highest extent? They already export 250,000 tons of sugar. They export a vast quantity of manila hemp, the best in the world. Under the conditions that American enterprise and capital and skill could create in those islands, all these products and many more to be developed would come in competition with the products of American labor right here at home.

There is no opportunity there, as the Senator well remarks, for any hard-working, industrious white man to go to the Philippines. He can not stand the climate. If that were an uninhabited country in the temperate zone, notwithstanding it is 7,000 miles away from our coast, if it could afford a place where the American workman, the American yeoman could settle and better his fortunes, it would not be a great evil; but as it is 7,000 miles from our coast, inhabited by a people who perhaps will, at least to a small extent, come here while certain it is that our people can not go there except as capitalists and exploiters, I see, Mr. President, from an economical standpoint, from an industrial standpoint, great danger of the competition of the products of those islands with the products of American home labor.

That point ought to be settled. That point arises in these resolutions, for the resolutions of my colleague say that we must keep those islands until such time—indefinite, perhaps perpetual—as the United States may think proper to dispose of them. There is not in those resolutions a single guaranty of anything but American government; there is not a single statement of anything but the exercise of our authority with the reservation to alienate if we see proper; and pending our absolute control, no doubt such influences will be brought to bear as will perpetuate our dominion there. There is no doubt that the products of the islands, if allowed to come in free, will seriously affect our home industries; and there is no doubt in my mind that they must come in free or the Constitution and the law must be set aside.

PUBLIC BUILDING AT ALTOONA, PA.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to call up the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1273) for a public building at the city of Altoona, Pa., and appropriating money

therefor. The matter went over yesterday at the request of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. COCKRELL]. The bill has passed the Senate and the House and the question is on concurring in the amendments of the House. It will not take more than a minute.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there any objection to the request?
Mr. CULLOM. I have no objection to it.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendments of the House of Representatives will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 1, line 5, strike out "cause to be erected thereon, a" and insert "to contract for the erection and completion of a;" on page 2, line 23, strike out all after the word "alleys" down to and including the word "therein," in line 29; and amend the title so as to read: "A bill for a public building at the city of Altoona, Pa."

Mr. COCKRELL. Let the words struck out by the House of Representatives be read.

The SECRETARY. On page 2, line 22, after the word "alleys," the House of Representatives struck out:

And that no money appropriated for this purpose shall be available until a valid title to the site for said building shall be vested in the United States, nor until the State of Pennsylvania shall have ceded to the United States exclusive jurisdiction over the same, during the time the United States shall be or remain the owner thereof, for all purposes except the administration of the criminal laws of the said State and the service of civil process therein.

Mr. COCKRELL. When the bill was laid before the Senate yesterday and the junior Senator from Pennsylvania moved that the Senate concur in the House amendments, I asked that it might be laid over. I had the House amendment read, which shows that the House has stricken out the provision of the bill which requires the Attorney-General to pass upon the title and requires a cession of the jurisdiction of the State to the United States. It has been the universal rule of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds to have those provisions inserted in all the bills which have heretofore been passed for the erection of public buildings. I suppose the committee knew what they were doing, and that the provision was necessary. Therefore, when I saw that the House had stricken out the provision, I could not consent to the passage of the bill until that question was looked into. I made my objection at the time—

Mr. CULLOM. If the Senator—

Mr. COCKRELL. I am not objecting to the bill now, if the Senator from Illinois will just wait a little while. I will be through in a minute or two, and the amendments will be concurred in.

Mr. CULLOM. I thought the Senator was going to offer an amendment to the House amendment.

Mr. COCKRELL. No; there is no necessity for an amendment. I know exactly what I am doing.

Mr. CULLOM. All right.

Mr. COCKRELL. I objected yesterday until the matter could be looked into. I have conversed with the members of another body which have this matter in charge. I asked for certain information. The distinguished chairman of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. QUAY], is not present. I find that the House committee acted upon what is stated in the following letter addressed to me:

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.,
Washington, D. C., February 9, 1899.

Hon. F. M. COCKRELL,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Representative Hicks, of Pennsylvania, who is interested in the Altoona public-building bill—

That is the bill here—

informs me that you desire some reasons given you for the amendments made to the bill referred to in the House of Representatives. I refer to S. 1273. The reason for the first amendment, in page 1, line 5, is because the committee thought under the amendment that the construction of the building after the site was purchased would be very much hastened with reference to time, and in that respect it would be an improvement over the conditions set out in the original bill.

That I do not object to.

The second amendment, on page 2, line 22, etc., was made at the suggestion of the Treasury Department, Acting Secretary of the Treasury, Hon. O. L. Spaulding, using these words in explanation of his recommendations to the committee: "This prohibition (referring, of course, to the lines in the original bill stricken out by the second amendment, just referred to) will prevent the payment, until after the acquisition of a site, of the customary preliminary expenses, such as advertising, the traveling and subsistence expenses of the agent of this Department who may be detailed to examine and report upon the suitability of such sites as may be offered, etc. Unless it is intended that such items should not be paid promptly, it is suggested that the provisions of section 355, Revised Statutes of the United States, are ample to prevent the purchase of a site until the State has ceded to the United States jurisdiction over the same, or the erection thereon of any building until the Attorney-General has passed favorably on the title thereto, and it is respectfully suggested, therefore, that the prohibitory clause referred to be stricken from the bill, or that the ordinary preliminary expenses be excepted from its operation."

With reference to the amendment offered to the title striking out the appropriation in the Senate bill, I beg leave to state that, under the rules of the House, bills reported by the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds in the House of Representatives are not allowed to carry an appropriation.

Trusting this information will be satisfactory to you, I remain,

Yours, truly,

DAVID H. MERCER.

Mr. SPOONER. What section of the Revised Statutes does the letter refer to?

Mr. COCKRELL. Section 355. Now, Mr. President, if the statement made to me is true, that the Secretary of the Treasury decides that the existing law is ample and that under existing law, without any provision in these special bills, the title will be passed upon by the Attorney-General and the State will have to cede jurisdiction to the United States, there is no necessity for such a provision, and therefore I shall not object to this going out of the bill. I regret that the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds did not take the same view, because I should not have objected to it if it had not been the universal rule of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds to have the provision inserted in the bill, and I thought it was very strange that the House would strike it out after having concurred in it for so long a time.

Mr. VEST. Mr. President, I do not intend to detain the Senate more than a moment. The position taken by the House of Representatives and by the Treasury Department is not a conceded one. There has long been a controversy in both branches of Congress, and especially in the Senate, as to the cession of jurisdiction by a State in regard to the site of a public building of the United States. A former Senator, a member of this body, now deceased, Senator Jones, of Florida, made several very able arguments upon that question. The question alluded to by my colleague has been before the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. The chairman of that committee, now absent, and our deceased friend from Vermont, Mr. Morrill, the oldest member of the committee and its former chairman, always insisted upon this provision being put in the bill.

Mr. COCKRELL. May I read the section of the Revised Statutes referred to?

Mr. VEST. Yes; read the section.

Mr. COCKRELL. I will now read section 355, referred to in the letter I have read:

SEC. 355. No public money shall be expended upon any site or land purchased by the United States for the purposes of erecting thereon any armory, arsenal, fort, fortification, navy-yard, custom-house, light-house, or other public building of any kind whatever, until the written opinion of the Attorney-General shall be had in favor of the validity of the title, nor until the consent of the legislature of the State in which the land or site may be to such purchase has been given.

That is explicit, then.

The district attorneys of the United States, upon the application of the Attorney-General, shall furnish any assistance or information in their power in relation to the titles of the public property lying within their respective districts. And the Secretaries of the Departments, upon the application of the Attorney-General, shall procure any additional evidence of title which he may deem necessary, and which may not be in the possession of the officers of the Government, and the expense of procuring it shall be paid out of the appropriations made for the contingencies of the Departments, respectively.

It does contain it.

Mr. VEST. I simply want to add that this matter has always been disposed of in a perfunctory sort of way in the committee and in the Senate by the statement that it would do no harm to put such a provision in a public-building bill, and out of an abundance of caution it should be put there, as the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. CHANDLER] said some days ago when he offered a resolution distributing different appropriation bills of the Senate, amongst the balance placing the river and harbor bill in the possession of the Committee on Commerce. I called his attention to the fact that that committee already had jurisdiction of that bill. Then he said no harm could come from reenacting that provision in his resolution. That is all there is in this question.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on concurring in the amendments made by the House of Representatives.

The amendments were concurred in.

TICKET BROKERAGE.

Mr. CULLOM. I ask that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is the bill (S. 1575) to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate commerce."

Mr. HOAR. Mr. President—

Mr. CULLOM. Now I ask that that bill be temporarily laid aside, in order that the pending appropriation bill may be proceeded with.

PROPOSED EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. HOAR. I rose before that request was made. I wish merely to get the view of the Senator from Illinois as to the time when it will be agreeable to him to have a motion made to consider executive business.

Mr. CULLOM. Any time after the appropriation bill is disposed of to-day.

Mr. HOAR. At what time does the Senator think the appropriation bill will be disposed of?

Mr. CULLOM. I hope before the ordinary time of adjournment. If not, I shall be glad if the Senate would allow me to

finish it to-day, for the reasons which I intimated yesterday. I think the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. PRITCHARD] does not expect an executive session to-day.

Mr. PRITCHARD. That course will be agreeable to me provided we may have an executive session on Monday immediately after the Senate convenes.

Mr. HOAR. Very well. Then I give notice that if the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill be not sooner disposed of, so as to have an executive session this afternoon, I shall move one after the close of the routine morning business on Monday.

POLICY REGARDING THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS.

Mr. MASON. Mr. President—

Mr. CULLOM. I ask that the legislative appropriation bill be taken up.

Mr. MASON. Mr. President, I rise to a question of order.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Illinois will state his question of order.

Mr. MASON. I should like to know the parliamentary situation. I heard a request for unanimous consent.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. It was too late to entertain the request after 2 o'clock. At 2 o'clock it was the duty of the Chair to lay the unfinished business before the Senate, and he has done so.

Mr. MASON. What has been done, then, with the unfinished business?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The unfinished business was laid before the Senate, which is the bill (S. 1575) to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate commerce."

Mr. MASON. What disposition does my colleague wish to have made of that bill?

Mr. CULLOM. I ask that it be temporarily laid aside for the purpose of going on with the consideration of the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to that request? The Chair hears none, and the unfinished business will be temporarily laid aside.

Mr. MASON. Mr. President, I object. I rose to object.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The objection is in time.

Mr. CULLOM. Then if my colleague objects to the consideration of the legislative appropriation bill, I move that the bill be taken up for consideration.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The senior Senator from Illinois moves that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 11414) making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1900, and for other purposes.

Mr. MASON. I do not think it will be necessary to make any motion if I may be given one minute to inquire as to the parliamentary situation. I should like now to know the situation. I rose to object until I could make a request for unanimous consent.

Mr. CULLOM. To do what?

Mr. MASON. I desire to ask unanimous consent or to renew the request made by the Senator from Louisiana that his resolution be voted on at 4 o'clock on Monday.

Mr. CULLOM. If my colleague will allow me to say a word on that subject, those resolutions or some one of the resolutions was before the Senate during the morning hour, and the discussion of it continued until the morning hour expired, when regularly, under the rule, the resolution went over, or went on the Calendar at least.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. On the Calendar.

Mr. CULLOM. At least the discussion ceased under the rule. So I think my colleague is mistaken as to there being any purpose on the part of anybody to refuse to give a hearing to a Senator on that resolution within the time in which it was before the Senate. I hope he will not insist upon any further action with reference to taking up the resolutions at this time.

Mr. MASON. I have no objection, but I wish to be heard for a moment. I desire to make a few remarks. I do not intend to resist the motion to take up the appropriation bill.

Mr. CULLOM. Then let the bill be taken up.

Mr. MASON. It can be done by unanimous consent; but I wish to be heard for five minutes.

Mr. COCKRELL. The Senator from Illinois can speak as soon as the appropriation bill is taken up.

Mr. MASON. That is all right.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. If there is no objection, the appropriation bill will be laid before the Senate.

Mr. HARRIS. I desire to ask the consent of the Senator from Illinois to call up for consideration House bill 11098 reported from the Committee on Indian Affairs. It is a matter of considerable importance and will take only a very few minutes.

Mr. CULLOM. Let the appropriation bill first be laid before the Senate.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the bill (H. R. 11414) making appropriations for the legislative,

executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1900, and for other purposes.

Mr. CULLOM. I desire to say that on yesterday my distinguished friend from Kansas [Mr. HARRIS] stated that I told him if he would desist from attempting to call up the bill for which he asked consideration then, I would yield to-day. I do that because of my promise; but I hope that no other Senator will ask for a similar favor, as I am very anxious to get the appropriation bill out of the way.

Mr. HARRIS. I appreciate the consideration of the Senator from Illinois. The bill on which I desire action has passed the House of Representatives and will take only a few moments.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Illinois [Mr. MASON] desire to make any request for unanimous consent at this time?

Mr. MASON. Yes, sir; if it is in order.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. That request for unanimous consent was made prior to the request of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. HARRIS]. Will the Senator from Illinois please again state his request?

Mr. MASON. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution offered by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. McENERY] be taken up on Monday after the morning business and voted upon before adjournment on Monday.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senate has heard the request made by the Senator from Illinois. Is there objection?

Mr. HOAR. Mr. President, may I say something before that matter is disposed of?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. HOAR. I consider myself bound absolutely to request an executive session at that time, as is well known.

Mr. MASON. Then I will make the request for Tuesday, after the routine morning business.

Mr. HOAR. Very well.

Mr. GORMAN. I trust the Senator from Illinois will not press that request now, as the Senator from Georgia [Mr. BACON] left the Chamber a few moments ago, and I ask him to defer his request for a few moments until the Senator from Georgia can be sent for.

Mr. MASON. I do not believe any one will object, after all that has been said, to giving us a vote upon the resolution.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Maryland desire the Chair to withhold the request or to put it now?

Mr. GORMAN. I ask the Senator from Illinois to withdraw it for the present.

Mr. ALLISON. I hope the Senator from Illinois will wait for a few moments until the Senate is fuller. The Senator from Georgia before objected to the request for unanimous consent.

Mr. MASON. I suggest the absence of a quorum, and I ask for a call of the Senate.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The absence of a quorum being suggested by the Senator from Illinois, the Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Allen,	Gorman,	McMillan,	Pritchard,
Allison,	Hanna,	Mallory,	Rawlins,
Bacon,	Hansbrough,	Mantle,	Ross,
Bate,	Harris,	Martin,	Shoup,
Burrows,	Hawley,	Mitchell,	Spooner,
Carter,	Heitfeld,	Money,	Stewart,
Chilton,	Hoar,	Morgan,	Teller,
Clay,	Jones, Nev.,	Pasco,	Thurston,
Cockrell,	Lindsay,	Penrose,	Tillman,
Cullom,	Lodge,	Perkins,	Warren,
Deboe,	McEnery,	Pettigrew,	Wellington.
Fairbanks,	McLaurin,	Platt, Conn.	

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Forty-seven Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. CULLOM. I hope the reading of the appropriation bill will be proceeded with, if there is no motion before the Senate.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Illinois has made a request for unanimous consent that a vote be taken on Tuesday next, immediately after the routine morning business, on Senate joint resolution 240, introduced by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. McENERY].

Mr. BACON. I shall not object to the unanimous-consent agreement to take up the joint resolution and vote on it before we leave the subject.

Mr. MASON. That is right. That is all I request.

Mr. CULLOM. To vote during the day?

Mr. BACON. That we shall not go on with any other matter until that is determined.

Mr. MASON. That is right.

Mr. BACON. Of course I do not mean that it shall be determined that day.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. President, I object to the entire performance.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Objection is made.

Several SENATORS. Regular order!

Mr. MASON. I desire to be heard upon the pending bill.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator will be entitled to the floor when the bill is being read.

Mr. HOAR. I desire to ask a unanimous consent of the Senate, which I think in all fairness we are bound to give. During the discussion this morning, which lasted several hours, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. MASON] repeatedly sought the floor without success. Now, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Illinois be given five minutes in which to address the Senate at this time, which is, I understand, the time he asked for just now.

Mr. CULLOM. My colleague can deliver his address on the pending appropriation bill if he chooses.

Mr. HOAR. That is not a good practice, and I do not think any Senator ought, when another subject is distinctly up, to debate other questions. We can not stop a Senator, because he himself must judge of what he will say, but it is not a fair thing. I think a better way is to give the unanimous consent for five minutes, as that is all the Senator asked for just now.

Mr. MASON. I may take longer than that.

Mr. TELLER (to Mr. MASON). Go on and make your speech on the bill.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR]? The Chair hears none.

Mr. MASON. I do not understand that I am limited to five minutes.

Mr. TELLER. I object. The Senator has the right to go on and speak on the pending bill. I do not want to limit him to five minutes. Let him go on and make his speech.

Mr. HOAR. He has a physical, but not a moral, right to do so, in my judgment.

Mr. CULLOM (to Mr. MASON). I trust my colleague will proceed now.

Mr. MASON. Mr. President, I presume, at least I hope, that no one of my colleagues is more susceptible to kind treatment than I am. I suspect that I am as ambitious to be liked among my colleagues as any Senator on this floor, and I suppose that I interfere with the transaction of routine business with as much hesitancy as any Senator would indulge in when doing the same work that I feel my duty now compels me to do.

More than a month ago I gave notice upon a simple resolution which I offered merely saying that the just powers of government were derived from the consent of the governed and that we would not undertake to govern an alien people by force perpetually without their consent—I gave notice then that before the vote on the treaty was taken I should ask for a vote upon that resolution. If I had pursued the tactics which are common, disregarding that thing which you call Senatorial courtesy, and which you yield to Senators who can force you to do it and refuse to those who observe the amenities of life, I might have had a vote ere this. But I have tried to pursue a course dictated by the feeling that one Senator owes some consideration to his colleagues. I have asked day after day for a vote, doubting the propriety and the correctness of that treaty, waiting for information, anxious to do the best I could for my State and my country.

When you asked for a time to vote upon that treaty, I, with the rest of us, consented. I supposed it had been agreed that some resolution declaring the policy of this Government would be passed before the ratification of the treaty. Every suggestion that I have made has been met here by my elders upon this floor, first by one and then by another, with the quiet slings and flings such as came this morning from the distinguished Senator from Connecticut, the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs [Mr. HAWLEY]. When I asked simply for a statement of the health of the army in the Philippines, when I asked to know how many lives of American soldiers it would cost to take those islands by force, when I asked to know not only the money that went into this investment in the purchase of sovereignty, the same Senator sneeringly withdrew his objection and said he had no respect for it.

To-day he announces that he has no respect for and that he objects to the "whole performance," as though I, sir, were not his equal upon this floor, as though I, sir, had a little less due me as a Senator of the United States than if I had sat here for years at the head of some great committee conducting affairs. I claim to be the peer of the Senator. I represent as good a State as he, and I claim here and now the personal privilege that I have so long waited for.

Gentlemen say—and I have had no opportunity to reply—that we who speak for independence in the Philippine Islands are to blame for this war. I question the motives of no man, and I give you notice now collectively that I shall permit no gentleman to question mine.

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. President, I beg to interrupt the Senator a moment. I was called out awhile ago, and I understand the Sen-

ator has been paying his compliments to me during my absence. I would be glad to have him tell me to my face what he has said.

Mr. MASON. I did not observe you were absent from the Chamber. I directed a part of my observations to you.

Mr. HAWLEY. Repeat them, please.

Mr. MASON. I shall be delighted to do so. I said that when I asked for a vote on a simple resolution inquiring as to the state of the health of our troops in the Philippines the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, when he withdrew his objection, said he had no respect for it.

Mr. HAWLEY. Not for you; for the resolutions, I said. I made that distinction.

Mr. MASON. The same distinguished Senator said this morning that he objected to the "whole performance," as though I, I said, a younger and less experienced Senator, had less rights upon this floor to ask unanimous consent than had he.

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. President, I was not thinking of the Senator in saying that I objected to the performance. It was to these other proceedings here that were likely to interrupt the consideration or bar out the consideration of an appropriation bill. I did not take into consideration for a moment that the Senator desired to speak.

Mr. MASON. It is all satisfactory to me if it is to the Senator. I was guilty of no "performance." I intend to be guilty of no "performance." I am endeavoring to discharge a solemn obligation as I understand it, and if I have to take the floor and stay here until the snow flies next winter, I am willing to do it.

I say to you now, Mr. President, that I consider that some declaration as to the policy of the Government of the United States is much more important than it is to take the money out of the Treasury.

Mr. President, we are in war. We have shifted the scene of action from war against Spain to war against the insurgents, who never did us any harm. We are fighting to-day men with bows and arrows in their hands, who six months ago were our allies. There is no lawyer upon this floor, from the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, but who has admitted that they became our allies. Now, let us see whether some one has made a mistake; and if it is a mistake, it is a mistake of this Senate and of this country, and we are all equally to blame. It is our country. The Dred Scott decision was just as much the decision of Illinois as it was of South Carolina. Whatever wrong a nation does rests upon us equally and alike.

At the close of this most holy war, when we gave notice to the world that we unlimbered our guns in the cause of humanity, before the treaty of peace was finally made, money considerations came in and indemnity was talked of as though we had played the part of a good Samaritan at a price, at a per diem; and the moment money came into the peace treaty, that moment we descended from the high plane of liberty, that moment the trouble began. The moment the jingle of gold and silver was heard at your peace-treaty meeting in Paris, that moment the American people began to wonder and to revolt.

Let us see where we are, Mr. President. At the close of this war we had two great islands in our hands that I am to speak of, the islands known as the Philippines and the island of Cuba. One of the great questions that disturbed the American people was: What treatment shall the Philippine Islanders have? One class of people said: "Let us pursue the course of the fathers; let us give to them the same thing we gave to Cuba." Another class of gentlemen said: "Oh, no; they are ours. We have bought them; we have bought them from the King." Do you know that you never can buy a better title than the grantor has? The title of a king, the right of a king to govern, sovereignty to be sold like chattels.

In one island, where we pursued the way of the fathers, there is peace; in the other island, where we have pursued the other way, there is war. Gentlemen say the Filipinos declared war. I say as a lawyer that the declaration and the *casus belli* came from us. I propose to discuss that about Monday or Tuesday or Wednesday. I say that we made the cause for war; that they had some rights; that they presented their petition at our door; that they had a right to be heard; that they were our allies; and when they presented the petition here we kicked them out of the door. They crossed the water and at Paris they said to the people there, "You are parting our raiment; and, for God's sake, let us be heard for our people." They were turned away there; and yesterday, when the rebel chief, as you call him, asked for the poor privilege of a conference, without knowing what request he had to make, you refused even to hear his voice, to hear his prayer, and you continue to burn his villages; and yet in this Chamber we condemn the action of Weyler along the same lines! You do not have to shoot the first gun to declare war. You do not have to strike me to make me strike you.

Now, Mr. President, some one has made a mistake. We promised to Cuba ultimate independence. Is not that the promise? Is it not so nominated in the bond? On the island of Cuba to-day

the people are a little restless, a little weary, yet they are getting ready every day and every hour, and they say, "God bless the Americano," while in the same zone, as the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILLMAN] says, the same class of people, having the same language, practically the same religion, practically the same sports, and of the same character, we have so conducted our business that their bows and arrows are aimed at us.

But I heard the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. SPOONER], when he gave a lecture the other day to the Senators who disagreed with him, declaim in loud voice against the Filipinos. You would have thought from his voice, his gesture, and from his language that the British lion had struck us a deadly blow. A few days ago gentlemen belittled the Filipinos and said they are mere children—they have not the mental or moral capacity to govern themselves; they are half man and half devil, half child and half brute—and yet those very distinguished gentlemen who so belittled them and put them on a lower plane are the gentlemen who boast the loudest of our bravery when we shoot them like dogs and burn their buildings a la Weyler!

More than a month ago, Mr. President, I asked for a simple vote—it is part of the public record—not in executive session. I am betraying none of the sacred secrets of this antiquated, old, nonsensical rule of ours known as the executive session; but in open session, Mr. President, at this seat where I am now standing, one month and one day ago to-day, on the 10th day of last month, I gave notice and it was received, and made an impression almost equal to that which the summer wind makes against the Capitol Dome. There was no more intention of considering my resolution than there is to-day of considering the resolution of the Senator from Louisiana.

Day after day I had asked for it; hour after hour I had hoped for it; aye, I have prayed for one chance to vote upon some kindred resolution. I appeal to every Senator on this floor whether I have taken one moment of the time of the Senate before this. Not one moment have I taken from the business of the Senate until now; and now I intend to take all the time I want. I begin to feel the glorious liberty of Senatorial courtesy. [Laughter.] I have learned there is no limit; and I intend to imitate a distinguished Senator, who is not now in the Chamber, who has the happy faculty of setting his mouth going and going off and leaving it for a week at a time without any intellectual exercise. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, I have been put off from time to time, first by reason of my consideration for one Senator, and then for another; and to-day, at this present moment, I feel that I have a duty to perform; I feel that I have had to crowd my own distinguished colleague [Mr. CULLOM] out of a few moments' consideration of the natural right to invade the Treasury Department and distribute the surplus. [Laughter.]

But if I shall yield the floor now, Mr. President, it will only be to give notice that on Monday or Tuesday, and probably on both days, I intend to be heard further upon this question. I am willing that this bill shall proceed; but I am also willing that no further business shall be done in this Senate that shall take me from my divine right to speak until you give me a chance to vote upon some resolution. Gentlemen say this is a threat. Oh, no. When I made a fight against your barnacles known as the Rules of the Senate I told you that when I had a filibuster to make I would serve you notice that it was a filibuster, and that I would take off the kid gloves.

Mr. MONEY. Will the Senator from Illinois allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. MASON. Certainly.

Mr. MONEY. I wish to ask the Senator whether he expected to have a vote on the resolution?

Mr. MASON. I certainly did expect it; and I say now if the gentlemen in the Chamber—

Mr. MONEY. Will the Senator be kind enough to give the reason why he thought he would get a vote?

Mr. MASON. I was not entirely familiar with Senatorial courtesy. [Laughter.] I hope to learn as I grow older in this body whom to trust, when to trust, and how to trust. I feel that my distinguished colleague from Illinois would not wish to proceed with his appropriation bill until he has heard one side of this question as given by Caesar's ghost.

It has been charged by some and believed by many—

Mr. TILLMAN. Will the Senator permit me, before he leaves the subject of the question just asked by the Senator from Mississippi? He may feel, possibly, that it would be a reflection on him to speak of an absent Senator. We do not know who he is; but would he mind telling us just what he was promised?

Mr. MASON. The Senator has been answered once or twice.

Mr. TILLMAN. Oh, no.

Mr. MASON. Yes. I told the Senator from South Carolina the Senator was absent. I would not use the name of a Senator in his absence.

Mr. TILLMAN. I do not want the Senator to give his name until he comes back; but just tell us what he said, will you not?

Mr. MASON. I think on reflection I will not. [Laughter.] I intend to be entirely respectful to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. TILLMAN. Of course.

Mr. MASON. As I was saying, it has been charged by many, and believed by many, that we were to discard the liberty cap; that we were to go into the business of buying sovereignty, and we became so heroic here in the Senate after Dewey's splendid victory that we were going to lay aside the American eagle as our mark of nationality and become the whelp of the lion. I have had transmitted to me through some newspaper a suggestion as to whether we are to be the whelp of a lion. It is signed "Caesar's Ghost."

The purring mother, stretched at ease within her island lair,
Throws high her tawny head and sniffs the blood smell on the air.
Slow lifting to her feet she roars across the angry sea,
"I know thee now, my lion whelp, it can be none but thee!"

"I feel no more thy milk teeth haggling at my stingy breast;
I joy to know thou 'st tasted meat, young lion of the West!
Who said I bore an eagle that the jungle dark would shun,
And soar to heaven with eyes that look unflinching at the sun?"

"A lie! I know my growling cub, I know that glorious roar;
I've roared it oft on Indian fields, from Africa's golden shore.
He smacks his lusty lips, his eyes with blood-red fire are light;
His drooling jaws are sign of hunger and of prey in sight."

"Beneath his paw I see a red man struggling to be free—
That is our playful way, to tease with hope of liberty—
What majesty! What lion likeness in that shaggy crest!
E'en I could not so tear that black man's heart from out his breast."

"We will hunt together, cub!"—

Here is the alliance that you are coming to, gentlemen—

"We'll hunt together, cub, on every land, by every sea,
And when we find a man not shirk responsibility.
O lion's whelp! I hear thy roar across the roaring main—
Thou art my cub, thou art the true (improved) imperial strain."

—Caesar's Ghost.

Mr. President, differing somewhat with the poet who signs his name as Caesar's Ghost, I deny that we are to become the lion's whelp. I confess that we are acting a little bit like it; I confess that when these islands were within our hands we had not patience enough, statesmanship enough, generosity enough, to tender those people something that would bring peace. The roar did sound more like that of the whelp of a lion than the screech of the eagle that stands for true Americanism.

Mr. President, I desire to give notice that after to-day, during the morning hour, I shall ask to be heard upon some of the pending resolutions, and that I shall yield my time at any moment to any other Senator to speak upon the resolutions or at any time when we can have an opportunity to vote upon any one of the pending resolutions. Understand me, Mr. President; I desire to be understood. I have waited two hours to-day, I have waited two days, I have waited two weeks, nearly two months. I say that my request has been considered by my colleagues as of no weight, of no binding effect, and not to be entertained by them. First the friends of the treaty beat me. Then the enemies of the treaty beat me. Between the upper and the nether millstone I have been refused a chance to vote upon any one of these resolutions. I see no other course left. I will answer for myself. I shall criticize the conduct of no man. I shall impugn the motives of no man. I shall not permit any gentleman upon this floor to impugn mine. As I see the light, as I read the future, as I am a student of evolution and a believer in it, I believe there is one way to end this matter, and that is to end it here.

We have imitated England in all of her past cruelty to her colonists. England never was guilty of more cruelty. We are not defending our land now. Our declarations of war came when we sent our men there within the last few weeks, against the protest of the natives and without giving them a hearing. You are not waiting in Manila. You are extending your lines and burning towns. The villages you burned yesterday were not mentioned in the protocol, and the treaty is not signed. The treaty is not complete. We are taking revenge upon these poor weak children of the forest. England in her palmy days was never more cruel. Let us imitate Gladstone for one minute upon the subject of retrocession; let us imitate England, as attention was called to her conduct by the distinguished Senator from South Carolina. The English flag was put over the Boers when they did not want it. I had hoped that the time would never come when the colors of our beloved country would go above an unwilling people. I had hoped that no living person would ever look into the sky and curse my flag; but you have put it to-day where 9,000,000 people are cursing your flag, your institutions, and they do not know the difference between Spain and America, either by your protestations or by your conduct.

My country, right or wrong, but let us right her. The power to right her is here. In the last days of Gladstone's life he spoke of "false shame." The English flag was over the Boer, and was taken down by the civilization and the Christian thought of England. Let the dudes imitate the English dudes, if they will. Let them imitate England as long as they will; but if you have to have

a little English in your conduct, take the example of William E. Gladstone. Read his last speech where he said the question is not who shall haul down the flag, but what is just. That is what we are looking for. I am not afraid of "false shame." I have seen a real gentleman apologize to a bootblack for a thoughtless word, and I have seen a bully kick a bootblack half across the street. Let us get a little of the Gladstone idea—not who shall pull down the flag, but how long shall our flag remain above an unwilling people.

"Oh, but," they say, "we put it over your people down South, and it was an unwilling flag." Not so. The flag was there by contract. We simply fought to keep our flag where you had agreed it should be kept; and that difference is settled. We went into an agreement whereby the South was to stand by the North, the alliance being like a wedding that could not be divorced. We did not put the flag above an unwilling people. We kept it there after you had put it there yourselves. This is the first time in all the history of this beloved country of ours—this country which has attracted the admiration of the world—that the flag has ever floated over an alien who has cursed it. You love your flag and so do I. It is not an idle sentimentality. It means protection to my home; and the home of the Filipino is as sacred to him as yours is to you. The laws of nations, which I propose to discuss (and I shall read from the lecture of the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. DAVIS]), is based upon justice, upon humanity, upon right. I have been pleading for their homes. I shall continue to do so until this session adjourns. I have learned something of the Republican-Democratic idea of home.

I remember to have talked with a man within a few weeks who said to a man who lived away up in the Northland, where they have night for six months, "If you had \$500, what would you do?" "Oh, I would go back to my old home and build a house there." There is six months darkness; it is cold and barren; but it is his home. Some of you people on both sides of this Chamber remember when at Vicksburg our boys got so close to the Confederates that they talked back and forth. Every man kept his head below the breastworks. Our band played Yankee Doodle and theirs played Dixie. We played the Star-Spangled Banner and they played the Bonnie Blue Flag. I believe one Irishman put his finger up, and got a shot in his wrist. He said to his captain that he was seeking a furlough, but got a discharge. Every man, when Dixie and the Bonnie Blue Flag and the Star-Spangled Banner were being played, kept out of danger, until one of the bands finally struck up Home, Sweet Home. Then the guns went into the trenches. Then the men stood upon the breastworks. "Hurrah, Johnnie!" "Hurrah for home, Yank!" There was no danger with the music of home in the air.

Mr. President, I have learned that every home made by human hands is a sacred thing. My country has proceeded, choosing the lines which best fitted and suited, along the line of empire, to take land without the consent of the inhabitants. No one denies that. They say we have a legal right. Oh, yes. But we knew, when we took the legal title, of the claim of those poor people. You are sending our boys over there, and the ships will be coming back loaded with their corpses. How many Senators have sons there now? How many Senatorial appointees have retired from the Commissary Department? Are we any less thoughtful of an American boy because he is not ours? I am told that we will subdue the Filipinos, and that it will not cost us over three or four thousand lives. I tell you that the whole group, the whole archipelago, is not worth the life of one American boy, trade and barter and dicker as you will.

But distinguished and pious gentlemen say, "God put them in our hands; it is destiny." The Lord! There was never a tyrant who cut off heads who did not charge it to the Lord. All crimes are laid at that door. We profess to be a Christian nation and we have conducted our affairs with a weak, childish people in such a way that we are killing them hands down, and we say we must do it for their good. If you were honest about it, gentlemen, and could show me where you could steal something for your country, I could excuse it on the ground of high (?) statesmanship, but there is not a dollar in it for your country or for your States. It is murder. Then you pull the cloak around you and go into high places and say, "Thank God, we are not as other men. We are Anglo-Saxons. We have worshiped at the throne of the Nazarene ever since we were born." But, as Cæsar's ghost says, "We have tasted blood."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a vote be taken upon the joint resolution introduced by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. McENERY] at half past 2 o'clock on next Tuesday.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senate has heard the request of the Senator from Illinois that on next Tuesday at half past 2 o'clock, by unanimous consent, a vote be taken on the joint resolution introduced by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. McENERY], known as Senate joint resolution No. 240. Is there objection? [A pause.] The Chair hears none, and the order is made.

Mr. HAWLEY subsequently said: Mr. President, I rise to what

I think is a question of privilege. I will be very brief about it. I give notice that when the Senate is fuller I shall ask to have the unanimous-consent agreement to have a vote taken on what is familiarly called the McENERY resolution set aside for this reason: Myself and several others made a peremptory objection to the agreement, but it so happened that three of us went out, I suppose, on public business. I was absent from the Chamber on important public business. I shall at the first opportunity ask to have that agreement set aside.

LEGISLATIVE, EXECUTIVE, AND JUDICIAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. CULLOM. Now, let the appropriation bill be proceeded with.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 11414) making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1900, and for other purposes.

Mr. CULLOM. I desire to inquire whether the amendment in lines 3 and 4, at the top of page 76, was adopted. It was intended that the words "five hundred" should be stricken out and "one thousand" inserted.

Mr. TELLER. Can we not have order?

The SECRETARY. In lines 3 and 4, page 76, it is proposed to strike out "five hundred" and insert "one thousand;" so as to read:

For postage stamps for the War Department and its bureaus, as required under the Postal Union, to prepay postage on matters addressed to Postal Union countries, \$1,000.

Mr. COCKRELL. Is that for postage stamps?

Mr. CULLOM. For postage stamps under the Postal Union.

Mr. COCKRELL. Is it a new estimate?

Mr. CULLOM. Yes, sir. The chairman of the committee, I think, has a communication stating that it ought to be done. I have not got it here. Mr. Cleaves has the letter. The Senator from Iowa may know about the matter. It was to go in, as I understood from the chairman.

Mr. ALLISON. The amount appropriated by the House is not enough.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURROWS in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed and continued to the end of line 19, on page 76.

Mr. CULLOM. In line 18, page 76, after the word "charges," I desire to insert the words "temporary labor, not to exceed \$1,000;" so as to read:

For contingent expenses of the War Department, * * * expenses of horses and wagons to be used only for official purposes; freight and express charges, temporary labor, not to exceed \$1,000, and other absolutely necessary expenses, \$38,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 76, line 19, after the word "dollars," to insert as a proviso the following:

Provided, That purchases of law books are authorized from the appropriation for contingent expenses of the War Department for the fiscal year 1899, made by the legislative act approved March 15, 1898.

Mr. CULLOM. I move, after the word "books," in line 20, to insert "books of reference and periodicals."

The SECRETARY. After the word "books," in line 20, it is proposed to insert "books of reference and periodicals."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed. The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, in the clause for "library of the Navy Department," on page 80, line 17, after the word "one," to insert "one clerk, \$1,000," and in line 18, to increase the total appropriation for library of the Navy Department from \$2,580 to \$3,580.

Mr. MASON. I desire to call the attention of my colleague to the amendment. I understand that the clause in line 16, "one clerk, \$1,000," is a mistake, and I move an amendment to the amendment which conforms to the request of the Secretary of the Navy. After the word "for," in line 16, I move to insert "one clerk of class 2," and then to strike out, in line 17, the words "one clerk, \$1,000," proposed to be inserted by the committee.

Mr. CULLOM. I have no objection to the amendment offered by my colleague to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. CULLOM. That changes the total in the paragraph, and it ought to be \$3,980 instead of \$3,580.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The total will be changed accordingly. The committee amendment is disagreed to.

Mr. CULLOM. It is disagreed to; that is right; and the total is changed so as to read, "in all, \$3,980."

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, in the clause for "Bureau of Equipment, Navy Department," on page 83, line 7, after the word "dollars," to insert "one clerk of

class 4," and in line 9 to increase the total appropriation for the Bureau of Equipment from \$8,480 to \$10,280.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Hydrographic Office," on page 84, line 13, to insert:

For the construction from Government surveys of a series of engraved nautical charts of the coasts and harbors of the Pacific Ocean, \$12,000.

Mr. CULLOM. I ask the Senate to disagree to the amendment. The amendment was rejected.

The next amendment was, in the clause for "Bureau of Steam Engineering," on page 86, line 15, after the word "laborers," to insert "draftsman, \$2,000;" in line 16, before the word "draftsman," to insert "assistant;" and in line 20, to increase the total appropriation for Bureau of Steam Engineering from \$11,340 to \$13,340.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HARRIS. With the consent of the Senator from Illinois, I ask consent to call up Order of Business 1710, being House bill No. 11098.

Mr. CULLOM. I agreed with the Senator from Kansas yesterday that I would allow his bill to be taken up to-day, so far as I was concerned, and I am inclined to allow it to be acted upon now if it leads to no debate.

Mr. HARRIS. The bill has passed the House and has been favorably reported by the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. ALLISON. I do not object. I only want to call the attention of the Senate and of the Senator from Kansas to the fact that the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN] also has a bill in charge that I think ought to be passed at an early day. It will take very little time, and I had hoped that both bills could be postponed until the bill under consideration is completed. I think it will not take a great while to finish the pending appropriation bill.

Mr. CULLOM. We shall get through with it pretty soon, if the Senator from Kansas is willing to wait.

Mr. HARRIS. I am willing to wait until the appropriation bill is passed.

Mr. CULLOM. Very well.

Mr. ALLISON. The bill can be called up later to-day sometime.

The reading of the bill was resumed. The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, in the items for "Bureau of Medicine and Surgery," on page 87, line 19, after the word "dollars," to insert "stenographer and typewriter, \$1,000;" and in line 22, to increase the total appropriation for the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery from \$8,940 to \$9,940.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Department of the Interior," on page 88, line 50, after the word "each," to insert "three additional members of said board of pension appeals to be appointed by the Secretary of the Interior and to be selected from the force of the Pension Office, at \$2,000 each;" so as to read;

Office of the Secretary: For compensation of the Secretary of the Interior, \$8,000; First Assistant Secretary, \$1,500; Assistant Secretary, \$4,000; chief clerk, \$2,500, and \$250 additional as superintendent of the Patent Office building; nine members of a board of pension appeals to be appointed by the Secretary of the Interior, at \$2,000 each; three additional members of said Board of Pension Appeals to be appointed by the Secretary of the Interior and to be selected from the force of the Pension Office, at \$2,000 each, etc.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 90, line 5, to increase the total appropriation for the Office of the Secretary of the Interior from \$232,980 to \$238,980.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 90, after line 10, to insert:

For the following additional employees, for the proper protection, heating, care, and preservation of the General Post-Office building, to be occupied by the Department of the Interior, to be available when said building shall be occupied by offices of the Interior Department, namely: One engineer, at the rate of \$1,400 per annum; one assistant engineer, at the rate of \$1,000; four firemen, at the rate of \$720 each; three watchmen, acting as lieutenants, at the rate of \$940 each; fourteen watchmen, at the rate of \$720 each; fourteen laborers, at the rate of \$600 each; ten laborers, at the rate of \$480 each; in all, \$23,940.

Mr. CULLOM. In lines 14 and 15, on page 90, I move that the words "occupied by offices of" before the words "the Interior Department" be stricken out, and the words "turned over to" be inserted, so as to read "to be available when said building shall be turned over to the Interior Department."

Mr. GORMAN. I should like to ask the Senator what is the object of that provision?

Mr. CULLOM. When the building is turned over to the Interior Department, that Department ought to become responsible for it, and those words are inserted for that purpose.

Mr. GORMAN. I ask the Senator what the effect of that will be. There are various offices, some of the Interior Department, now in rented buildings, and they have quite a corps of officials looking after the preservation, the heating, and so on. Is it a duplication of that force?

Mr. CULLOM. These are additional employees for the purpose of taking charge of that building. The old employees of the Post-Office Department, I suppose, of course, will go with that Department, and it is necessary to make provision for the Interior Department.

Mr. GORMAN. I am aware of that, but the branches of the Interior Department that will go into this building and are already in rented buildings, have a corps already. Would it not be a duplication to keep those in who are now in the outside offices and then provide a full corps of new employees in the Post-Office building?

Mr. CULLOM. I do not think that would be the case, but it might be well to look into it a little to see whether or not that would be so. I think we considered that matter pretty carefully in the committee, and we determined that we would have to provide this force in order to be sure that the Government building would be cared for immediately after it is turned over by the Post-Office Department.

Mr. GORMAN. I agree with that, but then what becomes of the corps that is already employed by the various bureaus, for instance, in the Atlantic Building?

Mr. CULLOM. I do not know how much of the force belonging to the Interior Department will come from outside buildings. I imagine that most of it will come from the Interior Department itself. It is mainly engineers, firemen, watchmen and that sort of employees who are needed.

Mr. GORMAN. I only call the attention of the Senator from Illinois to the matter. I suppose he will not legislate out the men already employed, for instance, by the Indian Office, who are in a rented building, or is it necessary to duplicate the number?

Mr. CULLOM. This item was furnished in the regular estimates by the Department.

Mr. GORMAN. I simply call the attention of the Senator to it.

Mr. CULLOM. I will say to the Senator that when the bill gets into conference and is under discussion with the House conferees I will look into the matter a little further.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the clause for "General Land Office," on page 92, line 10, to increase the number of clerks of class 1 from 61 to 63; in line 11, to increase the number of clerks at \$1,000 each from 49 to 51; in line 12, to increase the number of copyists from 55 to 57; in line 13, to increase the number of laborers from 18 to 21; and in line 16, to increase the total appropriation for the General Land Office from \$487,000 to \$495,270.

Mr. CULLOM. I move to amend the amendment of the committee. In line 10, instead of "sixty-three," I move to make the number "sixty-six."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CULLOM. Then, in the following line, I move to strike out "fifty-one," as the committee had it, and insert "fifty-three."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CULLOM. In line 11 I move to strike out "fifty-seven," as the committee had it, and insert "fifty-eight," before the word "copyists."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CULLOM. In line 13 I move to strike out "twenty-one," as the committee had it, and insert "twenty-four," before the word "laborers."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CULLOM. The total should be changed, in lines 16 and 17, so as to make the amount "\$503,750."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. COCKRELL. I was called out unavoidably. I should like to know what was done with the amendment on page 84, where the committee recommended the insertion of the following clause:

For the construction from Government surveys of a series of engraved nautical charts of the coasts and harbors of the Pacific Ocean, \$12,000.

Mr. CULLOM. It was stricken out.

Mr. COCKRELL. All right.

Mr. CULLOM. I believe the Secretary has passed beyond lines 14 and 15, on page 93. I desire to offer an amendment to come in at that point, which palpably ought to be made. It is in the clause referring to the distribution of maps prepared in the General Land Office, and the language employed in line 14 is "and the residue shall be delivered to the General Land Office for distribution." It ought to be "Secretary of the Interior for distribution."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment suggested by the Senator from Illinois will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In line 14, on page 93, after the words "delivered to the," it is proposed to strike out "General Land Office" and to insert "Secretary of the Interior."

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed. The next amendment of the legislative appropriations was, in the clause for "Indian

Office," on page 94, line 8, to reduce the number of clerks of class 3 from 15 to 14; in line 11, to increase the number of clerks of class 2 from 10 to 12; in line 12, to increase the number of clerks of class 1 from 23 to 25; in line 13, to increase the number of clerks at \$1,000 each from 13 to 16; in the same line, after the word "each," to insert "stenographer to superintendent of Indian schools, \$1,000;" and in line 18, to increase the total appropriation for the Indian Office from \$124,920 to \$132,520.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Pension Office," on page 96, line 8, after the word "day," to insert "including necessary sleeping-car fare;" so as to read:

For per diem, when absent from home and traveling on duty outside the District of Columbia, for special examiners, or other persons employed in the Bureau of Pensions detailed for the purpose of making special investigations pertaining to said Bureau, in lieu of expenses for subsistence, not exceeding \$3 per day, including necessary sleeping-car fare, and for actual and necessary expenses for transportation and assistance and any other necessary expenses, including telegrams, \$100,000, etc.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Surveyors-general and their clerks," on page 106, line 8, after the word "records," to insert "pay of messenger;" so as to make the clause read:

For stationery and instruments, binding records, pay of messenger, and other incidental expenses, \$500.

For surveyor-general of Idaho, \$2,000; and for the clerks in his office, \$8,000; in all, \$10,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 107, line 1, after the word "typewriter," to insert "pay of messenger;" so as to make the clause read:

For stationery, printing, binding, typewriter, pay of messenger, and other incidental expenses, \$500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 107, line 21, after the word "soap," to insert "pay of messenger;" so as to make the clause read:

For printing, stationery, drafting tools, plats, drawing papers, binding records, books and plats, telephone, registration of letters, towels, soap, pay of messenger, and other incidental expenses, \$1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 108, line 1, after the word "surveyor-general," to insert "pay of messenger;" so as to make the clause read:

For rent of office for the surveyor-general, pay of messenger, stationery, printing, binding, lights, laundry, furniture and repairs, and other incidental expenses, \$1,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 109, line 10, after the word "surveyor-general," to insert "pay of messenger;" and in line 12, after the word "dollars," to insert the following proviso:

Provided, That the appropriations for incidental expenses in the offices of surveyors-general of Florida, Minnesota, New Mexico, North Dakota, and Wyoming for the fiscal year 1899 shall be available for the payment of a messenger, janitor, or laborer in each one of these offices.

So as to make the clause read:

For rent of office for the surveyor-general, pay of messenger, stationery, lights, ice, and other incidental expenses, \$1,000: *Provided*, That the appropriations for incidental expenses in the offices of surveyors-general of Florida, Minnesota, New Mexico, North Dakota, and Wyoming for the fiscal year 1899 shall be available for the payment of a messenger, janitor, or laborer in each one of these offices.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Office First Assistant Postmaster-General," on page 111, line 8, after the word "of," to strike out "the;" and in the same line, after the word "free-delivery," to strike out "system;" so as to make the clause read:

The assistant superintendents of free delivery shall hereafter be allowed a per diem of \$4 in lieu of all expenses when traveling on business of the Department.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the clause for "Office Second Assistant Postmaster-General," on page 111, line 21, to insert "chief of contract division, \$2,000; chief of mail-equipment division, \$2,000;" on page 112, line 1, to reduce the number of clerks of class 4 from 11 to 9; and in line 7, to increase the total appropriation for the Office of Second Assistant Postmaster-General from \$167,180 to \$167,580.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the clause for "Office Fourth Assistant Postmaster-General," on page 113, line 3, to increase the number of clerks of class 3 from 17 to 18; in line 4, to increase the number of clerks of class 2 from 12 to 13; in line 5, to increase the

number of clerks of class 1 from 17 to 20; in line 7, to increase the number of clerks at \$1,000 each from 7 to 9; in line 8, to reduce the number of clerks at \$900 each from five to four; and in line 10, to increase the total appropriation for the Office of Fourth Assistant Postmaster-General from \$99,340 to \$107,040.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the clause for "Office of Topographer," on page 113, line 19, after the word "two," to insert "one clerk, \$1,000;" and in line 23, to increase the total appropriation for the Office of Topographer from \$29,340 to \$30,340.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Department of Justice," on page 117, line 15, to increase the appropriation for salary of solicitor for the Department of State from \$4,000 to \$4,500; on page 118, line 8, to increase the number of assistant messengers from 7 to 8, and in line 13, to increase the total appropriation for the Office of the Attorney-General from \$172,600 to \$173,820.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 118, line 19, before the word "books," to strike out "law;" in the same line, before the word "library," to insert "law," and in line 20, before the word "dollars," to strike out "one thousand five hundred" and insert "two thousand;" so as to make the clause read:

For books for law library of the Department, \$2,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 118, line 23, before the word "dollars," to strike out "seven hundred and fifty" and insert "five hundred;" so as to make the clause read:

For purchase of session laws and statutes of the States and Territories for library of Department, \$500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 119, line 6, to increase the appropriation for official transportation, including purchase, keep, and shoeing of animals, etc., from \$1,000 to \$2,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 123, line 24, to increase the salary for reporter to the court of appeals, District of Columbia, from \$1,000 to \$1,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 124, line 5, to increase the total appropriation for the court of appeals, District of Columbia, from \$25,720 to \$26,220.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 126, line 22, after the word "incapacitated," to strike out "by age or otherwise for employment in" and insert "for performing;" and in line 24, after the word "roll," to strike out "or an honorable service roll;" so as to make the section read:

SEC. 4. That the appropriations herein made for the officers, clerks, and persons employed in the public service shall not be available for the compensation of any persons permanently incapacitated for performing such service. The establishment of a civil pension roll, or the exemption of any of the officers, clerks, and persons in the public service from the existing laws respecting employment in such service, is hereby prohibited.

The reading of the bill was concluded.

Mr. CULLOM. I offer an amendment to come in at the end of line 2 on page 127.

The amendment was read and agreed to, as follows:

Provided, That the thirty days' annual leave of absence with pay in any one year to clerks and employees in the several Executive Departments authorized by existing law shall be exclusive of Sundays and legal holidays.

Mr. CULLOM. I desire to enter a motion to reconsider the vote by which the Senate disagreed to the amendment on page 21, line 13, and I wish to have the amendment agreed to.

The SECRETARY. In line 13, page 21, the committee amendment was to strike out "two hundred and fifty" and insert "five hundred;" so as to read:

Chief clerk, who shall also be superintendent of art department, \$2,500.

Mr. ELKINS. Let me ask the Senator what that is for.

Mr. CULLOM. For the purpose of allowing the amendment to stand as the committee recommended in the first place.

Mr. ELKINS. At \$2,500?

Mr. CULLOM. Yes, sir.

Mr. ELKINS. What is it for?

Mr. TELLER. The chief clerk of the Library. He now receives \$2,250.

Mr. ELKINS. And he is now to get what?

Mr. CULLOM. The purpose of the committee is to raise it to \$2,500.

Mr. ELKINS. Why should he get \$2,500 and the others get but \$2,250?

Mr. CULLOM. Many of the chief clerks get more than \$2,200 now, but the private secretaries to Cabinet officers get only \$2,250.

Mr. ELKINS. Do you propose to give the chief clerk of the Library more compensation than you give the secretary of a Cabinet officer?

Mr. CULLOM. Yes; more than the private secretary of any Cabinet officer, but not more than other chief clerks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the Committee on Appropriations.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CULLOM. So far as I am concerned, I believe I have concluded the offering of amendments.

Mr. ELKINS. I wish to call up an amendment which I have heretofore proposed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 27, line 11, before the word "dollars," it is proposed to insert "five hundred;" so as to read:

Second and Third Assistant Secretaries, at \$4,500.

Mr. TELLER. What is that for?

Mr. ELKINS. This is a proposition to give the two Assistant Secretaries of State as much as the other Assistant Secretaries receive. For instance, the Assistant Secretary of War receives \$4,500. The three Assistant Secretaries of the Treasury receive \$4,500 in this same bill, and I do not see why there should be any distinction made as against the State Department. The ability required to be an Assistant Secretary of State is quite as great as that required of any Assistant Secretary in any other Department, and it seems to me to be a discrimination and an injustice. No doubt the committee has overlooked this discrimination. It was not in their minds, I hope.

Mr. CULLOM. I think I have a right to make a point of order upon the amendment, but aside from that, the increase is not estimated for in the Book of Estimates at all or in any other way. I hope that the amendment offered by the Senator from West Virginia will be voted down.

Mr. ELKINS. What does the Senator say?

Mr. CULLOM. I said, in the first place, that I think the amendment is subject to a point of order, and in the second place, it is not estimated for by the Department at all.

Mr. CHANDLER. The Senator from Illinois does not make the point of order?

Mr. CULLOM. Well, I will make it if the Senator insists upon a vote.

Mr. ELKINS. Because it is not estimated for?

Mr. CULLOM. Because it is not estimated for. We increased this salary last year \$500.

Mr. ELKINS. If I understand the Senator in charge of the bill, several items have been increased here, and they were without any recommendation.

Mr. CULLOM. No, sir; I think not.

Mr. ELKINS. I think that is true of the one last referred to.

Mr. CULLOM. The case the Senator refers to, having relation to the law officer of the State Department, came up in the estimates for the Attorney-General's Office or the Department of Justice. It is estimated for.

Mr. ELKINS. You raised the salary of the chief clerk of the Library \$500.

Mr. CULLOM. That was estimated for by the Librarian himself, who is now deceased.

Mr. ELKINS. I should like to have the ruling of the Chair on the point of order.

Mr. CULLOM. All right.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois [Mr. CULLOM] make the point of order?

Mr. CULLOM. I do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will have to sustain the point of order.

Mr. ELKINS. I submit another amendment.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 27, line 14, strike out the words "two hundred and fifty" and insert "four hundred;" so as to read:

Private secretary to the Secretary, \$2,400.

Mr. CULLOM. This refers to the private secretary to the Secretary of State, and the committee and the Senate have had a good deal of trouble with that class of officers, for the reason that some of them draw twenty-four hundred dollars a year, some of them two thousand, and some of them twenty-two hundred and fifty. After the committee had raised some of them to two thousand two hundred and fifty, others insisted that they should have twenty-four hundred dollars. We recognized the inequality of the situation, and the result is that under this bill—I do not know but that we got them all to the same figure last year—we put them all at

twenty-two hundred and fifty, so that each private secretary of a Cabinet officer will get that amount—no more and no less.

This amendment would destroy that equality. The situation as it is gets rid of the inequality and restores equality among that class of secretaries. If we begin to amend again, unless we put them all up or all down, the same inequality will prevail. I hope the Senator will not undertake to do it.

Mr. ELKINS. In reply to the Senator having in charge this bill, I would state that the proposed compensation seems to be just and fair. The work of a private secretary is laborious. It requires talent and ability to perform the duties of his office. He is not limited to hours. He may be called on to work till midnight. He does not go to the Department at the time prescribed for the other employees. He goes before that hour and stays later. I think these private secretaries, in view of the work and duties and responsibilities laid upon them, ought to have \$2,400.

Mr. CULLOM. It has been only a few years since Cabinet officers had any private secretaries at all. They generally did the work themselves.

Mr. ELKINS. That is not against the private secretaries.

Mr. CULLOM. Not at all. I know every one of these private secretaries. They are very clever and very competent, and I am sorry I can not give them what they want.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from West Virginia.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. ELKINS. I propose the amendment which I send to the desk.

The SECRETARY. On page 28, line 21, it is proposed to strike out the words "two hundred and fifty" and insert "four hundred;" so as to read:

Clerk to the Secretary, \$2,400.

Mr. CULLOM. That is the same kind of an amendment, and I hope it will be voted down.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. ELKINS. On page 70, line 1, I move to strike out the words "two hundred and fifty" and insert "four hundred;" so as to read:

Clerk to the Secretary, \$2,400.

Mr. CULLOM. That is the same sort of an amendment.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. ELKINS. On page 79, line 19, I move to strike out the words "two hundred and fifty" and insert "four hundred;" so as to read:

Clerk to the Secretary, \$2,400.

Mr. CULLOM. That is the same thing.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. ELKINS. On page 89, line 8, I move to strike out the words "two hundred and fifty" and insert "four hundred;" so as to read:

Private secretary to the Secretary of the Interior, \$2,400.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. ELKINS. On page 100, line 22, I move to strike out the words "two hundred and fifty" and insert "four hundred;" so as to read:

Private secretary, \$2,400.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. ELKINS. On page 117, line 23, I move to strike out the words "two hundred and fifty" and insert "four hundred;" so as to read:

Private secretary to the Attorney-General, \$2,400.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. CHANDLER. I offer an amendment to come in on page 88, line 1.

The SECRETARY. After the word "two," on page 88, line 1, it is proposed to insert "one clerk of class 1."

Mr. CULLOM. The purpose of the Senator from New Hampshire is to increase the number of clerks?

Mr. CHANDLER. To increase by one the number of clerks in the Bureau of Yards and Docks. It has been estimated for and I know that the Bureau needs the additional force. It is strictly within the rule, I will say to the Senator. If he finds that it is not necessary he can strike it out in conference. It was estimated for, but on the whole did not receive the approval of the Committee on Appropriations. They probably did not know what I know, that the work of the Bureau has so increased that this clerk is absolutely necessary to the work of the Bureau.

Mr. CULLOM. I am willing that the amendment shall be adopted, with the understanding that I shall, unless very good reasons are furnished to the committee, allow it to go out in conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from New Hampshire.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CHANDLER. There is another amendment.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to amend the total so as to read, "\$10,380."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CHANDLER. On page 125, after line 11, I move to insert what I send to the desk.

The SECRETARY. On page 125, after line 11, it is proposed to insert:

To defray the cost of the employment of auditors in the Court of Claims, to be disbursed under the direction of the court, \$10,000.

Mr. CHANDLER. This amendment is reported favorably from the Committee on the Judiciary. That committee made an investigation into the subject and found that it is an important and necessary appropriation in order properly to expedite the work of the Court of Claims.

Mr. COCKRELL. Let the amendment be read again.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment will again be read.

The Secretary again read the amendment.

Mr. CULLOM. There is here somewhere a letter on that subject, but it is a little difficult to find it. I think, as a matter of fact, that the committee was somewhat in doubt whether the appropriation ought not to be made. Here is the letter addressed to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations:

I am informed that an amendment to the legislative appropriation bill for the compensation of auditors in the Court of Claims has been referred to your committee, and I take this opportunity to urge upon you the importance of making provision for the purposes set forth in the bill providing for the appointment of these officers, originally referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Within a short time the Secretary of the Navy has referred to the Court of Claims for investigation all claims of the United States Navy for bounty earned during the recent war with Spain. It is altogether probable that this investigation alone will consume the attention of the auditors for that court, for whom provision has been asked, as above referred to, for the coming year. In addition to these matters, the Auditor for the War Department has in contemplation the reference of the claims of about twenty or more States for reimbursement for expenditures incurred in providing for and equipping the soldiers of the Government during the civil war. Two of these claims have already been thus referred and the others will soon follow.

I am informed that the services of at least one auditor or commissioner of the court will be wholly required for at least the coming year to attend to these matters. It seems to me, therefore, that it is quite imperative that provision be made for the employment and compensation of these auditors, as now asked for, and that it be done at this session of Congress, in order that their appointment may be made and their services be availed of without delay.

Very respectfully,

JOHN W. GRIGGS,
Attorney-General.

Mr. GORMAN. How many auditors does he want?

Mr. CULLOM. This letter does not seem to indicate that the court wants more than one.

Mr. CHANDLER. I do not understand that it is to be given to one person. The court will appoint different auditors in different cases, according to the discretion of the court, and the court will fix their fees.

Mr. CULLOM. It seems to me that if anything is allowed, we ought not to appropriate over \$5,000 on that vague sort of recommendation.

Mr. COCKRELL. I should like to hear from the Committee on the Judiciary on that question.

Mr. CHANDLER. I do not call it vague.

Mr. CULLOM. It is rather indefinite.

Mr. CHANDLER. I think it is very definite. If you put in five thousand, then the committee of conference will give away half of it, and if five thousand is required I think \$10,000 should go in now. I would rather the dividing process should take place at a later stage of the proceeding.

Mr. CULLOM. The committee does not want to give away anything that it is sure the Government wants or needs. I am willing, so far as I am concerned—

Mr. COCKRELL. I should like to hear from the Committee on the Judiciary on that subject. The amendment purports to be reported from that committee. I should like to hear their reasons for it.

Mr. HOAR. Mr. President, the amendment was unanimously reported by the Committee on the Judiciary, and it seems to me that every Senator on examination will see the propriety of it, and that \$10,000 is a very moderate amount. I expected myself, and I now expect, that it will turn out to be insufficient. We have loaded onto the Court of Claims every sort of jurisdiction. We have put upon them matters that are not ordinarily put on judicial tribunals, and it will be absolutely impossible for the judges to do the duty of that court—in the matter of Indian depredations and the thousand other matters that have gone in there—unless they may have the relief of having the right to employ auditors on matters involving the examination of accounts, and containing a great number of items. That, so far as I know, is a power which is given in nearly all the States, not only to the judges of their principal courts, but to the judges of their inferior

courts. In my own State it has been so for years, and it is true now in the United States courts.

Mr. CULLOM. I am inclined to think I perhaps ought to yield and accept the amendment—

Mr. HOAR. Let me finish my statement.

Mr. COCKRELL. I will say to the Senator from Illinois, with all due respect to him, that somebody else wants to hear a satisfactory reason why the amendment should go in. I insist upon hearing it, because I am very doubtful of the propriety of the amendment.

Mr. HOAR. It is a waste to have the duties of a mere accountant performed by a judge at a salary of four or five thousand dollars, who ought to be dealing with great public questions. It is a waste of time; and no court, unless the jurisdiction is not enough to take up half the time of the judges, can get along without such aid.

Mr. COCKRELL. Do I understand that these commissioners or auditors are appointed by the court for specific cases?

Mr. HOAR. Yes.

Mr. COCKRELL. It is not an annual employment?

Mr. HOAR. It is not an annual employment. They are required for a specific case, just like a master in chancery or a referee or any similar function.

Mr. COCKRELL. That is all I wanted to know. I wanted to know how they are appointed and what they do.

Mr. HOAR. In a question where the solvency or insolvency of a single merchant might come up in the course of judicial proceedings, or a single bank, it might take three months of a book-keeper's time to have those accounts properly stated and ready for the attention of the court and questions of law eliminated and stated out of the mere account. As the Court of Claims is at present situated, the judges have to do that themselves, and the result is that it will inevitably bring the business of that court, now getting into great arrears, into very much greater arrears. We have made some very large additions to the jurisdiction of the court within a few months.

Mr. GORMAN. There may be some good reason why an auditor for the Court of Claims should be provided for, but I suggest to the Senator who offers the amendment that, if there is any pressing necessity for the amendment—and I am not yet aware of it—an appropriation ought to be made for one or two auditors at a specific salary. In every other case connected with this court we provide, as the Senator will see by looking at the bill, for the salary of judges and all other officers of the court. I do not care to make a point of order if the committee think there is a necessity for the amendment, but ought there not to be a specific salary fixed?

Mr. COCKRELL. Let me suggest to the Senator from Maryland that we have not provided for any permanent auditors for that court. There are none by law.

Mr. GORMAN. I know there are not.

Mr. COCKRELL. If you appoint a permanent one, you will never get rid of him. This is simply the appointment by the court of a man to make an accounting in certain cases and to pay him for it. As a matter of course, it appoints lawyers and accountants, depending upon the character of the work to be done; and it would be safer in the way of economy to let it go in this way than to fix a salary.

Mr. HOAR. I will make one suggestion to the Senator from Maryland, which, I think, will be decisive to his mind, unless he suggests some answer to it that does not occur to me. The transaction that may be investigated may arise anywhere in the United States. Take, for instance, the Indian depredation claims, and some of the claims in regard to the cutting of timber. If you appoint an auditor or two auditors resident in the city of Washington, they might be called upon to travel to the State of Washington, or Alaska, or California, to investigate a single case; whereas if you appoint some competent attorney in the neighborhood he would do perhaps the whole work of the auditors in three or four days. I think a great deal is due to the uniform judicial experience in this country. I am not aware that in any State or in any court there is a system of having a permanent auditor to whom cases are referred.

Then another consideration is that the transaction may be one which requires a particular kind of an expert, a water engineer, or a manufacturing engineer, or an expert in certain kinds of fabrics, or a mining engineer. Very likely there might be some important questions connected with the value and yield of mines, and it would be necessary to have selected from the neighborhood an expert with reference to the case.

Mr. GORMAN. This is the first time I have heard of it, and I gather from the reading of the letter of the Attorney-General that he bases this very mild and modest recommendation for this appropriation or some provision on the adjustment of claims growing out of the extra work because of the war with Spain.

Mr. CHANDLER. I ask the Senator from Missouri to read the letter.

Mr. GORMAN. Yes; read Judge Nott's letter.

Mr. COCKRELL. It is as follows:

COURT OF CLAIMS CHAMBERS,
Washington, January 27, 1899.

DEAR SIR: I am informed by the chairman of the Judiciary Committee of the Senate that the committee has reported an amendment to the legislative appropriation bill for the compensation of auditors in this court, which has been referred to the Committee on Appropriations. Since the matter left the hands of the Judiciary Committee, a communication has been received from the Secretary of the Navy of which I think the Committee on Appropriations should be apprised.

The Secretary of the Navy has referred to the court for investigation what appears to be the whole naval part of the war with Spain. I inclose a copy of his communication.

More than fifteen hundred claimants have already appeared by attorneys. If the remainder of the officers and seamen come into court, there will be more than 5,000 claimants, so I am informed. This is doubtless a great convenience to the Secretary of the Navy and the Attorney-General, having all the claims before one tribunal, to be disposed of, probably, at one time; but it will throw an immense amount of work upon the court. The claims will undoubtedly fall into classes, and the judicial part of the work will be of a general character, such as determining in fact and in law the status of a certain vessel, etc., but assigning individual claimants to their proper classes and making up findings of fact, which will be of practical assistance for the Navy Department, will involve an immense amount of work in detail, such as the calculation of individual claims in a general fund, which, so it now seems, it will be impossible for the judges to perform without assistance.

No additional appropriation than that recommended by the Judiciary Committee will be necessary.

Respectfully, etc.,

CHARLES C. NOTT.

Hon. WILLIAM B. ALLISON,
Chairman Committee on Appropriations,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

Mr. CULLOM. I wish to state to the Senator from Maryland that the letter from the Attorney-General which I read was carried away by one of the reporters of the Senate, otherwise I would present it. It will be here in a moment.

Mr. GORMAN. The appropriations, of course, for the various Departments, including the Court of Claims, come here in the regular way. There was no estimate made for this appropriation, and no recommendation from the head of the Department other than these personal letters.

Mr. HOAR. It is recommended by the Attorney-General.

Mr. CHANDLER. I should like to say in answer to the Senator from Maryland, that I do not think Congress should be put into leading strings quite in that way. The committees have the right to originate amendments. If any Senator discovers a necessity of the public service and introduces an amendment to meet it, and refers the amendment to the committee, and the committee take the opinion of the head of the Department about it and it is then recommended, it ought to be just as free and open a matter of legislation as if it came through the machinery of regular appropriations made five or six months previous. If we do not exercise that privilege, we might as well enact the estimates when they come here in December and not trouble ourselves with any more attempts to legislate on these matters.

I agree with the rule of the Senate as it exists, that new appropriations and increased appropriations should not be made unless they are estimated for or unless they are recommended by a committee of this body. The Judiciary Committee of this body made a careful investigation and took the opinion of the Attorney-General and the opinion of the chief justice of the Court of Claims. Now, what more would the Senator have?

Mr. GORMAN. I do not pretend for a moment that it is not proper to make appropriations in this way, but they ought not to be made without understanding the fact.

Mr. CHANDLER. I do not ask that. I say that the evidence is ample. I am not undertaking to crowd any Senator at all. But the Senator's proposition that we ought not to do it, unless it was estimated for last October and came in the regular way from the Treasury Department in December, is an attempt to limit legislation in a way in which I do not think he really wishes to have it limited.

Mr. GORMAN. I did not intend to say that it ought to be made in the regular estimates, for a special estimate can be made, as is done frequently when cases arise after the regular estimates have been made out; but what I did say, and what I repeat, is that until this moment I have never seen any evidence whatever that there was a necessity for this appropriation. In view of the fact that we have been warned by the gentlemen who are in charge of governmental affairs that we ought to use great economy, and for the reasons publicly stated, which I shall not quote at this time, I thought that in an appropriation even as small as \$10,000 it was well enough to call the attention of the Senate to it.

I do not understand from reading again the letter of the Attorney-General that he considers this a very great emergency. It is true he says that the claims growing out of the war with Spain will require at least one auditor to adjust them during the next year. If the Judiciary Committee—the gentlemen responsible for the

management of the judiciary of the Government—think it absolutely necessary, I will not make the point of order.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. CHANDLER]. The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TELLER. I move, on page 3, line 3, to strike out the word "four" and the words "and forty" and insert in place of the word "four" the word "six," making it read "messenger, acting as assistant librarian, \$1,600," instead of "\$1,440."

Mr. CULLOM. While I have no feeling about the matter, I think that the salary asked for is not estimated for at all in the Book of Estimates, or anywhere else.

Mr. TELLER. I do not know whether it comes within the technical estimate, but it is recommended by the Librarian. It is for assistant librarian. One assistant librarian gets \$1,800, and I propose to make the salary of this assistant \$1,600. I think the Senator ought not to raise an objection to it.

Mr. CULLOM. I will not make any point of order against the amendment.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Colorado.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SHOUP. I offer an amendment. On page 65, line 5, I move to strike out the word "two," before the word "hundred," and to insert in lieu thereof the word "six," so as to read:

Assay office at Boise, Idaho: For assayer, who shall also perform the duties of melter, \$2,000; one clerk, \$1,600.

Mr. CULLOM. I think that is estimated for.

Mr. ALLISON. It is estimated for.

Mr. CULLOM. I can make no objection to it, so far as the committee is concerned.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GEAR. On page 5, line 11, after the word "Mining," I move to insert "the Committee on Pacific Railroads."

Mr. CULLOM. I think I ought not to agree to that amendment. I hope the Senator from Iowa will not press it.

Mr. GEAR. I do not see any reason why the clerk of that committee should not get the same salary as the clerks of other committees.

Mr. CULLOM. It is not estimated for; and I think I must make the point of order against the amendment.

Mr. GEAR. I do not think that any of these committee clerks are estimated for.

Mr. CULLOM. Yes, they are estimated for, and the appropriation is made accordingly. I shall make the point of order on the amendment. I hope the Senator will not press it. I dislike to make the point of order.

Mr. GEAR. I ask for the ruling of the Chair.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair believes the point of order to be good, unless the amount was estimated for by the head of a Department.

Mr. GEAR. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The SECRETARY. On page 10, after line 24, insert:

To continue employment and pay of P. L. Coultry as acting assistant foreman of the folding room, from July 1, 1899, to June 30, 1900, inclusive, \$1,400.

Mr. CULLOM. That is an amendment proposing to add to what the House itself has put into the bill, and it is not asked for by the House at this time.

Mr. GEAR. I will state to the Senator from Illinois that the House omitted to put it in.

Mr. CULLOM. I do not know how that is, but it certainly was not presented to the committee.

Mr. GEAR. It was so stated to me.

Mr. CULLOM. We generally allow the House to take care of itself unless it comes to the Senate committee and asks the Senate to do something through its committee.

Mr. GEAR. I understand that it was an oversight on the part of the House.

Mr. CULLOM. I do not think I can allow the amendment to go upon the bill.

Mr. COCKRELL. I hope the Senator from Iowa will not press an amendment of this kind. We have had repeated controversies with the House over our right to regulate and control our own affairs. The Senate established that fact after a long controversy, and with the distinct understanding that we would in no manner interfere, directly or indirectly, in their affairs.

Mr. GEAR. I will say, in reply to the Senator from Missouri, that I understand it was an oversight on the part of the House; that the gentleman who had the matter in charge failed to bring it to the attention of the House.

Mr. CULLOM. Then the House committee ought to have presented it to the Senate committee.

Mr. COCKRELL. We have made but one rule, and I insist that we shall not deviate from that rule. The committee that make up the bill in the House and report it and have it passed must

come and say that they want such a provision put in, and we have gone so far as to require that it shall be done in writing. Now, if we take the statement of a member of the House or of half a dozen members of the House and put something in the bill, we are gone; we have broken every anchor that holds us in a strong position.

Mr. GEAR. I will say, in reply to the Senator from Missouri, that I understand the committee of the House are willing to accept this amendment.

Mr. CULLOM. The committee has not called upon any member of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate in regard to it that I am aware of.

Mr. COCKRELL. They know perfectly well in the House exactly what we require. We have had this controversy with them. We know exactly and they all know what is required, and it is not right or fair or just that they should come and ask Senators to put upon these bills amendments of this character. They know perfectly well that if they can get the Appropriations Committee to come over here and ask our Appropriations Committee to put it in we will put it in, and then we will say to the conferees, "We did it at the request of the committee; take it out if you want to do it, or do with it just as you choose;" but we can not put in a provision of this kind on our own motion.

Mr. GEAR. I understand that the gentleman in charge failed to offer it in the House, but that the House committee will accept it in conference. It is of no personal concern to me whatever.

Mr. COCKRELL. The Senate of the present Congress will soon pass out, and if you want to set that precedent and get up that row I simply give notice as to what will be the result of it.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GEAR].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. STEWART. I offer an amendment on page 107. In lines 9 and 10 I move to strike out "\$1,800" and insert "\$2,000;" so as to read:

For surveyor-general of Nevada, \$2,000.

Mr. COCKRELL. Is that estimated for?

Mr. STEWART. That makes the salary the same as that of all the others.

Mr. COCKRELL. Is it estimated for, I ask the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. STEWART. I think so.

Mr. CULLOM. The Senator is mistaken. There is no estimate for it, and the claim is that there are two other officers.

Mr. COCKRELL. In three other States?

Mr. CULLOM. In three States where they receive only \$1,800 a year salary.

Mr. STEWART. I do not know of any other.

Mr. CULLOM. Yes; both Louisiana and Minnesota.

Mr. COCKRELL. And Florida.

Mr. CULLOM. And Florida in addition, I believe. So I must make the point of order on the amendment.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The point of order is made upon the amendment, and it is sustained.

Mr. CULLOM. Now, if there are no further amendments, I hope the bill will be reported to the Senate.

Mr. ALLEN. I do not want to delay the passage of this bill. I want to hasten it as much as I can. It may not be strictly germane to the bill itself at this time, but I should like to ask the Senator from Illinois or any other Senator belonging to the Committee on Appropriations in what order the other appropriation bills will be presented to the Senate?

Mr. CULLOM. I desire, as soon as this bill is out of the way, to call up the Agricultural appropriation bill and let it be taken up for consideration, but I do not desire that it shall be considered to-night.

Mr. ALLEN. I will put my question a little more direct, a little more pointed. Is there any purpose to bring up the Army bill for consideration before the other appropriation bills have been passed on?

Mr. CULLOM. I do not understand that the Army bill has passed the House as yet.

Mr. COCKRELL. Oh, it passed the House and has been in the Committee on Military Affairs for two weeks.

Mr. CULLOM. Well, it has not been reported here.

Mr. COCKRELL. No, it is in the committee.

Mr. CULLOM. I understood the Senator to refer to the Army appropriation bill.

Mr. ALLEN. It is rumored in the Chamber this afternoon that there is a purpose of bringing up the Army bill on Monday or Tuesday. Anticipating that the discussion on that bill will run to the end of the session, and that the other appropriation bills will be suffered to go over as a pretext for an extra session of Congress, I should like to know from the Senator from Illinois, or from any other Senator, if there is any intention of that kind?

Mr. CULLOM. I know very little about the Army bill or the Army appropriation bill. So far as I am concerned, I desire very much to proceed with the Agricultural appropriation bill on Monday and to continue its discussion and consideration until it is disposed of.

Mr. ALLEN. Is it the intention of the committee to present all these bills before the Army bill is brought up for discussion?

Mr. CULLOM. I understand that the Military Academy bill is now ready to be considered, and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SEWELL] who is in charge of it will ask for its consideration immediately after the Agricultural appropriation bill is disposed of.

Mr. ALLEN. How many appropriation bills are yet remaining?

Mr. CHANDLER. What does the Senator mean by the Army bill, may I ask?

Mr. ALLEN. I mean the reorganization bill.

Mr. CHANDLER. That bill is not in the hands of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. CULLOM. The Appropriations Committee has nothing to do with that bill.

Mr. ALLISON. It has not been reported from the Senate Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. CHANDLER. It has not.

Mr. ALLEN. But there is such an intermingling and commingling of purposes on the other side of the Chamber that I do not know exactly who is responsible for it.

Mr. CHANDLER. I should be glad myself to intermingle and commingle all the bills, so that the Senator from Nebraska could speak on all at once, instead of speaking on each separately.

Mr. ALLEN. I desire to lengthen my remarks, and therefore will cut them in two and fit them to each bill as it comes up.

Mr. CHANDLER. It would be better if the Senator could speak on the Army bill and on all the appropriation bills at the same time.

Mr. ALLEN. No; I think not.

Mr. CHANDLER. But the Committee on Appropriations has no power to report the Army bill, as it is before the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. ALLEN. I understood that the Committee on Appropriations was to give way for the Army bill.

Mr. ALLISON. Mr. President, the Committee on Appropriations, as I understand it, purpose to go on with the appropriation bills as rapidly as possible. They have been considerably impeded of late, as Senators very well know, by commingling, or omitting to commingle, in a way that has not been quite satisfactory, but we hope to proceed in a better way next week.

The first bill, as the Senator from Illinois has stated, will be the Agricultural appropriation bill. That is on the Calendar. The West Point Military Academy bill is on the Calendar, and we hope to have the Post-Office appropriation bill on the Calendar early next week, and to take it up as soon as possible.

Mr. ALLEN. I hope the Senator from Iowa will recognize the fact that the discussion on this bill and other appropriation bills indulged in by Senators, including myself, has thrown great light upon the duty of that committee.

Mr. ALLISON. I am quite sure of that; and I was not criticizing the Senator at all, because for myself I always feel interested in what he says; and when he has occasion to refer to the Committee on Appropriations, which he is extremely fond of doing, it is always gratifying to the committee. Therefore I find no fault with the Senator.

Mr. ALLEN. I feel that the Committee on Appropriations could not discharge its duty fully and completely without some slight aid from me from time to time.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. If there be no objection, the changes made necessary by amendments in various clauses will be made in the footings by the Secretary.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. CULLOM. I ask the Senate to allow the Agricultural appropriation bill to be now taken up.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator desire to have that done without interfering with the unfinished business?

Mr. CULLOM. I want the unfinished business to be temporarily laid aside for the consideration of the appropriation bill.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 11266) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1900? The Chair hears none, and lays the bill before the Senate.

Mr. CULLOM. I now yield to the Senator from Kansas [Mr. HARRIS], who desires the consideration of a bill which he has in charge.

KANSAS, OKLAHOMA CENTRAL AND SOUTHWESTERN RAILWAY.

Mr. HARRIS. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House bill No. 11098, which has been passed by the House of Representatives and reported favorably without amendment by the Committee on Indian Affairs of the Senate.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. I was going to ask to have that bill considered.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request made by the Senator from Kansas?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 11098) to extend and amend the provisions of an act entitled "An act to grant the right of way to the Kansas, Oklahoma Central and Southwestern Railway Company through the Indian Territory and Oklahoma Territory, and for other purposes," approved December 21, 1893, and also to extend and amend the provisions of a supplemental act approved February 15, 1897, entitled "An act to extend and amend an act entitled 'An act to grant the right of way to the Kansas, Oklahoma Central and Southwestern Railway Company through the Indian Territory and Oklahoma Territory, and for other purposes.'"

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

ROADWAY ACROSS ROCK CREEK PARK.

Mr. GORMAN. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 11358) for a roadway in the District of Columbia from Brightwood avenue across Rock Creek Park.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

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

The preamble was agreed to.

STATE EXPENSES FOR VOLUNTEER ARMY.

Mr. WARREN. I ask unanimous consent for the consideration of Senate bill 5260, which was left over from yesterday morning.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 5260) to amend an act entitled "An act to reimburse the governors of States and Territories for expenses incurred by them in aiding the United States to raise and organize and supply and equip the Volunteer Army of the United States in the existing war with Spain," approved July 8, 1898, and for other purposes.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. This bill has been read the second time in full, and there are several amendments which have been reported by the Committee on Military Affairs.

The first amendment reported by the Committee on Military Affairs was, in section 1, line 1, page 2, after the word "claims," to insert the words "of States and;" in line 4, after the date "1898," to strike out "Provided, That no reimbursement shall be made for expenses incurred after August 12, 1898: And;" and in line 7, page 2, before the word "That," to strike out "further;" so as to make the section read:

That the act entitled "An act to reimburse the governors of States and Territories for expenses incurred by them in aiding the United States to raise and organize and supply and equip the Volunteer Army of the United States in the existing war with Spain," approved July 8, 1898, be so amended that the Secretary of the Treasury shall be, and is hereby, authorized to allow, in the settlement of the claims of States and of the governors of States and Territories for reimbursement under the provisions of the said act, expenses incurred after as well as before July 8, 1898: *Provided*, That no reimbursement shall be made for service of members of the National Guard or organized militia of any State or Territory who were not accepted into the Volunteer Army of the United States as of the same grade.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 2, page 2, line 13, after the word "Territory," to insert "or the State or Territory;" in line 24, after the word "faith," to strike out "volunteer for service" and insert "present himself for enrollment;" and in line 1, on page 3, after the words "United States," to insert:

And provided further, That the provisions of this section shall apply also to individual volunteers who presented themselves in good faith for enrollment in the Volunteer Army of the United States.

So as to make the section read:

SEC. 2. That under the appropriation made by said act the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized to reimburse the governor of any State or Territory, or the State or Territory, for reasonable expenses incurred by him in the actual transportation of the members of organized militia or National Guard of his State from the place of company, battalion, or regimental rendezvous to the State rendezvous or place designated for examination and acceptance of the members of such organization into the Volunteer Army of the United States, and the actual transportation from the State rendezvous to their respective company, battalion, or regimental rendezvous of such men as were rejected for lack of physical qualifications: *Provided*, That no reimbursement shall be made for the transportation of any man who did not in good faith present himself for enrollment in the Volunteer Army of the United States: *And provided further*, That the provisions of this section shall apply also to individual volunteers who presented themselves in good faith for enrollment in the Volunteer Army of the United States.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 3, on page 3, line 7, after the words "reimbursement of," to insert "any State or;" and in line 13, before the word "accepted," to strike out "be" and insert "have been;" so as to make the section read:

SEC. 3. That nothing in said act of July 8, 1898, shall be so construed as to prohibit the reimbursement of any State or the governor of any State or Territory for reasonable expenses incurred in the subsistence of the members of any organization of the organized militia or National Guard of his State or Territory after having been called out by the governor on or after April 25, 1898: *Provided*, That such organization shall afterwards have been accepted into the Volunteer Army of the United States.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, to insert, as a new section, the following:

SEC. 4. That the expenses incurred by States or the governors of States in carrying out the provisions of this act shall be reimbursed and paid to them, notwithstanding any unsettled accounts, claims, or indebtedness of the United States against their States, and without prejudice to such unsettled accounts: *And provided further*, That where an officer of the Army detailed as mustering officer for volunteers, purchased equipment necessary for the comfort of the men in camp or rendezvous, and said equipment was subsequently taken into the United States service by said volunteers and no receipts given to such military officer, the certificate to that effect of the governor of the State or Territory to which the volunteers belonged shall be held sufficient to authorize the settlement of such accounts.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, to insert, as a new section, the following:

SEC. 5. That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and is hereby, authorized to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the just and proper account or claim of any railroad, transportation company, or person who has at the request of the Quartermaster-General of the Army or his agents, or at the request of any United States mustering officer or other officer authorized by the Secretary of War to enroll, muster, or mobilize volunteers for the war with Spain, for transportation of men or troops from place of enrollment to point of rendezvous, and also to pay such just and proper accounts as may be presented for transportation back from point of rendezvous to place of enrollment of men who volunteered in good faith and were rejected on account of disqualification as found by medical officers duly appointed by the War Department: *Provided*, That the amount allowed and paid for such transportation shall not be in excess of the rates charged for transporting troops of the United States under like circumstances.

All claims under the provision of this act must be filed in the office of the Auditor for the War Department, and must be supported by proper vouchers or other conclusive evidence of interest.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section [4] 6, line 4, after the word "before," to strike out "July" and insert "January," and in the same line, after the word "first," to strike out "eighteen hundred and ninety-nine" and insert "nineteen hundred;" so as to make the section read:

SEC. [4] 6. That all claims for reimbursement under this act or the act of July 8, 1898, shall be presented in itemized form to the Treasury Department on or before January 1, 1900, or be forever barred.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CHILTON. I move to amend by adding to section 4 what I send to the desk.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to amend by inserting after the word "accounts," at the end of section 4, line 3, page 4, the following:

And where the commander of a company or companies or troop or troops has purchased supplies necessary for the comfort or subsistence of the men in camp or rendezvous between the date of enrollment under the call of the President and the mustering in of the company or troop, the certificate to that effect of the governor of the State or Territory to which the volunteers belonged shall be held sufficient to authorize the payment of such accounts to the parties entitled.

Mr. ALLISON. I think that is a very crude amendment. It refers only to companies or troops; and I suggest that regiments should also be included.

Mr. CHILTON. I only drew the amendment to suit the case in my own State. Where the words "company or troop" are used, as the Senator suggests, there might be inserted the word "regiment."

Mr. ALLISON. Let the word "or" before the word "troop" be stricken out, and the words "or regiment" inserted after "troop" in both places where the word occurs.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON] to the amendment of the Senator from Texas [Mr. CHILTON].

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. TILLMAN. I offer an amendment to appear at the end of section 1.

Mr. COCKRELL. One moment. I desire to inquire if there is anything in the amendment of the Senator from Texas to indicate what shall be paid for?

Mr. CHILTON. The language is, "has purchased supplies necessary for the comfort or subsistence of the men in camp or rendezvous." I do not care about the language. I drew the amendment hurriedly in my seat, when I learned the bill would come

up, to meet the case in my State, which is this: Between the time the companies were organized and the time when they were mustered into the service certain officers made bills with merchants, supposing they would be paid under the prior act of 1898. The Secretary of War sent a telegram to our governor, which was supposed to cover that kind of a case. On the strength of that telegram the merchants furnished the supplies, and since that time the War Department has held that they are not covered by that statute. This is intended to authorize the governor to certify to the amounts of the supplies bought of the merchants for the subsistence or comfort of the companies, and in that way secure the payment of the claims.

Mr. COCKRELL. Would it not be better to have some limitation? We have a number of companies in Missouri in the same situation, where supplies were paid for. I have written to the Department about those accounts, and had one of them in my possession a few minutes ago. Would it not be better to say "necessary and suitable supplies," so that we should not have to pay for any and everything which might have been furnished?

Mr. CHILTON. I think the word "necessary," as used in the amendment, is really better than to put in the word "suitable." I do not think that word would help it any. I ask the Secretary to read again that particular language of the amendment.

The Secretary read as follows:

And where the commander of a company or companies, or troop or troops, or regiment has purchased supplies necessary for the comfort or subsistence of the men in camp or rendezvous, etc.

Mr. ALLISON. I think the certificate of the governor will cover the matter.

Mr. CHILTON. That is right; if we can not trust the governors of the States, I do not know whom we can trust.

Mr. COCKRELL. I think probably the language employed will answer the purpose.

Mr. TILLMAN. I ask that the amendment which I have offered may be read—to insert what I send to the desk at the end of section 1.

Mr. BACON. Has the amendment of the Senator from Texas been disposed of?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment has been agreed to.

Mr. BACON. I did not so understand. I wish to offer an amendment to it.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. No formal vote was taken upon the amendment, and the Senator is entitled to offer an amendment to the amendment if he so desires.

Mr. BACON. I will state what the amendment which I propose is intended to meet, so that it may be understood. There were 10 regiments raised, known as immune regiments, United States Volunteers. The company officers secured men, and up to the time of their mustering in they paid the expenses of the men; in other words, they acted really as recruiting officers, and many of them went to an expense of several hundred dollars. They had to get men, keep them at hotels and boarding-houses, and pay their railroad expenses to the point of rendezvous. In other words, they incurred all the expenses that the Government would have incurred if the Government had been recruiting the men.

Mr. TILLMAN. Those were immunes?

Mr. BACON. Yes; those 10 regiments.

Mr. TILLMAN. The same thing happened in my State.

Mr. BACON. I have no doubt it is true of all the 10 regiments. I have conferred with the War Department about the matter, and the officers there think that those expenses ought to be paid.

Mr. ALLISON. Those expenses will be paid by the War Department under proper regulations.

Mr. TILLMAN. On the Army appropriation bill.

Mr. ALLISON. The governors of the States have nothing to do with it.

Mr. TILLMAN. And this relates solely to volunteers.

Mr. ALLISON. Yes; it relates to the volunteers.

Mr. COCKRELL. It ought to be provided for by separate legislation.

Mr. TILLMAN. It should be placed on the Army appropriation bill, where it belongs.

Mr. ALLISON. I quite agree that proper provision should be made in the case stated by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. BACON], but I understand this to be a bill relating especially to the State troops.

Mr. COCKRELL. Volunteers of the States.

Mr. ALLISON. Volunteer troops of the States.

Mr. BACON. I was about to say that I had conferred with the War Department in reference to this matter, and the officers there agreed with the suggestion of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON] that these expenses ought to be paid, as they were really expenses incurred by individuals which would have otherwise been incurred by the Government—the ordinary expenses that the Government meets when it attempts to recruit men for the

regular regiment—but at the same time the expenses were created by the enlistment of the men. I do not desire, of course, to encumber this bill, as it relates purely to State volunteers.

Mr. WARREN. If the Senator will permit me, I will state to him that the matter is already covered, and refer him to the language of section 4.

Mr. BACON. Certainly.

Mr. WARREN. That section provides:

That where an officer of the Army detailed as mustering officer for volunteers purchased equipment necessary for the comfort of the men in camp or rendezvous, and said equipment was subsequently taken into the United States service by said volunteers and no receipts given to such military officer, the certificate to that effect of the governor of the State or Territory to which the volunteers belonged shall be held sufficient to authorize the settlement of such accounts.

Mr. BACON. But that is not the case, Mr. President.

Mr. TILLMAN. That refers to equipment and rations.

Mr. BACON. These persons were not then officers. For instance, a regiment of immunes was to be organized and a certain number of citizens would be selected to be captains. They were told if they would raise companies they would be commissioned as captains. That agreement was carried out, and they would, out in the country, take a month, engage in the finding of men, and get their agreement to enter the company. They had to take care of the men in the meantime, a squad here and a squad yonder. Finally they were sent to the points of rendezvous, being kept in boarding houses in the meantime until the company was completed and mustered in.

I know the fact that probably in every instance there was an expense of somewhere from \$300 to \$400 to each one of these captains who raised companies, and they were expenses not of themselves, but expenses of the men whom they recruited, and whose support could not be turned over to the Government until they were enlisted.

Mr. ALLISON. Does the War Department suggest any remedy for that?

Mr. BACON. The officers at the War Department have said to me that they thought the class of officers to whom I have referred ought to be reimbursed, but there was no authority under the law by which it could be done; that they had no authority under the law to reimburse such expenses; and the suggestion has been made by the Department that there should be legislation for that purpose.

Mr. ALLISON. There should be some legislation; but there must be some power somewhere to review these accounts.

Mr. BACON. Undoubtedly.

Mr. ALLISON. But it seems to me that an entirely separate provision ought to be made in some other bill.

Mr. TILLMAN. The Army appropriation bill is the place for it.

Mr. ALLISON. A provision should be made separately for the immune regiments, and some officer of the Army should be designated to deal with these accounts.

Mr. CHILTON. The governors of States would have nothing to do with that.

Mr. BACON. I realize that; and under the suggestion of the Senator I will not offer my amendment now, but will simply ask that the matter be taken into consideration by the Appropriations Committee and attention given to it.

Mr. BATE. The Committee on Military Affairs, seeing the embarrassment in this case, framed a bill and sent it, with a communication, to the War Department. That Department sent an assistant adjutant-general to the committee, and with his assistance a bill was framed for the purpose of covering these cases. That bill was in the hands of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN].

Mr. WARREN. I will say regarding this section of the bill that it was one which was sent from the committee to the War Department and to the Treasury to meet exactly such a case as the Senator from Georgia [Mr. BACON] describes. For instance, a captain who was raising troops for a company of the Second Volunteer Cavalry, which is exactly on the same basis as the immunes, presented a bill for meals at the hotel that he had paid. That was sent down, and the way they propose to cover it and the language in which they put it is embraced in section 4. If they have not covered it, it is not the fault of the Committee on Military Affairs in reporting the bill.

Mr. BACON. Will the Senator read it again?

Mr. WARREN. They stated that it was difficult to legislate so as to approach that directly and not let in accounts that would not be properly certified. They were willing to pay an account sent up from the mustering officer to the governor and by him certified, wherever the troops were. There seemed to be but one way of obtaining the authority.

Section 4 reads:

That the expenses incurred by the governors of States in carrying out the provisions of this act shall be reimbursed and paid to them, notwithstanding any unsettled accounts, claims, or indebtedness of the United States against

their States, and without prejudice to such unsettled accounts: And provided further, That where an officer of the Army detailed as mustering officer for volunteers—

The mustering officer, of course, was not an officer of the State or an officer of the State militia in any way.

Mr. BACON. Go on and read that.

Mr. TILLMAN. You will see also that he was not an officer at all, but he was trying to get to be an officer. I know one instance in Charleston in which a young man—

Mr. COCKRELL. There is no provision in this bill to cover that.

Mr. TILLMAN. He was organizing a company for one of the immune regiments, white men, and he spent several hundred dollars and then carried his company to Macon at his own expense. He never could get them mustered in or received, and he could not get a cent of compensation under this bill.

Mr. WARREN. Having appealed to the Department to cover just such a case as this, having sent a case of that kind down, we are without any language or authority from them to correct the bill. I submit that it is best, then, to pass this bill as it is, and then undertake to cover that in some other way, upon an appropriation bill or otherwise, or else that some Senator present offer an amendment such as will cover the fault complained of and place it in this bill now. I want to cover all the points necessary to reimburse all parties who paid out money.

Mr. TILLMAN. Let me suggest an amendment.

Mr. COCKRELL. I hope the Senator will not open up the door that wide. The question of paying for recruiting service is a very broad one. There were no less than from five to ten million dollars of claims during the late war by persons who claimed to have organized troops, and they have been presenting them ever since the close of the war. The Government has persistently refused to pay them. It is an entirely different service from the service provided for in this bill. This bill provides for the expenditures made by the States or individuals in the States, and it ought to be kept entirely separate from the other question.

Mr. BACON. I was going to make the same suggestion. In view of what has been said, and as the chairman of the committee thinks that the amendment could be adopted at any time, that it could as well be put upon the Army bill as any other, I would myself withdraw any proposition to amend this bill, hoping in the meantime that we may provide some amendment which will meet with the approval of the committee.

Mr. ALLISON. I think that in cases where the recruiting officers recruited men and paid them during the organization of the company or regiment, the Government should pay it, but I think it should only apply to people who were afterwards mustered into the regiments. It seems to me that we can carefully guard it.

Mr. COCKRELL. Certainly, wherever they came for that purpose.

Mr. ALLISON. I think so.

Mr. COCKRELL. We have always done that. When the war began there was \$50,000,000 appropriated for the express purpose of paying off those men, and I think there is an appropriation already. I can not point it out just now, but I think the War Department has jurisdiction of that matter.

Mr. ALLISON. In the war of the rebellion all that class of expenditures was made generally in the form of reimbursement to the States, because the company officers were usually recruiting under commissions from the Government.

Mr. COCKRELL. Yes.

Mr. ALLISON. But this is a case where it was going on directly under the Government of the United States, and they ought to be familiar with every detail.

Mr. COCKRELL. Certainly.

Mr. BATE. Mr. President, there is an embarrassment in that matter which no one has seemed to touch on, that there are a great many of these men who were recruited, but were not mustered in. They came there in cold weather. Take my own town, for instance. The United States officer, a captain, who was there mustering in saw the necessity, and he sent them a lot of blankets. They were appropriated, and he never took the receipt. The law is exact and requires that the individual shall give the receipt. Now they have stopped the pay of this gentleman, as I understand it, for the purpose of meeting some \$4,000, or something like that. This bill in the hands of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN] is intended to remedy that, if possible.

Mr. PASCO. I think the difficulty complained of by the Senator from Tennessee is covered in part by this language in the fourth section:

And provided further, That where an officer of the Army, detailed as mustering officer for volunteers, purchased equipment necessary for the comfort of the men in camp or rendezvous, and said equipment was subsequently taken into the United States service by said volunteers and no receipts given to such military officer, the certificate to that effect of the governor of the State or Territory to which the volunteers belonged shall be held sufficient to authorize the settlement of such accounts.

I think that will cover the larger part of it.

Mr. BATE. That was intended to cover it.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILLMAN].

Mr. CHILTON. Has my amendment been acted upon?

Mr. COCKRELL. The amendment of the Senator from Texas has been agreed to.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. It has been agreed to.

Mr. COCKRELL. What is the amendment of the Senator from South Carolina? Let it be read.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. It will be read.

The SECRETARY. At the end of the first section it is proposed to insert:

Provided further, That compensation, at the rate paid to officers and soldiers in the Regular Army, shall be allowed to the States and governors of States as pay to such volunteers and Naval Reserves as appeared at the place of muster and were afterwards received into the service, for the period between the date of assembly at the rendezvous and the date on which they were mustered in.

Mr. TILLMAN. I will state for the information of the Senate—

Mr. ELKINS. I move that the Senate do now adjourn.

Mr. COCKRELL. Read the amendment again.

The Secretary again read the amendment.

Mr. COCKRELL. I suggest to insert "appeared and remained." The words "and remained" should go in.

Mr. TILLMAN. Of course; if they did not remain, we do not want them.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. COCKRELL. Then it only applies to those who remained there and were mustered in.

Mr. TILLMAN. That is it.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILLMAN] as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TILLMAN. Lest there may be some doubt in the minds of the officers of the War Department, whom I find exceedingly particular, I want the Senate to give its own idea by its vote on this bill as to its meaning. The State of South Carolina has bonds in the Treasury Department purchased in 1857 as Indian trust funds. Those bonds are there as obligations by South Carolina, along with six or seven other Southern States—Virginia, Florida, Alabama, I think, etc.—and when we came to present our account we were met by the act of 1878, I think, or some act which prohibits a State from being paid any money until these Indian trust funds or this claim of the United States against the States on account of money owing the United States by the States for the trust fund had been settled. Therefore the claim of our governor for reimbursement was disallowed—every dollar of it. Section 4 says:

That the expenses incurred by the governors of States in carrying out the provisions of this act shall be reimbursed and paid to them, notwithstanding any unsettled accounts, claims, or indebtedness of the United States against their States, and without prejudice to such unsettled accounts.

I presume that language is put in there to meet the very case of an offset.

Mr. COCKRELL. Certainly.

Mr. TILLMAN. Is that it?

Mr. PASCO. That was the purpose.

Mr. WARREN. That was the intention of the Military Affairs Committee fully in considering the question, and I presume it is the intention of the Senate.

Mr. ALLISON. It certainly meets the question.

Mr. TILLMAN. Do the words "incurred by the governors"—

Mr. PASCO. That is the language of the original bill.

Mr. TILLMAN. I know, but under the original bill we were told simply "we can not pay you, because there is a law forbidding it."

Mr. PASCO. This is to prevent that very thing. If the word "accounts" is not sufficient—

Mr. TILLMAN. In our case this condition arose. Our legislature had adjourned in January before the war opened, and it did not meet until last January. The governor had no funds at his disposal with which to meet these expenses. He telegraphed the Secretary of War, "What am I to do for means to subsist these people and bring them together, and furnish them something to eat, etc., until you can muster them in?" The answer was, "Incur the obligations or purchase all that is necessary and we will pay you." He has not paid those accounts, because he did not have the money, but he obligated his word of honor, based upon the promise of the Secretary of War, that the accounts should be paid.

Now, does the word "incurred" include those accounts which have not been paid by the governors as well as those which have been paid by the governors who had funds at their disposal?

Mr. COCKRELL. I think this covers the whole case. It is intended to prevent the United States from presenting any claim it

may have against any State in this Union as an offset to the claims under this bill. That is the intention.

Mr. TILLMAN. Does it intend also to allow payment for every account that a governor has paid and every account which has not been paid, but which he has certified to as just?

Mr. WARREN. I think that is the intention.

Mr. COCKRELL. Of course.

Mr. TILLMAN. If that is the intention of the proposed law, and you so intend, the Comptroller of the Treasury will not tell me again that the law will not permit him to pay it.

Mr. BATE. In some of the States, as in my own, in the case of these bonds, we claim that the Government of the United States is indebted to us as a State for having taken possession of the railroad, etc., during the war. There is a bill in this Congress upon that very question, and some of the States stand in that way. We think the Government is in debt to us largely. We certainly ought not to be stopped because of that. It is in litigation. Therefore this is all right, I think.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend an act entitled 'An act to reimburse the governors of States and Territories for expenses incurred by them in aiding the United States to raise and organize and supply and equip the Volunteer Army of the United States in the existing war with Spain,' approved July 8, 1898, and for other purposes."

Mr. ALLISON. I move that the Senate adjourn.

Mr. CHANDLER. Will the Senator from Iowa allow me to call his attention to the fact that the Senator from Oregon and I have been patiently waiting here to pass two little bills before the Senate adjourns.

Mr. ALLISON. I should be very glad to yield to both Senators, but I am constrained, in view of the fact of there being very few Senators here, and it was generally understood that we should adjourn when these two matters were disposed of—indeed, I made a promise privately, not publicly, that I should make this motion—

Mr. CHANDLER. That illustrates the danger of making these agreements.

Mr. ALLISON. No; not an agreement. It was a promise that I would make this motion. I have redeemed my promise.

Mr. CHANDLER. The arrangement should have been stated to the Senator from Oregon and myself.

Mr. ALLISON. I am very sorry I can not yield.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Iowa that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 48 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, February 13, 1899, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SATURDAY, February 11, 1899.

The House met at 12 o'clock m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY N. COUDEN.

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

Mr. CURTIS of Kansas. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Pennsylvania has a conference report.

BOWMAN ACT AND OTHER CLAIMS.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I desire to present a conference report.

The conference report was read, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4936) for the allowance of certain claims for stores and supplies reported by the Court of Claims under the provisions of the act approved March 3, 1883, and commonly known as the Bowman Act, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference have been unable to agree.

THADDEUS M. MAHON,
THEOBOLD OTJEN,
JAMES D. RICHARDSON,
Managers on the part of the House.
HENRY M. TELLER,
WM. M. STEWART,
S. PASCO,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House agree to a further conference.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania moves that the House further insist on its disagreeing votes and agree to a conference.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will appoint the same conferees—Mr. MAHON, Mr. OTJEN, and Mr. RICHARDSON.

PUBLIC BUILDING AT NEWPORT NEWS, VA.

Mr. MERCER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call up the bill S. 1964, and move that the House adhere to its amendments and agree to a conference.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Nebraska moves that the House further insist on its amendments to the Senate bill and agree to a conference on the bill, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1964) for the erection of a public building for the use of a custom-house and post-office at Newport News, in the district of Newport News, Va.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Nebraska moves that the House further insist on its amendments and agree to a conference.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Let us have the amendments reported.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 7, strike out the word "elevator."

Page 1, line 11, strike out the word "elevator."

Page 1, line 12, strike out "one hundred" and insert "seventy-five."

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, is that a privileged question? If it is not, I object.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks it is in order.

The question was taken; and the House insisted upon its amendments and agreed to the conference.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints as conferees the gentleman from Nebraska, Mr. MERCER, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. HICKS, and the gentleman from Alabama, Mr. BANKHEAD.

RIGHTS OF WAY BY RAILROAD COMPANIES THROUGH INDIAN RESERVATIONS, ETC.

Mr. CURTIS of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill that I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 11868) to provide for the acquiring of rights of way by railroad companies through Indian reservations, Indian lands, and Indian allotments, and for other purposes.

Mr. DOCKERY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will permit me a moment just at this point, is this the general right-of-way bill reported by the Committee on Indian Affairs?

Mr. CURTIS of Kansas. It is the bill.

Mr. DOCKERY. I think that fact should be stated, so that the House may give some attention to the bill.

The Clerk proceeded to read the bill, as follows:

A bill (H. R. 11868) to provide for the acquiring of rights of way by railroad companies through Indian reservations, Indian lands, and Indian allotments, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted, etc., That a right of way through any Indian reservation in any State or Territory, or through any lands held by an Indian tribe or nation in Indian Territory, or through any lands reserved for an Indian agency or for other purposes in connection with the Indian service, or through any lands which have been allotted in severalty to any individual Indian under any law or treaty, but which have not been conveyed to the allottee with full power of alienation, is hereby granted to any railroad company organized under the laws of the United States, or of any State or Territory, which shall comply with the provisions of this act and such rules and regulations as may be prescribed thereunder: *Provided,* That no right of way shall be granted under this act until the Secretary of the Interior is satisfied that the company applying has made said application in good faith and with intent to construct said road.

SEC. 2. That such right of way shall not exceed 50 feet in width on each side of the center line of the road, except where there are heavy cuts and fills, when it shall not exceed 100 feet in width on each side of the road, and may include ground adjacent thereto for station buildings, depots, machine shops, side tracks, turn-outs, and water stations, not to exceed 100 feet in width by a length of 2,000 feet, and not more than one station to be located within any one continuous length of 10 miles of road.

SEC. 3. That the line of route of said road may be surveyed and located through and across any of said lands at any time, upon permission therefor being obtained from the Secretary of the Interior; but before the grant of such right of way shall become effective a map of the survey of the line or route of said road must be filed with and approved by the Secretary of the Interior, and the company must make payment to the Secretary of the Interior for the benefit of the tribe or nation or individual Indian, as the case may be, of full compensation for such right of way, including all damage to improvements and adjacent lands, which compensation shall be determined under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, in such manner as he may prescribe.

SEC. 4. That should any such company fail to construct and put in operation any portion of its road within three years after the approval of its map of location by the Secretary of the Interior, the right of way hereby granted shall be deemed forfeited and abandoned ipso facto as to that portion of the road not then constructed and in operation: *Provided,* That the Secretary may, when he deems proper, extend the time for the construction of any road for which right of way has been granted.

SEC. 5. That where a railroad is constructed under the provisions of this act through the Indian Territory there shall be paid by the railroad company to the Secretary of the Interior, for the benefit of the particular nation or tribe through whose lands the road may be located, such an annual charge as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior, not less than \$15 for each mile of road, the same to be paid so long as said land shall be owned and occupied by such nation or tribe, which payment shall be in addition to the compensation otherwise required herein. And within the Indian Territory upon any railroad constructed under the provisions of this act the rates and charges for passenger and freight service, if not otherwise prescribed by law, may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior from time to time, and the rate for carrying the United States mail may be fixed by Congress, and when not fixed by Congress may be fixed by the Postmaster-General.

SEC. 6. That the provisions of section 2 of the act of March 3, 1875, entitled

"An act granting to railroads the right of way through the public lands of the United States," are hereby extended and made applicable to rights of way granted under this act and to railroad companies obtaining such rights of way.

SEC. 7. That the Secretary of the Interior shall make all needful rules and regulations, not inconsistent herewith, for the proper execution and carrying into effect of all the provisions of this act.

SEC. 8. That Congress hereby reserves the right at any time to alter, amend, or repeal this act, or any portion thereof.

The amendments recommended by the committee were read, as follows:

On page 3, in line 3, after the word "prescribed," add the following:
"Provided, That the compensation herein provided for must be paid for the benefit of the allottee or person in possession before construction is commenced through such allotment or possessory rights, and the other compensation shall be paid at such time for the whole line, or such part thereof, as the Secretary may provide."

On page 3, line 11, strike out the word "construction" and insert in lieu thereof the word "completion."

In line 12, page 3, after the word "granted," add the following: "and a part of which shall have been built."

Mr. CURTIS of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the reading of the report. It is very short. I hope there will be order while it is being read.

The report (by Mr. CURTIS of Kansas) was read, as follows:

The Committee on Indian Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 11968) to provide for the acquisition of rights of way by railroad companies through Indian reservations, Indian lands, and Indian allotments, and for other purposes, having had the same under consideration, make the following favorable report:

When it is remembered that 34 bills have been introduced and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs at this session of Congress granting rights of way in the Indian Territory alone, to say nothing of the number of bills which have been introduced granting rights of way over Indian reservations and Indian lands outside that Territory, the necessity for this bill is perfectly apparent. A great part of every meeting of the committee is taken in hearing parties interested in these measures, and unanimous consent is frequently asked for bills of this description on the floor of the House.

In addition to the above, all of the bills are referred to the honorable the Secretary of the Interior, and the time of clerks in that office and in the office of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs is greatly encroached upon in the work of reporting upon the same, all of which will be done away with by the passage of this bill. We attach herewith, as a part of this report, a letter from the Secretary of the Interior and Commissioner of Indian Affairs asking for the passage of this bill:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, January 27, 1899.

SIRS: There is transmitted herewith a draft of a general bill for rights of way for railroads through Indian reservations, Indian lands, and Indian allotments. During the sessions of Congress no inconsiderable portion of the time of the Indian Bureau and of the Secretary of the Interior is taken up in the consideration of and in reporting upon special bills granting railroad rights of way through the Indian Territory, Indian reservations outside of that Territory, and through Indian allotments. These special bills attempt no uniformity in the substance of their provisions or in the manner of proceeding thereunder. It is believed that legislation of this character should be uniform, as in the case of rights of way for railroads over the public lands under the act of March 3, 1875 (18 Stat., 482), and as in the case of rights of way for canals and ditches through the public lands and reservations of the United States under section 18 of the act of March 3, 1891 (24 Stat., 1095, 1101).

The bill herewith inclosed is thought to be so framed as to fully preserve and protect the rights and interests of Indians and also to secure entire uniformity in the method of obtaining such rights of way and to save the time which, under existing conditions, must be given to each of the separate special bills. It is earnestly recommended that it receive the favorable consideration of Congress.

Very respectfully,

W. A. JONES,
Commissioner of Indian Affairs.
C. N. BLISS,
Secretary of the Interior.

The COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS,
House of Representatives.

Your committee therefore recommend the passage of the bill with the following amendments:

On page 3, in line 3, after the word "prescribed," add the following:
"Provided, That the compensation herein provided for must be paid for the benefit of the allottee or person in possession before construction is commenced through such allotment or possessory rights, and the other compensation shall be paid at such time for the whole line, or such part thereof as the Secretary may provide."

On page 3, line 11, strike out the word "construction" and insert in lieu thereof the word "completion."

In line 12, page 3, after the word "granted," add the following: "and a part of which shall have been built."

Mr. CLARDY. Mr. Speaker, I desire to reserve the right to object until after I hear the gentleman's explanation.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky reserves the right to object.

Mr. DOCKERY. I understand this bill was prepared by the Department and approved by the Secretary of the Interior and the Commissioner of Indian Affairs.

Mr. CURTIS of Kansas. It was prepared by the Department and submitted to a subcommittee composed of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LACEY], the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. LITTLE], and myself. We carefully went over it and recommended two or three amendments.

Mr. DOCKERY. And it is unanimously reported by the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. CURTIS of Kansas. It is unanimously reported by the Committee on Indian Affairs, and it is very urgent that the bill be passed.

Mr. DOCKERY. If I heard aright, the bill allows a company chartered three years before entering upon the construction of the railroad.

Mr. CURTIS of Kansas. The bill as prepared by the Department allowed five years, and we reduced it to three.

Mr. DOCKERY. What has been the time heretofore fixed in special bills?

Mr. CURTIS of Kansas. From three to five years. They generally required 50 miles to be built within one year.

Mr. DOCKERY. I also notice a provision that in the carrying the mails Congress shall have the right to fix the rate of compensation, and in the absence of exercising such right the Postmaster-General shall fix the rate. Is that correct?

Mr. CURTIS of Kansas. That section was prepared by the Interior Department.

Mr. DOCKERY. The chairman of the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads is present. I did not know of any special provision as to compensation for carrying the mails in Indian Territory. I thought the mails were carried by all railroads on the basis of weight, space, and distance.

Mr. CURTIS of Kansas. I have no personal knowledge on the subject, but I suppose there is some provision.

Mr. LOUD. The law covers the whole country.

Mr. DOCKERY. It occurred to me that this provision was unusual.

Mr. CURTIS of Kansas. There surely can be no harm in the provision. It is simply a matter of precaution.

Mr. LOUD. It may be a question of whether it does not by implication repeal the law and give him discretionary power to pay what he sees fit.

Mr. CURTIS of Kansas. If the House thinks that way, I have no objection to its going out.

Mr. DOCKERY. My queries are for information. If the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads is content with the provision, I shall not press an objection; but, as I have understood the law, railroad companies are now paid on a basis of the weight of the mail they carry, the space it occupies, and the distance they haul it. I supposed the law as to compensation would apply to the carrying of mails in the Territories just as in the States.

Mr. CURTIS of Kansas. One of the railroads running through the Indian Territory only charges 3 cents a mile in Kansas for passengers, but charges 5 cents a mile in the Indian Territory, and there may be something in the original charter in regard to the carrying of the mails. I have not looked that question up, as it has never come before our committee.

Mr. DOCKERY. I simply call it to the attention of the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads because it seems to fix different rates for carrying mails through the Territories from those fixed by the statute for the States, or at least there is a presumption that it does.

Mr. CURTIS of Kansas. I think it was only put in the bill as a matter of precaution.

Mr. DOCKERY. What precaution?

Mr. CURTIS of Kansas. To prevent any extortion in case there were no such rules or regulations.

Mr. DOCKERY. Would not this provision enable the railroads to carry the mails at a different rate of compensation to that which other roads of the country are compelled to carry them?

Mr. CURTIS of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LACEY], who will read the provision.

Mr. LACEY. The provision, Mr. Speaker, is as follows:

And within the Indian Territory upon any railroad constructed under the provisions of this act the rates and charges for passenger and freight service, if not otherwise prescribed by law, may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior from time to time, and the rate for carrying the United States mail may be fixed by Congress, and when not fixed by Congress may be fixed by the Postmaster-General.

This was intended as a reserve power to prevent any extortion. Of course the Postmaster-General can fix the rate by contract, if a fair and reasonable one, but in case he does not, the reserved power would be held to fix the rates absolutely in the Department, or for Congress to do so. In view of the fact of this grant of that additional right and privilege, Congress has the reserved power that they have not attempted to exercise heretofore.

Mr. LOUD. I want to suggest to the gentleman that the language in the bill is ambiguous. You are evidently seeking to compel the railroad company to carry the mail, but the language can not be interpreted in that way. You do not say that they shall carry the mail, but you say the Postmaster-General or Congress may prescribe the rates. Under the general statute railroad companies are not compelled to carry the mails, but if they do, they must carry them at certain rates.

Mr. CURTIS of Kansas. The companies must comply with the provisions of the act and the rules and regulations of the Department.

Mr. McRAE. I would suggest that there might be a change of language so that the rates paid them should be the rates paid other railroads.

Mr. LOUD. I think the bill ought to prescribe that the railroads shall carry the mails, but it does not prescribe it at present.

Mr. DOCKERY. The language "fixed by Congress" is a little

faulty, because Congress does not fix the rate; it is fixed by law. Any expression of the two Houses of Congress must have the approval of the President. I think the word "Congress" should be stricken out and the word "law" substituted.

Mr. LOUD. Does not the gentleman from Kansas think that at this late day we ought to compel railroad companies, where they are coming to Congress for cessions—to compel them under it to carry the mail?

Mr. CURTIS of Kansas. I do.

Mr. LOUD. The bill as now drawn will evidently not accomplish that purpose, because the present statute would probably govern their carrying the mail.

Mr. CURTIS of Kansas. We can change the word "may" to "shall."

Mr. LOUD. I do not think you would accomplish it then. It ought to state specifically that the railroad companies shall be compelled to carry the mail.

Mr. LACEY. Mr. Speaker, I would suggest the following amendment to meet the objection:

Strike out in line 12 the word "Congress" where it appears twice and insert the word "law" instead. Also add at the end of line 13, "and such railways shall be post routes, and the mails shall be carried by companies operating the same." I offer that as an amendment.

Mr. CURTIS of Kansas. I am willing to accept the amendment.

Mr. CLARDY. Mr. Speaker, the bill was refused consideration yesterday, as alleged by the gentleman who made the objection, because the mortgages which might be placed on the road were recorded in the Interior Department. That was simply for one railroad. I understand this is for many railroads.

Mr. CURTIS of Kansas. It is a general right-of-way bill, but I want to say to the gentleman that for the Indian Territory there is no other place to file mortgages except with the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. CLARDY. That was what was stated yesterday, and it did not satisfy the gentleman who made the objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Kansas. I did not make the objection.

Mr. CLARDY. No; but that was the alleged objection. Where are the mortgages which shall be placed on the road provided for in this bill?

Mr. CURTIS of Kansas. That will be provided for in the rules and regulations of the Department. There is but one place where they can be filed, and that is with the Secretary of the Interior, until a place is provided in the Indian Territory.

Mr. CLARDY. If that had been stated yesterday I think there would have been no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The question is on agreeing to the amendment. The Clerk will report the first committee amendment.

Mr. LOUD. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LACEY] be considered separately.

The Clerk read the committee amendments, as follows:

On page 3, in line 3, after the word "prescribed," add the following:

"Provided, That the compensation herein provided for must be paid for the benefit of the allottee or person in possession before construction is commenced through such allotment or possessory rights, and the other compensation shall be paid at such time for the whole line, or such part thereof, as the Secretary may provide."

On page 3, line 11, strike out the word "construction" and insert in lieu thereof the word "completion."

In line 12, page 3, after the word "granted," add the following: "and a part of which shall have been built."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments other than that offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. CURTIS of Kansas. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the Clerk read the section as it will read when amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

And within the Indian Territory upon any railroad constructed under the provisions of this act the rates and charges for passenger and freight service, if not otherwise prescribed by law, may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior from time to time, and the rate for carrying the United States mail may be fixed by law, and when not fixed by law may be fixed by the Postmaster-General; and such railways shall be post routes and the mails shall be carried by the company operating the same.

Mr. LOUD. I want to say, Mr. Speaker, to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LACEY] that it reads a little awkwardly at present, because it is the understanding that they should carry mails under existing law. Would it not be well to provide in the bill that these companies shall carry the mails under such laws or regulations as may be hereafter enacted by Congress?

Mr. LACEY. I think the suggestion a good one. An amendment inserting at the proper point the words "under existing law" would, I think, meet the gentleman's suggestion.

Mr. LOUD. I suppose we would have at any rate the right to repeal the law at any time.

Mr. LACEY. Oh, yes. Mr. Speaker, I move the amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

After the word "carried" insert the words "under existing law;" so as to read, "the mails shall be carried under existing law by the companies operating," etc.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is now on ordering the bill as amended to be engrossed and read a third time.

Mr. DOCKERY. I do not think the amendment is in correct form. I suggest that by unanimous consent the bill be allowed to go over until Monday morning immediately after the reading of the Journal, and in the meantime the amendment can be perfected.

Mr. CURTIS of Kansas. There is no objection to that.

The SPEAKER. If there be no objection, the vote on agreeing to the amendment will be considered as vacated, and the matter will go over, to be called up after the reading of the Journal on Monday morning.

Mr. CURTIS of Kansas. The question then to be only on this amendment and the passage of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

FORTIFICATION APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. HEMENWAY, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported a bill (H. R. 12086) making appropriations for fortifications and other works of defense, for the armament thereof, for the procurement of heavy ordnance for trial and service, and for other purposes; which was read twice, referred to the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I reserve all points of order on the bill.

The SPEAKER. All points of order are reserved.

Mr. HEMENWAY. I give notice that I propose to call up this bill as soon as the sundry civil bill is disposed of.

SUPPORT OF MIAMI, FLA.

Mr. DAVIS. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 5186) to amend an act entitled "An act to amend the statutes in relation to immediate transportation of dutiable goods, and for other purposes," approved June 10, A. D. 1880, by extending the privileges of the first section thereof to the support of Miami, Fla.

Be it enacted, etc., That the privileges of the first section of the act approved June 10, A. D. 1880, entitled "An act to amend the statutes in relation to immediate transportation of dutiable goods, and for other purposes," be, and the same are hereby, extended to the support of Miami, in the State of Florida.

Mr. DAVIS. The object of this bill is fully explained in a very brief report of the Committee on Ways and Means, which I ask to have read.

The report (by Mr. PAYNE) was read, as follows:

The Committee on Ways and Means, to whom was referred the bill (S. 5186) to amend the statutes in relation to immediate transportation of dutiable goods, and for other purposes, approved June 10, A. D. 1880, by extending the privileges of the first section thereof to the support of Miami, Fla., report the Senate bill back without amendment and with the recommendation that the bill pass.

The object of this bill is to extend the privileges of the first section of the act approved June 10, 1880, to the support of Miami, Fla. The first section of said act reads as follows:

"Be it enacted, etc., That when any merchandise, other than explosive articles, and articles in bulk not provided for in section 4 (1) of this act, imported at the ports of New York, Philadelphia, Boston, Baltimore, Portland, and Bath, in Maine, Chicago, Port Huron, Detroit, New Orleans, Norfolk, Charleston, Savannah, Mobile, Galveston, Pensacola, Fla., Cleveland, Toledo, and San Francisco shall appear by the invoice or bill of lading and manifest of the importing vessel to be consigned to and destined for either of the ports specified in the seventh section of this act, the collector at the port of arrival shall allow the said merchandise to be shipped immediately after the entry prescribed in section 2 of this act has been made."

The effect of the adoption of this bill would be to allow merchandise destined for other ports to be carried directly through Miami, as provided in the statute quoted above. This privilege has been extended to many other ports, and in this case is recommended by the Secretary of the Treasury.

The committee also recommend that House bill No. 11192, regarding the same subject-matter, lie upon the table.

There being no objection, the House proceeded to the consideration of the bill; which was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. PAYNE. I suggest to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DAVIS] that the House bill (H. R. 11192) corresponding in its provisions with this Senate bill be laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. In the absence of objection, that order will be made.

DAM AND BRIDGE ACROSS MISSISSIPPI RIVER.

Mr. FLETCHER. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 11732) to authorize the Grand Rapids Water Power and Boom Company, of Grand Rapids, Minn., to construct a dam and bridge across the Mississippi River.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to the Grand Rapids Water Power and Boom Company, of Grand Rapids, Minn., its successors and assigns, to construct across the Mississippi River, at a point within the limits of the village of Grand Rapids, Minn., to be approved by the Secretary of War, a dam, canal, and works necessarily incident thereto, for water-power purposes, and a wagon and foot bridge if desired in connection therewith for the purpose of travel. Said dam shall be so constructed that there can at any time be constructed in connection therewith a suitable lock for navigation purposes: *Provided*, That the Government of the United States may at any time take possession of said dam and appurtenant works and control the same for purposes of navigation by paying the said company the actual cost of the same, but shall not do so to the destruction of the water power created by said dam to any greater extent than may be necessary to provide proper facilities for navigation: *Provided further*, That said dam shall be so constructed as to provide for the free passage of saw logs and fish. The said Grand Rapids Water Power and Boom Company, its successors and assigns, shall make such change and modification in said dam, canal, and works incident thereto, and said bridge, as the Secretary of War may from time to time deem necessary in the interests of navigation, at its own cost and expense: *Provided further*, That in case any litigation arises from the obstruction of the channel by said dam, canal, and works incident thereto, or such bridge, the case may be tried in the proper court of the United States in the district in which said works are situated.

SEC. 2. That the right to amend, alter, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

SEC. 3. That this act shall be null and void unless said dam herein authorized be commenced within one year and completed within three years from the date hereof.

The amendments reported by the committee were read, as follows:

After the word "dam," in line 3, insert "and appurtenant works."

After the word "navigation," in line 8, page 2, insert the following:

Provided also, That said dam shall be so constructed that it will not at any time raise the water surface, at a point 300 feet above said dam, to an elevation higher than the floor of the sluices of the reservoir dam built by the Government at Pokegama Falls on the Mississippi River, in section 13, township 55, range 23 west of the fourth principal meridian, Minnesota."

In lines 17 and 18 strike out the words "and fish. The said Grand Rapids Water Power and Boom Company" and insert "without tolls or charges; and the said company shall construct and maintain, at its own expense, suitable fishways, to be approved by the United States Fish Commissioner; and the said company."

MR. LOUD. Is this improvement to be constructed at a part of the river which is now navigable?

MR. FLETCHER. It is the extreme head of navigation on the Mississippi River.

MR. LOUD. There seems to be a very dangerous implication in the provision that hereafter the Government may be at liberty to buy this dam if it should want to improve the river. It seems to me that if the Government should desire to improve the river these people, who may meanwhile have dammed up navigation, should at least be required to donate the dam to the United States, without compelling the Government to buy it.

MR. FLETCHER. The Government has a dam about 600 feet above this. This dam, below that of the Government, will not interfere with any future navigation.

MR. LOUD. I do not know anything about the river at the point contemplated. But it seems to me dangerous to even intimate in a bill of this kind that the Government should buy this dam after these parties have dammed up the river.

MR. DOCKERY. What use would the Government have for this dam?

MR. LOUD. It might be desirable to extend navigation, as will evidently be the case in a few years.

MR. DOCKERY. There is another provision in the bill, if the gentleman will allow me to suggest, that ought to be changed in the interest of the Government. If the Government buys this dam, the bill provides that it shall "pay the cost" of it. There should be some provision to determine what that cost is.

MR. FLETCHER. I am perfectly willing to strike out that provision.

MR. DOCKERY. Because the cost of the dam may not be the actual cash value of it at the time of purchase, and if the Government should desire hereafter to make the purchase, it ought to be provided that the payment should be the actual cash value and not the actual cost.

MR. TAWNEY. I think it would meet the suggestion of the gentleman from Missouri to strike out the proviso entirely. Then hereafter if the Government wishes to purchase the dam it can do so under ordinary condemnation proceedings.

MR. DOCKERY. I think that is a good suggestion.

MR. FLETCHER. I have no objection to striking out the provision to meet the point made by the gentleman from Missouri.

MR. DOCKERY. What use could the Government make of the dam?

MR. FLETCHER. None whatever.

MR. PAYNE. What use does the Government make of the dam above this one?

MR. TAWNEY. That is a reservoir dam.

MR. FLETCHER. This dam is at the extreme head waters of navigation and it can be of no service to the Government.

I would sanction striking out that portion of the bill to which the gentleman from Missouri refers. This bill was introduced by

the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MORRIS], and he knows all about it. I will yield to him.

MR. DOCKERY. Is it proposed to strike out the proviso as to the purchase altogether? If not, I would like to amend, before unanimous consent is given, to provide that the Government in the event of its purchase of the dam shall be required to pay only the cash value.

MR. FLETCHER. There is no objection whatever to striking that out.

MR. DOCKERY. Does the gentleman make a motion to strike out the provision in question?

MR. FLETCHER. I will move that that provision relating to the purchase be stricken out altogether.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Minnesota.

The amendment proposed by Mr. FLETCHER was read.

MR. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman from Missouri that that provision was put into the bill, as it is put into all bills of this character, for the protection of the Government.

MR. DOCKERY. That may be. But some of the gentlemen around me on the floor, lawyers, have suggested—and notably the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. TAWNEY]—that the interest of the Government would be better subserved by striking out the entire provision, and leaving the matter of purchase to be hereafter determined by condemnation proceedings.

MR. MORRIS. I have no objection to its going out of the bill, but I do not believe it is better to eliminate it.

MR. DOCKERY. I have no information whatever in reference to the matter. What I sought to do was to simply strike out a provision which seems to require the Government to pay the cost, in the event of purchasing the dam, instead of what I think should be inserted if the provision remains at all in the bill, the actual cash value.

MR. PAYNE. I would suggest that the amendment be simply to strike out the word "cost" and insert the words "actual cash value."

MR. MORRIS. That, I think, would be better.

MR. FLETCHER. I will withdraw my amendment, then, and accept the amendment suggested by the gentleman from New York.

MR. DOCKERY. It ought to read "not exceeding the actual cash value."

MR. MOODY. If the gentleman from Missouri will allow me, there comes up another question, if his suggestion is adopted, as to what the word "value" may include. Does the word "value" include as an element the value of the franchise? It opens a very wide field.

MR. DOCKERY. I suggest simply the words "cash value," which would seem to include everything.

MR. MOODY. The value of a bridge, for instance, has been held to include the value of the franchise to use the bridge and collect tolls. I fear the amendment will take us "from the frying pan into the fire."

MR. DOCKERY. Will the gentleman from Massachusetts suggest an amendment to meet the difficulty?

MR. LACEY. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that these words be substituted, "the actual cash value not exceeding the cost."

MR. MORRIS. I think I can suggest an amendment that will meet all the objections which have been urged. Let the proviso be made to read in this way:

Provided, That the Government of the United States may at any time take possession of the dam and control the same for purposes of navigation.

Then leave out all about paying the cost or anything of that kind, and go on as follows:

But shall not do so to the destruction of the water power created by said dam to any greater extent than may be necessary to provide proper facilities for navigation.

That leaves out all about paying for the dam, and simply provides that the Government may at any time take possession of it for purposes of navigation when it becomes necessary.

MR. DOCKERY. Is that suggestion acceptable to the gentleman from Massachusetts?

MR. MOODY. The suggestion eliminates the question of compensation altogether, and I have not followed sufficiently the general purposes of the bill to know whether it would leave it in a proper form.

My objection was that, if we were going to provide for a standard of valuation and payment, we ought to provide for it without including any element of franchise, the uncertainty of which we all know. If there is to be no payment, then the suggestion I make about excluding the franchise value falls to the ground.

MR. TAWNEY. Mr. Speaker, will my colleague allow me to ask him a question?

MR. MORRIS. Certainly.

MR. TAWNEY. Would it not answer every purpose if you were to eliminate entirely this provision, and then if the Government afterwards desires to take possession of that dam in the

interest of navigation it could do so under the right of eminent domain and pay whatever the assessed value of the property was at the time of taking?

Mr. MOODY. Then I will call the attention of the gentleman from Minnesota to the fact that that would include the franchise value.

Mr. TAWNEY. Certainly it would.

Mr. MOODY. And it seems to me that if the Government is to authorize this company to construct a work upon a navigable river, and it seems possible that it may become desirable in the future that the Government should revoke that grant and should retake control of the stream for purposes of navigation, there really ought to be some provision in the bill that the Government should take possession of that work upon payment of a sum not exceeding the actual value of the physical construction. And while I am not ready with a suggestion which would cover this particular aspect of the question, I think it could be very readily done.

Mr. LOUD. Why should the Government pay for this dam? If they propose to make the river navigable, if John Smith has dammed it up, why should the Government pay for the dam?

Mr. MOODY. The suggestion of the gentleman from California is a very apt one. My position would be that the Government ought to have the right to retake control of the navigable stream, and if the Government is to pay anything for that, which is a question upon which I express no opinion, it ought not to pay anything further than the actual value of the dam as constructed.

Mr. LOUD. I will ask the gentleman, should it pay anything?

Mr. MOODY. I must say, Mr. Speaker, that if one pays only sudden attention to a question of this kind, he does not like to answer it offhand.

Mr. HOPKINS. Oh, well, the answer will appear only in the RECORD, and nobody will ever know what you said. [Laughter.]

Mr. MOODY. I understand that; but the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HOPKINS] is doing me the honor to listen to me now, and I do not want to suffer any depreciation in his good opinion.

Mr. LOUD. The gentleman from Illinois is judging your remarks by his own.

Mr. HOPKINS. I certainly do not judge them by those of the gentleman from California. [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER. Gentlemen will kindly avoid conversation on the floor.

Mr. MORRIS. I should like to call the attention of my friend from Massachusetts [Mr. MOODY] and my friend from California [Mr. LOUD] to the provisions of this bill, which have been drawn, as far as they could be drawn, for the protection of the Government, and are directly in the line of similar bills which have been passed heretofore in this House. Just before this provision to which exception is taken there is a provision that—

Said dam shall be so constructed that there can at any time be constructed in connection therewith a suitable lock for navigation purposes.

With that provision in, there is no danger that navigation will be obstructed if it shall hereafter be necessary to open the river for navigation. There is a provision for the construction of a lock, which will afford the facilities necessary to get by this dam. Now, if you add to that the further proviso that the Government of the United States may, at any time, take possession of said dam and control the same for purposes of navigation—

Mr. LOUD. If you will stop right there—

Mr. MORRIS. Wait a minute. But that it shall not do so to the destruction of the water power created by said dam to any greater extent than may be necessary to provide proper facilities for navigation, you have got the whole thing guarded.

Mr. LOUD. That would guard the interests of the Government, and the Government could take possession of the dam without paying anything, to such extent as the interests of navigation may require?

Mr. MORRIS. To such extent as the interests of navigation may require.

Mr. BROMWELL. I would suggest to the gentleman from Minnesota that he insert the words "without compensation therefor," so that there shall be no question about it.

Mr. MORRIS. That is the meaning of it.

Mr. BROMWELL. No, I think not. It says, "take possession of it," but still leaves it open whether they shall have compensation.

Mr. MORRIS. Why, I accept the idea of the gentleman from Ohio, and ask that the amendment read this way; that the first proviso shall read as follows:

Provided, That the Government of the United States may at any time take possession of said dam without compensation and control the same for the purposes of navigation, but shall not do so to the destruction of the water power created by said dam to any greater extent than may be necessary to provide proper facilities for navigation.

In other words, at the end of line 3, after the word "dam," insert the words "without compensation therefor," and strike out the words, in lines 5 and 6, "by paying the said company the actual cost of the same." That will accomplish it.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Chair understands all other proposed amendments are withdrawn. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 2 amend the first proviso so that it will read as follows:

Provided, That the Government of the United States may at any time take possession of said dam without compensation and control the same for the purposes of navigation, but shall not do so to the destruction of the water power created by said dam to any greater extent than may be necessary to provide proper facilities for navigation.

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

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. MORRIS, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

PERSONAL REQUEST.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Speaker, I desire to submit a personal request to the House. On yesterday I made some remarks upon one phase of the tariff law. Under the leave given yesterday I have permission to extend my remarks for five days. I find I shall have to be absent Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday, leaving tomorrow. I ask unanimous consent that I may have until a week from to-day; and I state to the House that there will be no word in the extension except what relates to the particular subject-matter of my remarks.

Mr. CARMACK. Will you give bond for your good behavior?

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

PENSACOLA AND NORTHWESTERN RAILROAD COMPANY.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill H. R. 11736.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 11736) granting the right and authority to the Pensacola and Northwestern Railroad Company, a company organized under the laws of the States of Florida and Alabama, to build one bridge over each of the following-named rivers in the State of Alabama, namely, the Alabama River, the Warrior River, the Sipsey River, and the Tennessee River, the said bridges to be used and operated for and in behalf of the Pensacola and Northwestern Railroad Company to carry freight and passengers by rail and otherwise.

Be it enacted, etc., That the Pensacola and Northwestern Railroad Company, a railroad corporation organized under the laws of the States of Florida and Alabama, be, and is hereby, authorized and empowered to construct, maintain, and operate one bridge over and across each of the following-named rivers, all in the State of Alabama: The Alabama River, at a point in Monroe and Clarke counties, or in Wilcox County, Ala.; the Warrior River, at a point in Hale and Greene counties, Ala.; or at a point in Marengo and Greene counties, Ala.; the Tennessee River, at a point in the counties of Colbert and Lauderdale, Ala.; the Sipsey River, at a point in Pickens or Tuscaloosa County, Ala.; and to lay railroad tracks on the said bridges to run trains on same: *Provided*, That the said bridges shall be constructed and maintained in such a manner as not to obstruct navigation; and the plans for said bridges shall be filed with and approved by the Secretary of War; and the said bridges over the said streams shall be built by the plans approved by the Secretary of War, evidenced by his written approval, of which written approval there shall be filed and recorded a certified copy in the office of the secretary of state of Alabama, and the original shall be filed and recorded in the office of the said railroad company; that the said bridges are to be used, operated, and maintained for and in behalf of the said Pensacola and Northwestern Railroad Company to carry freight and passengers, by rail and otherwise, at a reasonable price, not in conflict with the United States or State laws.

SEC. 2. That any part of this grant and act not carried out within five years from its passage will become subject to repeal.

The amendments recommended by the committee were read, as follows:

On page 1, line 7, strike out the words "over and."

On page 2 strike out all after the word "same" and insert the following: "SEC. 2. That any bridges built under this act and subject to its limitations shall be lawful structures, and shall be recognized and known as post routes; and they shall enjoy the same rights and privileges as other post-roads in the United States; and equal privileges in the use of said bridges shall be granted to all telegraph and telephone companies; and the United States shall have the right of way across said bridges and their approaches for postal telegraph purposes."

"SEC. 3. That all railroad companies desiring the use of said bridges shall have and be entitled to equal rights and privileges relative to the passage of railway trains over the same and over the approaches thereto upon the payment of a reasonable compensation for such use; and in case the owner or owners of said bridges and the several railroad companies, or any of them, desiring such use shall fail to agree upon the sum or sums to be paid and upon the rules and conditions to which each shall conform in using said bridges, all matters at issue between them shall be decided by the Secretary of War upon a hearing of the allegations and proofs of the parties."

"SEC. 4. That all bridges authorized to be constructed under this act shall be built under and subject to such regulations for the security of the navigation of said rivers as the Secretary of War shall prescribe, and to secure that object the said company or corporation shall submit to the Secretary of War, for his examination and approval, maps of location and designs and drawings of each of the bridges; and until the said plans and locations are approved by the Secretary of War the bridges shall not be commenced or built; and should any changes be made in the plans of said bridges, or any one of them, during the progress of construction or after completion, such changes shall be subject to the approval of the Secretary of War, and all changes in said bridges, or any one of them, required by the Secretary of War, at any time, or their entire removal, shall be made promptly by the corporations or persons owning or operating said bridges at their own expense."

"SEC. 5. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved."

Sec. 6. That this act shall be null and void if actual construction of the bridges herein authorized is not commenced within one year and completed within three years from the date thereof."

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill granting the right and authority to the Pensacola and Northwestern Railroad Company to build bridges over certain rivers in the State of Alabama."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The amendments recommended by the committee were agreed to. The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. SPARKMAN, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

The title was amended in accordance with the recommendation of the committee.

OWNERS OF BRITISH SHIP FOSCOLIA.

Mr. STONE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 10814) for the relief of the owners of the British ship *Foscolia* and cargo.

Be it enacted, etc., That the claim of the owners of the British steamship *Foscolia*, sunk by collision with the U. S. S. *Columbia* on the evening of May 28, 1898, near Fire Island light-ship, for and on account of the loss of said vessel and cargo, may be submitted to the United States district court for the southern district of New York, under and in compliance with the rules of said court sitting as a court of admiralty; and said court shall have jurisdiction to hear and determine and to render judgment thereupon: *Provided, however*, That the investigation of said claim shall be made upon the following basis: First, the said court shall find the facts attending the loss of the said steamship *Foscolia* and her cargo, and second, if it shall appear that the responsibility therefor rests with the U. S. S. *Columbia*, the court shall then ascertain and determine the amounts which should be paid to the owners, respectively, of the *Foscolia* and her cargo, in order to reimburse them for the losses so sustained, and shall render a decree accordingly: *Provided further*, That the amounts of the losses sustained by the master, officers, and crew of the *Foscolia* may be included in such decree.

SEC. 2. That should such decree be rendered in favor of the owners of the *Foscolia* and her cargo, the amount thereof may be paid out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated.

Mr. LOUD. What is this, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. STONE. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. STONE. One word. The report of the committee will explain the bill, which was prepared by the Secretary of the Navy.

Mr. DOCKERY. I reserve the right to object.

Mr. STONE. The bill was transmitted here with the recommendation that it receive the attention of Congress. The vessel *Foscolia* was run down by a United States vessel carrying no lights on account of anticipation of Cervera's fleet, and the bill is sent here with the recommendation that the whole matter be referred to a court of admiralty for consideration and action. The report of the committee embraces the letter of the Secretary of the Navy, and I ask that it be read.

The report (by Mr. Yost) was read, as follows:

The Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 10814) for the relief of the owners of the British ship *Foscolia* and cargo, have considered the same, and respectfully recommend that the bill do pass, for the reasons set forth in the letter of the Secretary of the Navy, as follows:

NAVY DEPARTMENT, Washington, January 26, 1899.

SIR: Referring to the bill (H. R. 10814) for the relief of the owners of the British ship *Foscolia* and cargo, and to your request of the 23d instant for report in regard thereto, I have the honor to inclose herewith a copy of the Department's communication of the 11th idem, addressed to the chairman of the Committee on Claims of the Senate, showing the facts regarding the loss of the *Foscolia* and the views entertained respecting the measure for the relief of her owners.

Very respectfully,

JOHN D. LONG,
Secretary.

HON. CHARLES N. BRUMM,
Chairman Committee on Claims, House of Representatives.

NAVY DEPARTMENT, Washington, January 11, 1899.

SIR: In response to the committee's request, contained in its letter of the 9th instant, for the views and recommendation of the Department in regard to Senate bill 5000, for the relief of the owners of the British ship *Foscolia* and cargo, I have the honor to state that on the 28th of May last, at 7.30 p. m., the U. S. S. *Columbia*, while engaged in patrol duty just outside the harbor of New York, and about 12 miles southerly and easterly from the Fire Island light-ship, came into collision with the British merchant steamer *Foscolia*. The *Columbia* was not seriously injured, but the *Foscolia* suffered much damage and sank nine hours after the collision. There was no loss of life, the officers and crew of the *Foscolia* being taken on board the *Columbia* and cared for and brought into port, but the *Foscolia* and her cargo were a total loss.

It appears from the finding of a naval board of inquiry, convened to investigate and report upon the circumstances attending the collision, that at the time it occurred and for an hour and a half previously a thick fog had prevailed; that the vessels were both running at reduced speed on account of the fog, that a proper lookout was kept on both vessels; that the *Foscolia* was exhibiting the usual lights and sounding the fog signal, but that the *Columbia* had all her lights screened and was sounding no fog signal. It also appears from the finding of the court that no fault is imputed to any of the officers or men on board the *Columbia*, and that aside from the screening of lights and discontinuance of the sounding of fog signals everything that could have been done by them to avoid the catastrophe and to minimize the consequences when it became inevitable was done. The testimony adduced shows that the lookouts on each vessel sighted the other at about the same time, the two vessels being about 100 yards apart, and that the *Columbia* was so maneuvered that a glancing blow only was received from the *Foscolia*, and doubtless little injury would have been caused either vessel but for the fact

that the bow of the merchant steamer was caught upon one of the projecting after spars of the cruiser.

Upon careful consideration of the facts reported by the naval court of inquiry above mentioned, the Department is satisfied that there is at least reasonable ground for the contention advanced by the owners of the *Foscolia* that the collision might have been avoided had the *Columbia* shown the lights and sounded the fog signals usual under such conditions. The lights and signals were, however, dispensed with by the *Columbia* on this occasion for the reason that the Spanish fleet, under the command of Admiral Cervera, had not at that time been located, and the cruiser was then engaged in patrol duty in the vicinity of the most important ports of the country, New York and Philadelphia, the points between which she was cruising being Fire Island light-ship and Delaware Breakwater, and that it was deemed essential to take extraordinary precautions, even to the extent of incurring some hazard, in guarding against possibilities which might have developed at any moment.

A collision with one of our war ships having occurred under such circumstances, when, for public reasons deemed sufficient to justify such action, our vessel was disregarding the rules of the road at sea, and a valuable merchant steamer and cargo belonging to a friendly power being destroyed, apparently without contributory negligence on the part of her officers and crew, it would seem proper that the losses incident thereto should not be allowed to rest upon the owners of a private vessel, but that such losses should, on the contrary, be borne by the United States, provided, of course, that it shall be judicially determined in the courts of the United States that the facts are as hereinbefore outlined.

Entertaining these views, and inasmuch as it appears that the bill (S. 5000) provides simply for the submission of all matters of fact in the case to the United States district court for the southern district of New York, sitting as a court of admiralty, and for the payment of such amount only as may be adjudged to the claimants by decree of such court, the Department recommends the bill to the favorable consideration of the committee, section 2 of the bill, making provision for the prompt payment of the amount which the court may find to be due, being deemed proper in view of the fact of the foreign ownership of the vessel lost and the desirability of avoiding in such a case the delay which would result from a resubmission of the matter to Congress for the necessary appropriation.

In this connection I desire to state that under date of the 21st of June last, this Department addressed letters to the Committees on Naval Affairs of the Senate and House of Representatives, respectively, recommending favorable action in the matter of the claim of the owners of the *Foscolia* and cargo. The inclosures of your communication are herewith returned.

Very respectfully,

JOHN D. LONG, Secretary.

HON. H. M. TELLER,
Chairman Senate Committee on Claims, United States Senate.

Mr. LOUD. Mr. Speaker, I shall not object to this case, but I can only submit to the House that there are a great many cases where American vessels have been destroyed under circumstances just as aggravating as they appear in this case, and yet the Department has not taken any action, while here we have a case where the Department does take action where the vessel was under the English flag; but in no single case where an American vessel has been sunk under more aggravating circumstances, where the parties have been knocking at the doors of Congress for a number of years for relief, have they been able to get action on the part of the Department. But as this goes to a court, I shall not object to the consideration of the bill.

Mr. DOCKERY. One point in connection with the consideration of this bill. I find that section 2 makes an indefinite appropriation. It is customary in cases of loss with our own seamen, under the general law, that after the court shall find judgment the judgment shall be reported to Congress for appropriation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BAIRD. I want to ask the gentleman if the second section of the bill does not carry an appropriation?

Mr. STONE. It does.

Mr. BAIRD. I object.

Mr. STONE. Let me make a suggestion for one moment. Suppose the second section goes out. The second section is that which provides for an adjudication in the southern district of New York. If the matter were to go before the Court of Claims, it would provide for a return of the findings to Congress. If this second section be stricken out, will the gentleman withdraw objection to that extent?

Mr. BAIRD. No; I object to the consideration of the bill.

PAY OF WORKMEN AT UNITED STATES NAVY-YARD.

Mr. RIXEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 307) authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to pay certain laborers, workmen, and mechanics at United States navy-yards and naval stations 50 per cent additional for work performed in excess of eight hours per diem.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay 50 per cent additional for all work in excess of eight hours per diem performed by laborers, workmen, and mechanics whose compensation is fixed upon a basis of eight hours per diem, and who, between March 18, 1898, and October 31, 1898, were employed at any United States navy-yard or naval station, and who worked in excess of eight hours per day and have not already received said additional compensation; the amount due each laborer, workman, and mechanic affected by the above to be based upon the time records of the several bureaus at the navy-yard or naval station where the work was performed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. DOCKERY. Mr. Speaker, I thought there was an eight-

hour law upon the statute books, preventing the working of laborers, mechanics, and artisans over eight hours. I shall not object to this bill, because laborers should be paid for any excess of time over eight hours.

Mr. HOPKINS. Well, Mr. Speaker, how are we to construe the remarks of the gentleman from Missouri? Is he in favor or against the joint resolution?

Mr. DOCKERY. "The gentleman from Missouri" stated very clearly that he was in favor of paying any laborer for any excess of time he may have worked over eight hours. As I understand the joint resolution, it proposes to accomplish that result. My query, however, was how they could have been worked over eight hours under existing law.

Mr. HOPKINS. This bill proposes to pay them for the excess of time and 50 per cent in addition to that allowed by law.

Mr. MOODY. I would like to ask the gentleman from Virginia if this has been paid?

Mr. RIXEY. This bill is to pay those who have not been paid for the extra time one and one-half rates.

Mr. DALZELL. Let us have the report read, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. RIXEY. Pending the reading of this report I will make a short statement. The Secretary of the Navy writes that under regulation (c) he has paid some of these men. That regulation provides that—

(c) Men who have rendered service during the day, and who, by reason of emergency, are required to work in excess of eight hours, shall be paid for all such extra work performed after 5 p. m. and before 6 a. m. at the same rate per hour as for day work, with 50 per cent additional.

Under that regulation the men who went to work at 12 o'clock in the day and worked until 12 o'clock at night were paid one and one-half pay between 8 o'clock and 12 o'clock, but the men who went to work at 12 o'clock at night and worked twelve hours on the same work and for the same number of hours only received the straight pay. Now, this bill would put all workmen on the same footing. As to the future, it has been provided against. The Secretary of the Navy has made this regulation:

(2) The following rules shall be observed for estimating the pay of laborers, workmen, and mechanics for work performed in excess of eight hours per day and for work performed outside of yard hours:

(a) For work performed, by reason of extraordinary emergency, in excess of eight hours per day, the ordinary rate of pay, with 50 per cent additional, shall be allowed.

(b) Men employed in relays shall be paid at the rate allowed for day work whether they work by day or at night.

(c) For work performed on Sundays or legal holidays the ordinary rate of pay, with 50 per cent additional, shall be allowed.

(d) The foregoing provisions relate solely to laborers, workmen, and mechanics whose compensation has been fixed upon a basis of eight hours per day, and have no application to employees whose ordinary duties require their presence before or after yard hours, at night, on Sundays, or on legal holidays, and whose compensation has been fixed with reference to the irregular and unusual character of their employment.

So this condition of affairs will not exist in the future. This bill is to authorize the payment of the men for the overwork between March 18 and October 31, and it seems to me there can be no objection to it.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

Mr. LEWIS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I would like to be recognized, if not inconsistent with the order of business concerning this bill. When it is ready to be put on its passage, or at the proper time if this is not the time, I would like recognition from the Chair.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Washington is recognized.

Mr. LEWIS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, the remarks of two distinguished friends, members of this House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HOPKINS] and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DOCKERY], calling attention that this bill was not necessary if there had been an eight-hour law already in vogue, compels me to call the attention of the House, as well as of the country, to the fact that there has been for twenty years a constant clamor throughout the nation, and a righteous demand, for an eight-hour law in all public work.

There has never been a national convention for twenty years of either of the great parties, nor of new ones, which has not pledged in its convention the enactment of such a measure. We have in this House observed seven consecutive measures projected, and yet events occurring immediately have inevitably prevented these measures either from becoming law; or when such, from receiving the recognition of the administrative officers. The Attorney-General of the United States, in a late opinion brought to the attention of the public, has given out that the late eight-hour law is practically suspended in its operation upon Government work. This upon the theory of emergency which justifies the suspension.

With that opinion at this time I have no expression of dissent. I do, however, call the attention of the House to the bill passed by this House at the last session, that it still lingers in the Senate, in another branch of this legislative body, not yet passed, sleeping

because of neglect. With the construction of the Attorney-General, which renders the old law practically nugatory and vitiates it as far as its effects or application is concerned, with the new law suspended in its passage, the country is confronted with the fact, demonstrated by the remarks of the two gentlemen I have referred to, that we are to do without an eight-hour law which has been the expression of both Houses and the desire of all humane people and the intention of this honorable House. Worse is it to admit to-day, sir, that there is an absolute failure of realization by all of those mostly interested, those burdened toilers whose interest it was the intention of this House to subserve.

Mr. Speaker, this House, with the best spirit, in many votes indifferent to partisanship, found it agreeable to give that bill an almost unanimous vote. I can not but call attention to the fair-minded men of the House, to the Speaker, and the country, so far as my voice may reach it, that I am impressed with the absolute injustice of longer letting that eight-hour bill remain suspended and longer deceiving the army of workmen by promises never fulfilled. What is it which ever induces the laborer to trust those who ever deceive? Why is he always the greatest object of solicitude during political campaigns, yet ever forgotten and ever ignored—yea, ever betrayed and oppressed—in the day when his righteous demands should be complied with and his honest needs be satisfied?

Mr. Speaker, a million men are interested in having their hours of labor shortened to the actual necessities of their toil, so that they may not only attend to the needs of their families, but cultivate social intercourse with them and look after the education of their children and their spiritual welfare. Such considerations as these appeal essentially to humane men. They call into operation a principle which is not only recognized to-day in the passage of this brief measure, but which will, I trust, prompt us, in the remaining hours of our service in this body, to do everything in our power to further the passage of a general eight-hour law. [Applause.] And if as members of this body we can bring any influence to bear upon the coordinate branch of Congress, we should not hesitate to do so in behalf of the interests to which I have referred, and as a matter of just humanity as well as of deserved right.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Will the gentleman yield to me for a moment?

Mr. LEWIS of Washington. I always yield with pleasure to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Is the gentleman from Washington familiar with section 3738 of the Revised Statutes of the United States—

Mr. LEWIS of Washington. "The gentleman from Washington" is familiar with it—

Mr. GROSVENOR (continuing). Which reads as follows—

Mr. LEWIS of Washington. I beg to ask the gentleman from Ohio whether he was present during the whole of my remarks?

Mr. GROSVENOR. Not quite all.

Mr. LEWIS of Washington. I thought not. I referred to that section.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Will the gentleman allow me to finish what I was undertaking to say?

Mr. LEWIS of Washington. Certainly. I thought the gentleman had concluded.

Mr. GROSVENOR. The provision to which I refer reads as follows:

Eight hours shall constitute a day's work for all laborers, workmen, and mechanics who may be employed by or on behalf of the Government of the United States.

Mr. LEWIS of Washington. I beg to answer my distinguished friend by saying that I had referred to that section. I observed that the gentleman was out of the House at the time. I stated that under the construction of the law department of the Government that provision of law is now practically suspended, although we passed in this House a bill designed to conform to the opinion of that distinguished law officer, so that the provision of law should not be wholly expended by such; that rather than increase the hours of labor there should be an increase of the force. We should give more men work, and not more hours upon those who do the work. Since the opinion to which I have referred, and since the bill which we passed has been held up in the Senate, it is found that we have no eight-hour law at present in operation with respect to work of the Government. It was to that point I desired to call the attention of this honorable body. I am in receipt of many communications from toilers working under Government contractors complaining of this injustice. I speak in their behalf.

Mr. LACEY. I should like to make a suggestion to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. LEWIS of Washington. I gladly yield for that purpose.

Mr. LACEY. I wish to say that the men in the employ of the Government were only worked extra time during the war, and that in our various arsenals, etc., the term of daily labor has now been

reduced to eight hours. During the exigency growing out of the war, men working in the navy-yard in relation to which this joint resolution is proposed, were working twelve hours a day on two shifts. They were not only willing, but desirous to work over time. But since the war closed, these men are working only eight hours a day. Their employment for extra time grew altogether out of the fact that the war brought us face to face with an immediate emergency, with inadequate implements of war on hand. During that emergency the men who commenced work at noon and worked till midnight received for work subsequent to 8 o'clock the regular rate and one-half additional, while the men who commenced their work at midnight received only one hour's pay for a straight hour's work. The object of this joint resolution is to cure that discrimination.

Mr. LEWIS of Washington. I appreciate the purpose of this resolution and I certainly advocate its passage. I appreciate also the suggestion made by my friend from Iowa. I recall that he was one of those gentlemen who gave attention to the defects of our eight-hour law and joined with me to amend its provisions, so as to cover what in justice it should cover with respect to workmen in the employ of the Government. I am glad also that he reminded the House of that other important fact that in the turbulent hours when the interests of this Government were greatly at stake her most loyal citizens, those who gave her their most zealous aid, were that army of toilers who cheerfully worked overtime without murmur or dissent and without extra compensation. Yet, sir, who were more needy than they?

In view of the existing conditions I respectfully suggest that not only should this measure be passed by the House, but that, acting in accord with its spirit, we should all do what we can to secure the passage of such an eight-hour law as will cover the cases of all persons justly entitled to the benefit of its provisions.

Mr. MOODY. Will the gentleman from Washington kindly inform us what are the hours of labor prescribed by law in his own State?

Mr. LEWIS of Washington. We have there, of course, three or four different classes of laborers. In respect to farm labor there is no limitation as to hours. In respect to mechanical labor, there are limitations similar to those adopted in the gentleman's own State, our law being copied practically from the statute of Massachusetts, as construed by the judicial decision to be found in 142 Massachusetts Reports.

Mr. MOODY. I will inform the gentleman from Washington that there is no State, as far as I am aware, that has an eight-hour law, except in relation to the employees upon the public works.

Mr. LEWIS of Washington. I referred to that.

Mr. MOODY. And my question, therefore, had no reference to such employees. I refer to the great masses of the people who are laborers in private employment, and ask the gentleman again what is the limit of the day's labor in the State of Washington?

Mr. LEWIS of Washington. I regret exceedingly that the legislature has not passed an act limiting the hours of all labor in that State. It has been a Republican legislature save on one occasion, and we have been unable to accomplish this act of justice. [Laughter.] We have now a labor commission, the most efficient of its kind throughout the nation.

Mr. MOODY. Then, as a matter of fact, what did the Democratic legislature do?

Mr. LEWIS of Washington. Unfortunately, in consequence of the inimical action of the filibustering Republicans, no relief could be afforded. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MOODY. Well, let us have the exact truth in reference to the matter. That is what we are seeking.

Did they pass a law—that legislature to which you refer—limiting the hours of labor in your State?

Mr. LEWIS of Washington. I confess I can not inform the gentleman. There was a serious conflict between the legislative departments upon this subject, which prevented the legislative action from becoming operative.

Mr. MOODY. Then, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest to the gentleman from Washington, in view of the fact that it seems he will have ample leisure for some time in that direction, that he go to his home and endeavor to have brought about by the legislature of his State the same provision of law that is enforced upon the same subject in the great Commonwealth of Massachusetts as to the hours of labor.

Mr. LEWIS of Washington. I will inform my friend from Massachusetts that I happen to be the author of the only bill which passed both houses of my legislature; but unfortunately, as I have stated, it later met the inimical action of the Republican governor. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. RIXEY, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. PLATT, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles; in which the concurrence of the House was requested:

S. 5427. An act granting to the Clearwater Short Line Railway Company a right of way through the Nez Perces Indian lands in Idaho; and

S. 5258. An act to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at the city of Yankton, S. Dak.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment the bill (H. R. 26) for the establishment of a light and fog-signal station on or near Hog Island Shoal, Narragansett Bay, Rhode Island.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 4690) for the relief of certain homestead settlers in Florida.

The message also announced that the Senate had insisted upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 11217) making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Indian Department and for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1900, and for other purposes, disagreed to by the House of Representatives, had agreed to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. ALLISON, Mr. PERKINS, and Mr. COCKRELL as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendments the bill (H. R. 9219) for the relief of the Fourth Arkansas Mounted Infantry.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, Senate bills of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and referred to their appropriate committees as indicated below:

S. 5258. An act to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at the city of Yankton, S. Dak.—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 5427. An act granting to the Clearwater Short Line Railway Company a right of way through the Nez Perces Indian lands in Idaho—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. HAGER, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the following title; when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 4382. An act to establish a national military park to commemorate the campaign, siege, and defense of Vicksburg.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the following titles:

S. 1357. An act for the relief of the legal representatives of Edwin De Leon, deceased, late consul-general of the United States in Egypt; and

S. 4690. An act for the relief of certain homestead settlers in Florida.

EULOGIES ON THE LATE REPRESENTATIVE DINGLEY.

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. Mr. Speaker, I now call up for present consideration the special order and ask the reading of the resolutions which have been submitted to the House.

The SPEAKER. The resolutions will be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the business of the House be now suspended that opportunity may be given for tributes to the memory of Hon. NELSON DINGLEY, late a member of the House of Representatives from the State of Maine.

Resolved, That as a particular mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, and in recognition of his eminent abilities as a distinguished public servant, the House, at the conclusion of these memorial proceedings, shall stand adjourned.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate.

Resolved, That the Clerk be instructed to send a copy of these resolutions to the family of the deceased.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the adoption of the resolutions which have just been read.

The resolutions were agreed to.

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. Mr. Speaker, it becomes my duty to call the attention of the House for a few brief moments to the occasion to which the special order just read is devoted, being the opportunity which the House has taken to pay its tribute to one of its former members who for many years was a conspicuous and influential Representative of the State of Maine in this body.

There are comparatively few members in the House, perhaps, concerning whom anything in the nature of biographical statement would be less necessary. Mr. DINGLEY has been so long a prominent factor in the legislative proceeding of our Government, has occupied such conspicuous positions in public life, and has so long been recognized as an influential member of the House of Representatives that it seems to be entirely unnecessary at this time that I should attempt anything like a sketch of his private or his public life. In my judgment this occasion is more that of an opportunity for us, his fellow-members who have been associated

with him for a long period of years, to pay an earnest and feeling tribute to his personal worth, his public services, his many amiable and winning qualities, rather than to give our judgment of the usefulness of his public life.

Governor DINGLEY has been an acquaintance and friend of my own for a great many years. Associated, as we were, professionally in the publication of newspapers, our relations with each other and our relations to public affairs have moved along in parallel lines; and it is a very gratifying reflection to me at this time that we have agreed on all great and moving questions that have attracted public attention and excited public interest during the last generation.

As the proprietor and editor of the Lewiston Daily and Weekly Journal, having an exceedingly large circulation in our State and beyond, the Hon. NELSON DINGLEY has for many years exerted a very widespread and potent influence upon public affairs not only in Maine, but throughout New England. It is unnecessary to say to those who have known him in his daily walks that his newspaper has uniformly been the advocate of all those policies and principles which in his belief lead to the uplifting of public morals, public integrity, and the advancement of civilization.

As a writer Governor DINGLEY has had few superiors in the journalism of this country. A profound student, a man of rare accuracy of information, he had a facility and a felicity with the pen that are seldom found, even in this age of so much writing. He was always an earnest man, profoundly so; not aggressive, rather inclined to be cautious. Carefully searching out with infinite pains the ground work of his beliefs and convictions, he framed them into arguments of rare cogency and great influence.

He came to this House in 1881, making his service here in the vicinity of eighteen years of long, faithful, conspicuous, and useful devotion of his talents and ability to the welfare of his Government. He was a modest man, distrustful of his own powers of attraction in public assemblages, and yet possessing a due self-respect and a confidence in his ability to search out the merit of questions and get at the pith of controversies.

It is interesting to me in the retrospect, as it was interesting to me during our joint service in the early years, the Governor having preceded me by a single session before the Forty-eighth Congress, to observe the steadfast purpose, the self-knowledge, and the determination to accomplish an object with which my distinguished colleague devoted himself to that line and sphere of public efforts to which he was best fitted. Without the charms of oratory, not having the attractions of a mellow and sibilant voice, the Governor early recognized, or, in fact, on his entrance into this forum became satisfied, that his sphere would not be that of the orator, to hold breathless thousands upon the resonance of his speech, but that he had a mission and a field and a talent that was not only adapted to this legislative body, but could be used with real devotion to the public interests, to advance those great causes upon which his heart was bent, and to frame his contribution as no insignificant one to the formation of the great public interests committed to the care of this body.

So my colleague became preeminently the student of the House of Representatives. It was my fortune to live in the same hotel with him during a long period of years, and I do not recall a single instance when I have entered his apartment while he was there that I did not find him seated with a pad upon his knee, surrounded by documents, laboriously but intelligently searching out the bases upon which the great questions agitating the American public were to be decided in Congress.

And so it came that in spite of his lack of a commanding presence, in spite of his lack of oratorical attractions, month by month and year by year, it became more and more fully recognized that the quiet, unassuming, unassertive man from Maine was a marvelous repository of accurate and trustworthy information upon an enormous variety of subjects, and that while his speech was not loud or aggressive, he was a very dangerous antagonist in any discussion which involved great knowledge of the question at issue.

So from year to year he went forward in his quiet, unassuming but devoted way, acquiring more and more of that information which perhaps some of us were inclined to permit him to dig out over the midnight oil, until it came to pass that all over the House, on both sides, without regard to political divisions, the Hon. NELSON DINGLEY was looked to as a trusted authority upon public questions, especially upon all of those intricate and most important affairs relating to the revenues and finances of the country, and when he made a statement as one of fact it came to be a rare thing to find anyone even disposed to question its correctness.

The amount of absolute labor by which Governor DINGLEY acquired the confidence of this House and of the country it would be hard to overestimate. In my knowledge I have never met so steadfast and devoted a student as my late colleague. I know the many hours that he has devoted to the most wearing of all pursuits, the elucidation of facts from statistics, the careful exami-

nation and analysis of public reports bearing upon the great questions that have agitated the country, and I have no question but that to a degree sapped his vitality and led to a shortening of his years. He was absolutely tireless in his devotion to the public service.

Within the last year, in addition to the immense labors and responsibilities of the great position which he held as chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means and the recognized leader of the controlling portion of this legislative body, he responded promptly to the invitation of the President to take a position upon the British and American commission which, in the midst of all these other cares, undertook to compose and adjudicate and settle the vast amount of rasping and difficult questions that had arisen during all the years of the past between this country and Canada.

Between those additional cares and those with which he was charged by the Speaker of the House in his assignment to the chairmanship of the great business committee of Congress, he wore out his life, his frail constitution broke down under the strain, and he passed away, as much a sacrifice of patriotism as if he had fallen on the field of battle, amid the flurry of drums and the roar of cannon, beneath his country's flag. No more faithful soldier of the Republic has ever fallen in the face of a foe than NELSON DINGLEY when the last spark of life gave out in a struggle that he had been making, performing heroic public duties until the body was too weak for the soul, and it passed to the hands of its Maker.

It became my duty to accompany the remains, with others of his late associates here, to his home in his native State for final disposition. No one who accompanied that sad party will ever forget the universal character of the interest manifested or the deep sympathy evinced by the people of communities all along the route; and when we reached his late home and found the population of a whole region practically massed around the station, hushed, reverent, and sorrowful, it impressed upon the minds of everybody present what a potent force there is in character when the death of one man, a quiet, unassuming man, can so impress itself upon a whole community that a great Commonwealth should toll its bells and wait in hushed silence while the friends of his childhood, the pastor who had watched over his manhood in church affairs, to which he was so sincerely devoted, paid their tributes to the memory of a great and good man.

Mr. Speaker, these services are held to furnish his late associates in this body an opportunity to speak their judgment upon him as a man, as an associate, and as a friend; and it is my purpose simply to-day to inaugurate this tribute as a fellow-member by the few remarks which I have made without attempting to go into a detailed record of his life or a detailed eulogy of his characteristics. For myself, his death has come as a very severe blow. The State of Maine has a small delegation in numbers. We have stood here since I became a member, only four of us. One passed away a year ago; another has recently followed; and the shattering of a delegation by the removal of one-half of its membership by the hand of death is a serious blow. And the death of Governor DINGLEY, while it will be lamented and felt throughout the country and especially by his State, is peculiarly a heavy blow to the delegation from the State of Maine with whom he has stood here so staunchly and so faithfully during all these years. It is a pleasant thought at this time that that delegation, of which the governor was so conspicuous and influential a member, stood together in all the great stresses that have come upon us, and no one of the surviving members will ever fail to remember how often and how securely we have depended upon the wise counsel, sagacious views, and faithful patriotism of our deceased colleague, Governor DINGLEY.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, on the 13th day of last month the earthly career of NELSON DINGLEY came to an end. It was the close of a long and useful life, in which he had accomplished much for his generation and his country. Though he had nearly filled out his three score years and ten, it seemed to us that he was cut off in the very height of his honor and in the midst of his greatest usefulness. It is fitting now that we, his companions and friends, should pause in the public business and offer a tribute to his memory.

My first acquaintance with Mr. DINGLEY began on the assembling of the Forty-eighth Congress in December, 1883. He had then served one term, while I was entering upon my first. I remember well his kindness to the new members, and very early there sprang up the beginning of that mutual friendship and respect which has ripened with the years. In the Fifty-first Congress we were both placed on the Committee on Ways and Means, where we were also associated at the time of his death. We had, therefore, labored together in the formulation of the tariff law of 1890, as also the tariff law of 1897. There is no place where you can get to know a man more thoroughly than in an association of this character.

Mr. DINGLEY came to Congress after a long experience in public life and a much longer study of public questions. It is related of him that long before he had reached his teens he read the speeches of Webster and Clay with more avidity than would most boys pursue Scott's novels. He was a Whig long before he was a voter, and could give "a reason for the faith that was in him." In 1855, when the Whigs and the Free Soilers united in Maine as a part of the new party, Mr. DINGLEY wrote that the Republican party then formed was "destined to live in history." He began writing political editorials before he attained his majority, and this was his favorite occupation and the one most cherished by him down to the last time of his departure from home to participate in the duties of the present session of Congress.

His studious habits were formed in his early boyhood, and they increased with his years. Often on his vacations, when others would carry a rod or a gun, he always provided himself with a writing pad and a pencil. He knew something about everything; he knew everything about many things.

Before he came to Congress he had served several terms in the legislature of his State, during a great part of which time he occupied the speaker's chair. He had also served two terms as governor.

Entering the House of Representatives in the fiftieth year of his age, he was splendidly equipped for a career of great usefulness and honor. His mind was a storehouse of useful knowledge on all public questions. But better far than this, he had formed a lifelong habit of untiring research. He had learned to take nothing for granted. He must verify the truth for himself. To him to know was a delight, and the toil by which he reached that goal, so irksome to others, had become the keenest pleasure.

In this body a man is generally measured by his companions at his true worth. We may have sharp encounters and fierce political debate, but, after all, men of all parties are measured by their comrades by a just and true standard. Political blindness never hides the true worth of our political friends or adversaries. It was a great tribute to the industry, perseverance, energy, and truthfulness of NELSON DINGLEY that information was sought from him by men of all political parties, and was uniformly accepted as reliable, frequently furnishing the basis for important action. This is the more remarkable when we consider that his greatest and most important work here was in connection with the formulation of two great tariff bills on partisan lines.

He has impressed himself on all the most important legislation of the last decade. No great question has arisen here that has not been illuminated from the stores of his knowledge, garnered by years of patient toil. He has been heard on the needs of a merchant marine, on the civil service, on the great appropriations, connected as they are with all the branches and interests of the Government, on the currency question, the national credit and the public faith, and especially on the great questions of revenue and protection. To each he has added a store of learning and good sense, winning the respect even of those who differed from him. His was not a brilliant genius. I was particularly impressed by the words of his pastor in his address to the neighbors of Mr. DINGLEY, at Lewiston, his late home. With a truthfulness and boldness too often wanting in the eulogist, he said, speaking of his enduring success:

It was not great intellectual ability, for his was not a preeminent endowment; it was not eloquence, for he had no special gifts as an orator; it was not the charm of a polished manner, for, while he was ever affable and courteous, he had not cultivated the "arts of grace as a means to an end."

What, then, was it that enabled him to attain unto and hold so long the position he occupied in the thought, esteem, and affection of his countryman?

The answer to these queries is found in his loyalty to principle, his devotion to truth, his thorough preparation, and conscientious work. Thus he was ever ready for and equal to the demands of the hour and the occasion. By his earnest application to the task in hand and by his signal success in his chosen field of effort he proved to the young men of this Republic that—

The heights by great men reached and kept
Were not attained by sudden flight;
But they, while their companions slept,
Were toiling upward in the night.

In this Hall mere elocution and oratory sometimes hold sway, but the man who uniformly reaches the ears and holds the attention of the members of this House is the man who always has something to say. Members are not looking for one who merely amuses for the moment, but for him who always furnishes valuable information. Although it required the utmost physical exertion to make himself heard, with no grace of oratory, no well-rounded periods or glittering sentences, yet Mr. DINGLEY never failed to get the attention of the members of the House. It was the triumph of patient toil and study over all outward circumstances.

In his own city, in his district, and in his State he was greatly beloved. I shall not soon forget the crowded throng that passed his bier in the city of his home. The sturdy farmer, the nervy mechanic, the high and the low, the rich and the poor, all seemed to feel the loss as of a personal friend. Many a poor man and woman brushed away a tear, while one thanked God for the friend who had saved her husband and her son by his timely aid. Bet-

ter than the plaudits of the nation, which followed him to his grave, was the heartfelt tribute of such as these, who knew him best. Looking back over his life, it would seem that he had performed a full measure of labor and success. Looking forward at the work before us, it would seem that the country could ill spare the ripened judgment of the political scholar and statesman. Questions new and grave are right in front of us, demanding the highest wisdom and best statesmanship. We shall miss his cool and dispassionate judgment, his wise counsel, his unerring sagacity, and his vast information. His life is a valuable lesson to the boys of America. It illustrates that genius is the capacity for hard work. Brilliance discourages patient toil; what we call natural genius is ever a failure without eternal vigilance and constant effort.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Speaker, I come to pay a brief tribute to the memory of a man whom I respected, revered, honored, and loved. I knew NELSON DINGLEY before he was elected to Congress, and my acquaintance with him began under circumstances which point to one of the great characteristics of the man. It was during a political campaign in the State of Maine. It was at a time when fierce controversy raged throughout that splendid State, and when public speakers were criticised with sharp intelligence and with almost brutal pertinacity. There was a question which involved a matter of financial history of our own country in comparison with that of France.

I had been challenged at a meeting in one of the lower counties of the State to answer certain interrogatories. I was not very well prepared for the emergency. I delayed and parried the issue, but I was to be met again the next night upon substantially the same field of battle, and a newspaper took occasion to remark that I had exhibited some of the merits that were valuable in a soldier under certain circumstances, and that I would live to fight, perhaps, another day. I did not have access to books; I did not know whom to go to for advice, but a gentleman told me to go to Lewiston and see Governor DINGLEY. I took the train, went up there, and met him for the first time. I introduced myself, and, laying before him the proposition, he sat down at his desk and in a very few moments wrote out a complete solution of the whole difficulty that I had labored under, and furnished me with the material on which I demonstrated to my audience the following night that I was absolutely master of the whole situation and knew all about it, and that they had made a great mistake in the challenge. From that day to this I knew Mr. DINGLEY, and met him often before I came to Congress in the Forty-ninth Congress, he having preceded me by two Congresses.

I am not attempting an analysis of his character. We are all familiar with it here. I had the honor to serve with him on the Committee on Ways and Means during the last two Congresses of his life. He had served on the Committee on Appropriations in the Fifty-third Congress, and then took the place that was vacated by his honored colleague, the present distinguished Speaker of the House of Representatives. Coming later into Congress, I tried to follow along in the footsteps he had made. I think I may say without hesitation that I never met a man who knew so much about so many things that were incident to our political history as he did.

It has been very well said by the gentleman who has preceded me that Mr. DINGLEY knew a great deal about everything and everything about a great many things; and under that second subdivision of his suggestion, I would state as my belief that he knew more facts and events of American history than I have known to be possessed by any one, living or dead, American. No man who was ever associated with him in the way of work of a committee will ever forget the patience and untiring industry with which he mastered every question that came before it. In the winter that followed the election of 1896 he called together the Republican members of the Committee on Ways and Means, and devoted the entire winter, by day and by night, to the study of every item that was to be affected by legislation in the coming Congress. I would not disparage the work of any other member of that committee, for there were several gentlemen upon it who were of distinguished ability and who had served long and faithfully in that connection, but the chairman of the committee—the chairman of the detachment of the committee—never allowed anything to go through and be finished that he did not at some time study and master every fact in connection with it.

It has been said by his pastor, in the extract read, and by other gentlemen who have preceded me, that he was not an orator; that is, in the ordinary and popular sense of the term. He came into public observation, into public prominence, and ultimately into the leadership of this House, during a period of time when there was a discount on oratory as compared with the market value of it in the years that have gone by. He might not have been a Henry Clay in oratorical power, but he far exceeded him in the power of analytical examination of the great questions of American politics. He may not have been fluent of speech, but he was reliable in

thought. He may not have been attractive in his personal appearance as he stood on the floor of this House, but when we came to examine the subject-matter of his address we found we had listened, perhaps unthinkingly at the time of the utterance, to the declarations of a master.

He had no sense of humor; he never permitted himself to be carried away for a moment from the sturdy and studious business of life by any thought of the attractiveness of humor or gaiety. We all remember some instances here in the House that we shall remember while we live and speak about as illustrative of this curious feature of his character. No man was ever brilliant enough in repartee or in wit to make apparently the slightest impression upon him. If it was a statement of fact, he heard it; if it was an application of an argument, he analyzed it; if it was a witticism, he did not seem to hear it.

He was a faithful man. He was one of the men that when you looked for him at the place where he notified you he would be found upon any question he was there; you did not have to consider whether or not there might be a change in his purposes in that behalf. Loyal and faithful to his party, I think it is fair to say that, strong partisan as he was, he never permitted partisanship to override his devotion to that which was best for his country.

His State had been peculiar in one matter of its politics. With the bare exception of a term for some gentlemen who represented a combination of opposition—with this exception, one single party, the Republican party, had dominated the representative capacity of that State ever since the Republican party was organized. So that we might have looked, in the development of a man who had come to be a Representative from that State, for a tendency toward more indifference to others' interests than the interests of his own party. I put it forward as one of the great characteristics of NELSON DINGLEY that he never lost sight of the greatest good to the greatest number.

I was talking with him a few days before he was taken sick. I was going home, and had an opportunity of an hour's conversation with him, and I can say this with perfect propriety, that he cast a horoscope forward through the entire session, the remaining session of this Congress; and in speaking of the several great measures that were to come before us I saw that he had already studied, considered, analyzed, and arranged the whole subject, not only of the arguments upon our side, but in those questions which were to be political, as he thought, he was prepared already to meet the arguments on the other side.

A word as I hurry along. What was the great strength of NELSON DINGLEY as a member of this House? I do not speak of him in his relations to the party, in his relations to the family, in his relations to the church and his people at home, but I speak of what it was that made him the powerful man he was on this floor. It was not because he had been assigned by the practice of the House to the leadership of the majority, not that. Because that may be repudiated at any time, as we all know and understand. The leader, the assigned and chosen leader in the House, must have capacity to assert the propriety of his choice, or he will not be the leader on this floor. What was his great strength? First, a wonderful knowledge of everything that came here; and, second, and possibly greater than all else, was the fact that he never made a statement of fact that did not turn out to be as he had stated it. He never was unwilling to be corrected in the hurry of debate if he had made a slip on facts or figures, but when he launched his case upon a proposition of fact, both sides in this House understood that the discussion afterwards must proceed upon the assumption that that was true.

And then in all that relates to that intercourse between members, that which relates to the orderly progress of business in partisan debate and partisan procedure, NELSON DINGLEY's words to the other side of this House were just as safe and just as certain to be accepted as truth as though it had been put by unanimous consent upon the Journal of the House. He was loyal and faithful to the party to which he belonged. I may state now without qualification or hesitation that there was no man in the United States who was nearer to the administration of this Government to-day than was he, no man who had the confidence of the President in a higher degree, no man who in an emergency was called upon oftener, nor so often, as was NELSON DINGLEY, and no man who knew the purposes and aspirations and hopes of the Administration more conspicuously than did NELSON DINGLEY of Maine.

I may not discuss the fact that he is gone. There will be no hour of this or the next Congress when we shall not miss him. He was a man upon whom his associates on this side of the House loaded their burdens. Let me be specific about that. An attack might be made from the other side assailing some act of this side, all along the lines of economical administration and legislation; facts and figures might be hurled at us. I am sorry to say that we paid but little attention to such things here, because we knew that at the proper time the matter would receive proper consideration and action at the hands of the chosen leader of the party. We shall miss him in that regard. And the other side will miss

the genial gentleman on whose courtesy and consideration they always relied. This brings us to the consideration of two or three propositions.

How wonderful are the ties that bind us here, even though the bitter assaults and storms of political controversy come and for the moment apparently divide and sever us. How quickly we learn the character of a man, even though he may be our assailant. How quickly we appreciate the man, though he may differ so widely with us. And so I think I can speak truthfully when I say that no man had a higher standing in the estimation of his fellows, even upon the Democratic side of the House, than did DINGLEY.

He has gone, but he has written upon the statute books of this country his views upon political matters. They will be his monument in coming time. He has left upon the hearts of his countrymen a sense of proprietorship in his great name that will be a heritage to the people who shall follow him.

Mr. BURLEIGH. Mr. Speaker, in view of my short service in this House, it seems but fitting that I should leave to those who were longer and more intimately associated with NELSON DINGLEY in its work the duty of testifying to the distinguished character of his services here.

In the brief but heartfelt tribute I desire to offer, I wish to speak more particularly of his relations to the social and political life of his own State. Maine has ever been loyal to her Representatives at the national capital, and has never failed to feel a just pride in the successes achieved by them. I was for some years in a position to know and appreciate how strong this feeling was in the case of Mr. DINGLEY. No man ever served in this body who enjoyed in a greater degree the love and respect of the people of his State and district. They knew his sterling worth and had an abiding faith in his sound judgment and purity of purpose.

Born on one of the rugged farms of Maine, in a section where nature in the dispensation of scenic beauties had been prodigal of her gifts but exacted toil as the price of existence, he inherited the sturdy self-reliance of an honest, God-fearing ancestry, and was early schooled in those habits of industry he retained through life.

His father, who combined the pursuits of agriculture with the running of a country store, was a man of sterling worth; possessed great energy, together with strong tenacity of purpose. His mother, who, prior to her marriage, had been a successful teacher, was a woman of rare attainments and beauty of character. To her gentle influences may be attributed no small part of her son's steadfast devotion to duty and the notable success that attended him in the work of life.

The qualities that so distinguished him in later years were early manifest. The child was father of the man. In his early years he evinced a power of self-control, a tenacity of purpose, a wonderfully retentive memory, and a love of truth that gave bright promise of his later distinguished career. As he progressed into manhood these qualities developed with his growth. His aspirations were ennobling, his associations helpful and elevating. He undertook no labor that he did not complete, and none that was not done thoroughly and well.

Following his graduation from college he pursued a course of legal study and was, in due time, admitted to the bar. He was a man of judicial temperament with marked powers of concentration. There can be no doubt that had he continued in the practice of law the same high qualities of head and heart, the wonderful insight, the intuitive grasp of the salient points in a case, and the great capacity for close and sustained labor that so distinguished him as a member of this House must inevitably have secured him eminence in his profession. His tastes, however, did not run in this direction. He had been for some time a successful contributor to various newspapers and soon abandoned his legal pursuits to purchase an interest in and assume the editorial duties of the Journal, a weekly paper published in the growing city of Lewiston.

No man was ever better equipped, both by nature and attainments, for duties of this character. He was an indefatigable worker, and his paper soon became a recognized power in the State. In 1860 he added a daily edition, which speedily pushed to the front in Maine journalism, a position it has ever since maintained. In those days the editorial writer was far more of an individual force than he is at the present time, when the personality of a writer is frequently merged and practically lost in the name and character of his paper.

To the readers of the Lewiston Journal NELSON DINGLEY was a living, breathing reality—a potential force. They soon came to entertain a profound respect for the sterling qualities of his character and the soundness of his judgment. The number of those who came to him for counsel and advice was large, and the circle of his personal influence became second only to that of his newspaper. How much Mr. DINGLEY owed to this absolute accessibility, this habit of taking his neighbors and friends into his

immediate confidence, it would be difficult to conceive. But undoubtedly here was the source, and, in large measure, the foundation of the strong hold upon the people of his district and his State which he retained to the day of his death.

Mr. DINGLEY carried into his editorial work the same direct and attractive qualities that characterized him in his personal relations. He was a clear and cogent writer, though never a maker of phrases. Language with him was merely a vehicle for the transmission of thought, and never in any degree an end in itself. There was in all his writings an atmosphere of truth and sincerity. He attempted nothing by indirection, nor was he a man who ever sought to evade or ignore the strong points of an opponent. He met them courageously and manfully. A man of absolute convictions, he was always ready with reasons for the faith that was in him.

Party workers sometimes imagined that he gave opposing views altogether too courteous consideration, for he had the same fairness that characterized Lincoln in stating the position of an adversary. There was no fighting, so far as he was concerned, with men of straw. He was strong enough and broad enough to seek or desire no undue advantage. He went directly, with unerring precision, to the heart of any question he was discussing. He was quick to detect the weak points in the armor of an opponent and knew how to direct his thrusts there with telling effect. At the same time his utterances were characterized by a calm dignity and tolerant spirit. He never permitted himself to be tempted to a lower level.

The irritability and acrimony that not infrequently fix the stamp of a small soul upon editorial expression had no place in the journalism of Mr. DINGLEY. He touched no subject that he did not elevate to the plane of frank and philosophical discussion. Throughout his long and busy life he was a man of high ideals. Positions of public trust and responsibility came to him naturally.

At the age of 29 he was elected to represent his city in the Maine house of representatives, and served in that body for four successive sessions. During two of them he occupied the Speaker's chair and declined a third election to that position, preferring to retain his place upon the floor. A few years later he again served his constituents for two sessions in the same body.

His experience at the State capital gave him a valuable legislative experience and so strengthened the popular appreciation of his high character and abilities that in 1873 he was given the Republican nomination for governor, receiving a vote of nearly two to one in the convention against two popular opponents. His administration of State affairs was clean and businesslike. He was reelected in 1874 by an increased majority, but declined a renomination in 1875, preferring to devote his energies to the work of his newspaper.

In 1881 the Republicans of the second Congressional district of Maine gave proof of the confidence and esteem in which they held him by electing him to this House as the successor of Hon. William P. Frye, who had been promoted to the United States Senate, and he was returned at every successive election with constantly increasing majorities. He had been elected to the Fifty-sixth Congress.

It was, after all, in his own happy home circle that Mr. DINGLEY was seen at his best. Here the tenderness and beauty of his character were most conspicuous. It was a Christian home, as unostentatious as it was hospitable. Here in the society of his devoted wife and children Mr. DINGLEY found the principal relaxation from the cares and anxieties of public station and passed the happiest hours of his life.

At no stage of his distinguished career did Mr. DINGLEY fail to keep in close and sympathetic touch with the plain people. Success did not allure him from his simple tastes and quiet life. He was to the end of his days the same unaffected, accessible, industrious, upright man that he was before he grew into national prominence. There was in his whole career no spot or blemish. The fierce light of publicity that shines upon every act of a great party leader in this House only served to throw into stronger relief the noble qualities of his nature. He grew in the estimation of the people of the country as he had long before grown in the estimation of the people of Maine. At his death a nation mourned.

Were a star quenched on high,
For ages would its light,
Still traveling downward from the sky,
Shine on our mortal sight.
So when a great man dies,
For years beyond our ken,
The light he leaves behind him lies
Upon the paths of men.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. Speaker, in the death of Mr. DINGLEY our country has sustained the loss of one of its purest public men, one of its wisest and most accomplished statesmen. It is a loss which will be long felt and which it is most difficult to supply. I know no one who possessed so thorough and so complete a knowledge of this Government and of all of its departments and institutions as did Mr. DINGLEY. His knowledge in this direction was

amazing, both for its breadth and its accuracy. He was fully equipped to be the chairman of any committee of this House. He had also the rare faculty of utilizing his vast learning both for the purposes of discussion and for the preparation of statutes and revenue bills. In him was successfully blended the thoughtful student and the practical man of affairs. His career in Congress was one of preeminent distinction.

Few members attended the sessions of the House so constantly as did Mr. DINGLEY. None kept a scrutiny upon proposed legislation so carefully as he.

For four years he was chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means and, as such, the leader of the Republican majority in this House. Not since the civil war has the great Committee on Ways and Means possessed a chairman who could surpass Mr. DINGLEY in his knowledge of finance, of the tariff, and in his acquaintance with the varied and immense industries of this country. He will be remembered in history as one of the most distinguished chairmen of this great committee.

During these four years this committee has had to deal with the most important questions affecting this nation. Mr. DINGLEY was the central figure, the moving spirit in the determination of all these matters by the committee. The recommendations by this committee to this House bear the impress of his mind, the conclusions of his thought and research.

Upon matters before this committee which did not involve the differences between the two great parties upon taxation and finance he was equally as potential with the Democrats as with the Republicans. Upon those questions involving the principles and the policies of his own party his was the voice that was listened to with attention and his was the hand that pointed the way that his party finally went.

Congress has witnessed very few more successful floor leaders than Mr. DINGLEY. He possessed the rare faculty of being first without exciting envy or jealousy. Much of this was due to the fact that it was recognized by all that he was entitled to this preeminent position on account of his solid attainments and not on account of superficial display. Much of it because he himself was entirely devoid of all jealousy and envy and rejoiced at the success and abilities of anyone. Much of it was due to his wonderful tact in controlling matters without pushing himself individually forward, and by his kind and considerate attention to the humblest members of this House.

He possessed the faculty of not exciting the bitter antagonism of the opposition more than any leader I ever knew of. He was held in affectionate esteem and regard by all members of the Democratic side. He accomplished this by unflinching courtesies, fairness, and by never descending to partisan discussions or indulging in personalities. He stated the position of those opposed to him fairly, and met the issues offered directly and manfully. When party policies were not involved, he was equally desirous to accommodate and to serve a Democratic member or constituency as a Republican. By acquiring the good will and affectionate regard of the opposition he was enabled to get along smoothly in the House and pass his legislation without inciting bitter feeling or encountering delays often engendered simply to harass.

When one reflects upon the many and important and exciting questions which he has had control of in Congress for the last four years which he passed through the House, and which was accomplished with very little friction, delay, or bad feeling, it is astonishing and gives one some conception of Mr. DINGLEY's wonderful tact and ability as a parliamentary leader. If measured by success and by achievements, he will be remembered as one of the greatest parliamentary leaders. No one, as a speaker, was listened to more attentively than Mr. DINGLEY. He did not possess the voice or the graces of an orator. His speeches were not resplendent with rhetoric nor sparkling with satire and wit, but they were illumined from commencement to conclusion with careful thought and valuable information. The House listened to him for instruction and not for entertainment. In his management of the Republican side of the House he was equally as tactful as in his treatment of the Democratic side. His control of the Republican side was nearly absolute. Many a time when there was a disposition on the Republican side to break upon important questions he rallied the disorganized forces by one of his lucid and thoughtful speeches.

In keeping his own party united he ignored entirely the usual methods of party leaders of appealing to party prejudices, but he addressed himself to the reason and the understanding of his party associates. The effect produced by his calm reasoning was remarkable.

In their future conflicts his party associates will sorely miss his calm, thoughtful speeches and his tactful and discreet leadership. The Democratic side will miss his unflinching courtesy, his uniform fairness, and his considerate kindness. The whole House will miss his great learning, his valuable instruction. His friends will miss a kind, sincere, gentle soul, undemonstrative, unpretentious, but as true as steel. His country will miss a wise, pure, patriotic statesman.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, I very much regret that, having been absent from the House when the time was set for eulogies on the life of Mr. DINGLEY, I received notice too late to make such preparation as I ought, to do justice to his memory. Though late in coming, I come with as eager a desire as any to lay my little wreath of affectionate admiration and esteem upon his coffin.

The language of eulogy is too apt to be the language of extravagance. Mr. DINGLEY needs no eulogy of that kind. Justice to his life and character calls only for the naked language of truth. His was a career that requires no embellishment in words and no exaggeration. What he thought and what he wrought suffice to give him a name and place among the most distinguished and useful men of his time.

He was fortunate in the opportunity to serve the people, both in his State and in the nation, during a critical time of the national life. His career covers the grave periods of the civil war, of reconstruction, and of the succeeding years which have seen the entrance of a nation, and not a confederation of States, upon a career of unexampled prosperity and a future of incalculable promise. Unfortunately for us all, the grim reaper seized him when we were facing new and untried conditions, and when his wisdom and experience would have been of immense service to his country. But he needed not any glory to be gathered in new fields to be added to the already full measure of his fame. He died full of years and of honors, and an appreciative people do willing and sorrowing homage at his bier.

When Mr. DINGLEY entered public life, the flames of civil war had made lurid the whole horizon and the perpetuity of the nation was at stake. When he was called to depart this life, a saved and reconstructed Union was in the enjoyment of an established and yet further promising prosperity. To this happy consummation he, in many ways, largely contributed. It was characteristic of him that to whatever place or whatever task called, he rendered faithful, conscientious, and fruitful service.

From 1863 till 1873 he was, with a slight interruption, a member of the Maine house of representatives, and during a term its speaker. Succeeding this service, he was the governor of his State. For eighteen years he was a member of the National House of Representatives and died its leader upon the floor, chairman of the Ways and Means Committee. In many other capacities he rendered distinguished public services. The mere recital of the places that he held is a witness that he was a man of mark amongst his fellows and of service to his kind. Mr. Blaine once said that no truer test of a man's power could be found than his success in the House of Representatives; that place therein must be fought for and won by merit. This test Mr. DINGLEY successfully stood. When he died he was facile princeps in the House, a leader whom we all delighted to follow and one who commanded the confidence of his party and equally commanded the respect and esteem of the opposition. His career is a valuable contribution to the glory of republican representative government, wherein the equality of all men, not only before the law but in a contest for advancement upon the ground of merit, is a conspicuous feature. He was a shining example of the possibilities of American citizenship. Nothing came to him by inheritance; he was the architect of his own fortunes, and his fortunes were built upon the solid foundation of a noble character.

He was a manly man, patient, learned, and eminently industrious. He was a manly man because he was ever true to his ideals, and his ideals were lofty. Pure of private life, with strong convictions, he never swerved from his standards nor forsook what he believed to be the interests of the people whom he was called upon to represent, and he believed that he was called upon to represent the people of the whole country. He was a patient man, charitable of the views of others, though fixed in his own. He was a tactful man, anxious, always, to work out by the wisest methods, by compromise, when necessary—but never a compromise of principle—by courageous methods when others failed, what he believed to be the true interests of the people. He was a learned man. He had a wonderful storehouse of information, in general and in detail, and his information was exact and accurate. A wonderful memory added greatly to his power as a leader. He was rarely found wanting for a ready reply to the arguments offered by the opposition.

To such an extent was reliance placed upon what he had to say that he never rose to speak that he did not command the attention of all, whether friend or foe. I have never known a more industrious man. Every waking hour of every day was given to the acquisition of useful knowledge. With an apparently delicate physique, his capacity for work seemed nevertheless without limit. All that he knew and all that by his patient industry he learned was gladly devoted to the public service. I could not if I would recount the measures that his advocacy wrought into the statute law of the nation. Suffice it to say, that during his long career there were few matters of important legislation that did not receive his attention. He was an ardent believer in the prin-

ciples of his party, and their predominance to-day is as much the result of his labor as it is of any other one man.

Nothing so knits men together as association in a work in which they have a common interest. Among the days of my public life that I shall always remember with the greatest interest will be those when the Committee on Ways and Means of the Fifty-fourth Congress was framing the tariff bill now known as the Dingley law. We were then in closest communion. Then it was that every man on that committee revealed to all his fellows his most characteristic qualities. Then it was that we learned from the inside the strength and the weakness of each other. We were engaged in a great work, one of stupendous importance to the nation at large and of more or less interest in its various features to each of us. Out of the struggle that ended in the framing of the Dingley bill we all came with an estimate of Mr. DINGLEY as a leader full of tact and resources, as a wise and conservative statesman worthy of the greatest of the chairmen of the past of the Committee on Ways and Means.

It is not for me to seek to penetrate the veil and speak of Mr. DINGLEY in that sphere in which as husband and father he was the beloved center. It was there that the graces of a Christian character made a happy home and furnished an example to bear fruit long after his time.

His life work ended, he died in the fullness of his fame, leaving to his countrymen the record of a useful life spent in their service and to his children the priceless legacy of a spotless name.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, the death of Governor DINGLEY has removed from public life one of the most useful men who has appeared in the national councils in this generation. His long service in this House gave him such a relation to national affairs that his untimely removal is in the nature of a national misfortune. He came into Congress in 1881, after a distinguished career in the legislature and the executive office of the State of Maine, and from the time of his entrance into the House was recognized as a trained and experienced legislator. He had a preparation for public life, based upon a liberal education in one of the most famous colleges in New England, besides the advantage which arises from the studies required for admission to the bar. In addition to this he was, throughout his life, identified with journalism, a circumstance which in itself greatly contributed to his usefulness as a statesman.

Mr. STEELE. Mr. Speaker, will my good friend the gentleman from Iowa permit me to inject into his address a brief expression of my appreciation of our departed friend?

Mr. DOLLIVER. Certainly.

Mr. STEELE. In an experience of nearly twelve years I do not think I have known a member of this House who has so industriously, so efficiently, and so ably devoted his time to the best interests of our great country, and at the same time has so faithfully, so successfully, or more unselfishly served the people of his own beloved State. He was a man of unusual information and ability, of unquestioned integrity, was respected and honored by all good people, more especially so by those who had the pleasure of his personal acquaintance.

Mr. DOLLIVER. He had the wisdom to understand that the range of public affairs is too broad to permit a man to become an authority in all its departments. He therefore, following the natural bent of his mind, deliberately identified himself with that branch of public affairs which deals with the fiscal problems of the Government, with the creation and disposition of the national revenues, and with the larger problems that relate to the coinage and currency of the country.

While he was alive his preeminence in these fields of research and controversy, generously conceded by all, invited neither envy nor jealousy, so that we only repeat the tribute ungrudgingly paid to the living statesman on all hands when it is said, now that the labors of his life are done, that no man of his time equaled him in the mastery of the complex and difficult problems which concern the Treasury of the United States.

In other matters the House may have turned to others for authoritative statements of fact and suggestions of policy, but when the questions of coinage, banking and currency, of ways and means were before the House every member acquiesced in the universal confidence in the profound knowledge of Governor DINGLEY upon these subjects.

It was not an accident that he occupied this unique relation to the affairs of the Government, for to a natural adaptation to studies of this character he added an industry with which he pursued his favorite themes without weariness and without vacation. We have heard it said that Governor DINGLEY owed little to natural talents and everything to unrelenting labor. It is nearer the truth to say that he was sagacious enough to know that even the possession of extraordinary gifts is futile unless they are put into the harness and driven by a steady and severe hand.

He was an example of the intellectual type that takes nothing for granted, that stands upon the solid rock of fact and truth,

perfecting every detail with patient care, until at last men looked upon him as a leader and teacher of his fellow-men.

It is probable that Mr. DINGLEY regarded his labor in the present Congress as his most important public work, and there is no doubt that his name will be chiefly known to posterity in connection with the fiscal legislation of 1897. It was my good fortune to be associated with him in the preparation of the tariff law which bears his name. For many months prior to the extraordinary session of this Congress he sat at the head of the table, surrounded by the ten members of the Ways and Means Committee belonging to his own party, conducting the investigations which resulted in the original draft of the Dingley tariff bill. They were months of labor, without a day of recreation and without an hour of leisure. The chairman of the committee, even then to all appearances frail and uncertain in strength, brought to the business in hand that wealth of accurate information, that vast store of definite knowledge, that unflagging zeal of personal attention which left his colleagues in daily astonishment as they came to see the fullness of his equipment in the field of practical legislation.

The minute details of previous legislation from the first tariff law to the last, and the history of American industries, great and small, including the vicissitudes of the business world, seemed to be within easy reach of his infallible memory, so that he could neither be deceived by the petitions of those who asked for duties unreasonably high nor the protests of those who sought to reduce them to a point unreasonably low. In this bewildering mass of statistics, official reports, price lists, and personal statements, Governor DINGLEY moved about like a man perfectly at home, never failing to get at the facts, never hesitating to cast aside hearsays from whatever quarter, and when the work was over and the bill approved by the House without an amendment not suggested by the committee, every man associated with him, in addition to admiration for the statesman, found in his heart a sincere affection for the man himself, for the unostentatious colleague whose greatness as a leader only emphasized his kindness and generosity as a friend.

In so far as his fame rests upon what he said and what he did, it is preserved in the RECORD of the proceedings of this House. That RECORD will show to future generations the wisdom with which he approached the questions of his time. His speeches upon this floor have a permanent value to the student and the historian, not only because of their trustworthy statement of the matters under consideration, but because they are inseparably connected with the national policies by which the business affairs of the Government have been guided.

But it is true of Governor DINGLEY, as of all others who have been influential in shaping great events, that we naturally turn away from the public arena in which he acted so conspicuous a part to recall the attributes of personal character, upon which, after all, every great reputation rests. Men followed Governor DINGLEY because they believed in him, and they believed in him because his life displayed, even in the smallest affairs, a fixed and immovable integrity.

His character was greater than his intellect and dominated every faculty that was in him. It exhibited that strong fiber of moral conviction, that inflexible vigor of conscience, which has done more to make the nation what it is than all the triumphs of genius, than all the ornaments of learning.

It was a character based upon the religious creed of our ancestors, a survival of the Puritan ages, so sure and steadfast that it seemed a little strange, from a common, worldly point of view, to find a man going about amongst us, the guide of the political thought of millions of people, the counselor of Cabinets and of Presidents, the trusted leader of a political party, whose funeral brought together in this Chamber the high officials of every department of this Government and the representatives of all the nations of the earth in a stately national ceremony, who had preserved the perfect ideal of Christian manhood and amid the vicissitudes of a long career had literally kept himself unspotted from the world.

The leadership of such a man in times like these is in the nature of a national benediction. It shows that in the midst of the evil tendencies of wealth and luxury the sources of the national life have not been corrupted, for while a single New England homestead may nurture such a man, it takes the scattered homesteads of a great nation to support and give significance to such a career.

The hope of the Republic lies in these old-fashioned homesteads, with their tables spread with the frugal comforts of life and their family altars made sublime by simple faith in God. The statesman in whose memory we are assembled here to-day illustrated before our eyes the homely virtues of the men and women who laid the foundations of society in the New World. They looked forward not alone to material prosperity. They had an eye also for the higher concerns of the community, so that, side by side with the material progress of the nation, the intellectual and moral interests of the people have been advanced, until to-day the

real estate of the Republic is not the boundless territory of the national domain, nor its real wealth the accumulated sum of its property, nor its real life the unnumbered millions of its people, for after you have gathered together all the statistics of material prosperity you have yet to find by the quiet firesides of an upright people the authentic census of a great commonwealth.

Mr. HOPKINS. Mr. Speaker, I desire on this sad yet interesting occasion to add my meed of praise to the memory of our departed friend and colleague. I shall leave it to others who knew him longer and better to speak of his early manhood and of the training that he had preparatory to his entering upon his great career in this House. My acquaintance with Mr. DINGLEY commenced in the Forty-ninth Congress. When I came here at that time he had served his district and State faithfully and well in our national councils for a number of years and had already attained a commanding position with his colleagues.

As a new member, I naturally made a careful study of the leading members of that Congress, and of all the men who then and since have filled conspicuous places in the public mind Mr. DINGLEY was one of the if not the most interesting character. He was not gifted by nature with a voice and person that would attract attention. What he gained in the way of public distinction was in spite of many personal defects. It was the superb quality of his mind and that never-tiring industry so characteristic of him that placed him in the foremost rank of the public men of the day. Whatever he had in hand to do he did well. He was a good parliamentarian, well versed in the science of finance, thoroughly conversant with the principles of political economy, and as a member of the Appropriations Committee he distinguished himself for the depth and variety of his information. As chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means he has inseparably connected his name with the legislative history of our country in connection with the law now on our statute book known as the Dingley law.

None of us dreamed at the opening of the present session of Congress that his earthly career was so nearly ended. Up to the holiday recess he came daily among us in the committee room and as leader on this floor with all the old-time vigor, courtesy, and firmness that have marked his leadership. He had the entire confidence not only of his Republican colleagues, but of our Democratic friends as well. Whenever he arose to address the Chair on any subject relating to legislation he was listened to with respectful attention, and his words made a deep impress upon his political friends as well as those in political opposition.

I think during my experience on this floor, for now nearly fourteen years, that I have never known a member more universally beloved, whose opinions were more highly regarded, or whose influence was greater than that of Mr. DINGLEY. He was an ideal American, and while the Second district and the State of Maine may claim him, he had long since outgrown those environments and stood forth a man of national character, whose ability and influence were dedicated to the service of his country. He exerted an influence upon legislation second to none of the men of our time. I can not, owing to the number who are to pay their tribute to his memory to-day, dwell at any length upon the characteristics which made Mr. DINGLEY the successful public man he became and so endeared him to his family and to his friends. His life was well rounded, and it was indeed a happy one. He achieved a success in public affairs realized by few of his contemporaries. In his domestic relations he enjoyed a felicity which falls to the lot of few. In his death we feel a personal bereavement and the public have sustained an irreparable loss.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Speaker, if it were not for the sacred demands which the dead make upon the living, I should prefer to leave undone that which I am about to do.

The esteem we bore him, the services he rendered to us and the country, the man he was and is—all these are the peculiar possessions of the heart, and it is with the greatest reluctance that we ignore her grief at the present hour and bid her deliver up her treasures.

Half the charm of men is usually lost under the pressure of work and the irritation of haste; and surely the citizen, journalist, legislator, statesman, and scholar whose life we honor and whose death we mourn to-day was one of the most industrious of men, but he was in an eminent degree an exception to that rule.

He possessed a grace of manner and a thoughtful consideration in word and act, particularly in his intercourse with the younger members of the House, which made him dearer than a friend to many of us.

When, in all his years of service on this floor, has he not stood ready to impart information and counsel to his colleagues? Who, in the annals of this numerous and eminent body, has enjoyed the friendship of so many men, of all political parties, as he has? Among the distinguished leaders upon this floor in the past, who enjoyed the confidence of his colleagues and followers to a greater

degree than he did? Did not all feel stronger because of his presence, and did not our hearts pause for a moment when we heard the sad news?

Many of those who knew Mr. DINGLEY here would, I believe, have preferred to leave unspoken the esteem in which we held him, so personal is the loss we feel; but silence does not become the living when a soul has passed from earth, and especially such a soul as his. The desire for immortality which burns in every breast bids us break the spell of grief and speak; the innate respect we rightfully feel for all that appertains to human life and its sorrows bids us speak; our gratitude for the duty he performed and for the life of industry and integrity he lived bids us speak.

The dead, sir, in this matter are the undisputed masters of the living. The lives of great men live and should live after them, as molding forces in succeeding generations, and I take it to be an obligation which devolves upon the living to describe the achievements, define the principles, and immortalize the virtues of those who weary of life's burdens and fall asleep in their midst.

Nor is it fitting that the cause of the solemn ceremonies which we have recently witnessed in this Chamber should lack commemoration. The ambassadors and ministers of foreign powers came here; the Supreme Court and the Senate of the United States adjourned their sessions out of respect for the dead and sought places upon this floor; the President of the United States, and his Cabinet were here; these walls were adorned with flowers and bathed in sacred song and oratory.

It is fitting, therefore, that we should pause for a few brief hours to recount the labors and define the ideals which hovered like angels about the life of our honored colleague and beloved friend.

The life of NELSON DINGLEY reminds me of nothing so much as of a majestic ship moving cautiously from its home port and grandly plowing the deep, gathering strength from each fresh encounter with wind and wave, until, out upon the high seas, while in the full enjoyment of proud dominion over the elements, almost without warning, sharp rocks crash into her bow, and the towering citadel of the sea, loaded with wealth and throbbing with power, sinks deeper than a plummet's sounding into the dark and swirling tide.

His life was one of steady progress and ever-increasing strength and usefulness. He was a boy on the farm, with high ideals and noble resolves; a student at college, at the head of his class; a journalist, with ready pen and broad information; a lawyer, of profound scholarship; a legislator, who loved truth and fairness; a governor, of wise discrimination and an able executive; a statesman, than whom none possessed a more complete mastery of the facts and principles appertaining to national policies and to the administrative affairs of the Government; a party leader of sincere devotion and reliable judgment, who led, not by the power of will alone, nor by persuasive eloquence, but by a charm of manner, a sincerity of purpose, a considerate regard for the opinions of others, and a masterful command of every detail of situation which inspired that confidence without which successful leadership is impossible.

In all the circumstances of his life he was an upright, industrious citizen and kindly neighbor, serving with the great talents God had given him his day and generation; and when the message came, as come it will to every man, and he was called to join the innumerable throngs which move to the silent halls of death, it found him in the midst of happiness among the scenes of his greatest usefulness and intensely devoted to those purposes which had been the guiding stars of his life.

It is said that Mr. DINGLEY was not a genius, and if to be a genius is to be eccentric, meteoric, and convulsive, the remark is certainly true. There was no steadier, saner man. But who is there that will maintain that he did not possess a truly great intelligence? Who would deny that his was the seeing eye and the faithful hand? And, moreover, he possessed a quality more valuable to the world than genius—a quality that gives to genius all its worth, a capacity and love for toil with both hand and brain.

He was not, like Achilles, talented beyond both Greeks and Trojans, but driven by passions stronger than himself. He was rather like Ulysses or Diomedes, far-seeing, faithful, and prepared. He loved law and order and hated chaos. Like Socrates, the greatest of the Athenian statesmen, he obeyed the laws of both church and state, even when he could not, in all the length and breadth of his catholic mind, respect them. He was practical, useful, and efficient. His great service to us and to his country was unobtrusive, not strained, and it had the quality of mercy, "which droppeth like the gentle rain from heaven upon the place beneath."

How beautifully did he describe those virtues which he himself possessed when on the 2d of February, 1886, he paid his last tribute to the deceased ex-Senator from Indiana and Vice-President of the United States, Thomas A. Hendricks.

The kindness of his manner—

Said Mr. DINGLEY—

his affability toward all who approached him, and his uniform courtesy to the

humblest united with a dignity and self-poise which lent a charm to his presence and made him hosts of friends, and even disarmed to a certain extent the criticism of political opponents. In the heat of party politics, characterized so often by unjust assaults upon personal character, I do not remember to have heard or read any charge reflecting on Mr. Hendricks's integrity. Certainly, if any such charge was made, it fell harmless at his feet. His private life was above reproach, and his example a beneficent influence in the community in which he lived. The loving tenderness of Mr. Hendricks's domestic life has made his memory in this respect a sweet savor wherever happy homes are recognized as the citadel of national virtue and the hope of the world.

While Mr. DINGLEY had neither the physical presence nor the fluent manner of a magnetic public speaker, and while he did not possess the quality and flexibility of voice upon which successful oratory depends, nevertheless he spoke with marvelous effect, and never assumed the floor but to instruct and enlighten and thereby to mold the judgment of his colleagues. With the subtle arts of oratorical suggestion he was not conversant. He belonged rather to that small group of public men who represent the progressive tendency of the age toward intellectualism.

The sphere for forensic discussion grows steadily narrower as the life of the American people becomes more and more complicated and its problems more difficult. The demand for sheer intelligence becomes greater. The work of the committee has, to a large extent, already supplanted open discussion. The wide and accurate information of the student is needed to-day rather than the insidious graces and poetic suggestions of the orator. The entire country has changed since the days of Webster, Clay, and Calhoun. And in this respect Mr. DINGLEY, I repeat, belonged rather to the advancing tendency. For I take it we are coming to the time when a great memory, clear thought, and profound learning in the affairs of state will be indispensable qualifications of those who aim to attain to usefulness in this body.

But NELSON DINGLEY possessed more than a great intelligence and a capacity for toil. He was justly esteemed as a citizen and a man. He had strong, pure affections that bound him to his country and to his friends like bands of steel.

He seemed the thing he was, and joined
Each office of the social hour
To noble manners, as the flower
And native growth of noble mind,
And thus he bore without abuse
The grand old name of gentleman.

Mr. DINGLEY possessed in an eminent degree the quality which we well name integrity, wholeness; for he was never two or many persons, but everywhere the same. To whatever position he was called, NELSON DINGLEY was always self-identical. He championed upon all appropriate occasions not only noble, but the noblest principles within his knowledge. His character had but few blemishes and many excellences. He was in the truest sense a religious man and could with perfect consistency say that for him "religion is life or neither is anything." He left all word battles and dogmatic narrowness to men of smaller minds. Beliefs were to him simply rules of action, attitudes toward the world. He seemed to be above all mere partisanship, whether ecclesiastical or political. His affiliations with the institutions of his time were the natural and inevitable outgrowth of his convictions. In all things he seemed, like Abraham of old, to seek for "a city which hath foundations, whose builder and maker is God."

It was this which gave to his life and character its unusual unity and poise. He stood—

Like some tall cliff that lifts its awful form,
Swells from the vale and midway leaves the storm.
Though round its breast the rolling clouds are spread,
Eternal sunshine settles on its head.

In my personal intercourse with Mr. DINGLEY, during the last two Congresses on the Committee on Ways and Means, of which he was chairman, I, like many of you, came to think of him with esteem and affection. His kindness and patience, his industry, and his great ability profoundly impressed me. I had come to rely upon his judgment in many things, and the news of his death brought with it a sense of personal loss.

I know of no sincerer compliment which the living pay the dead than their sorrow; and as for NELSON DINGLEY, with all my heart I wish he were living still. There was, there is, no simpler, gentler, manlier man.

Mr. JOHNSON of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, when the members of the Fifty-second Congress, in December, 1891, assembled in this historic Chamber and cast lots for seats, it so happened that Mr. DINGLEY, of Maine, did not hear his name when called.

The result was he had to take the one vacant seat in the rear row after all others had been selected. My name was called early in the drawing and I had selected seat No. 27, on the Republican side, now occupied by the gentleman from Minnesota, Mr. FLETCHER.

Being a new member from a new State, I really preferred the back seat which had fallen to Mr. DINGLEY's lot.

Next morning he accepted my offer to exchange seats.

No. 27 was the very seat which he had occupied for many years in preceding Congresses.

This little incident, so insignificant in itself, is now cherished as one of the happiest episodes of my Congressional life. It gave me the acquaintance and good will and in time the friendship of one of the noblest, truest, and purest minds and characters that American statesmanship has ever developed. He was always so helpful, so kind, and so thoughtful of us new members. Our admiration for and appreciation of him grew with the passing years. We of his own political household followed him unfalteringly, sometimes walking by faith more than by sight, through the years when our party here was in a hopeless minority. We rallied around him with confidence and courage when a turn in the wheel of political fortune made him the floor leader of a triumphant majority. In victory or in defeat he never failed us.

He knew well political history, the sources of revenue for the Federal Treasury, and the objects for which the public money could properly be expended. His accurate knowledge and comprehensive grasp of public affairs commanded our respect, and his integrity of character won our unbounded confidence.

Respect for his knowledge and confidence in his integrity gave to this man his commanding influence while living, and they will insure for him an earthly immortality in the Pantheon of his country's history.

The encouraging thought in connection with such a life is that the renown and success achieved by him were due to neither wealth nor hereditary rank, nor yet to any peculiar natural gift of oratorical or other intellectual endowment not vouchsafed to common mortals.

The homely virtues that made him respected and loved are the potential heritage of every American youth.

Knowledge is acquired and can be acquired by all who are willing to pay the price in patient, persevering, self-denying study. Integrity does not even have to be acquired. It is an original patrimony, possessed by all who do not intentionally or negligently throw it away.

It may be news to some, but it is a fact that the "Congressional Temperance Society" is the oldest temperance society in America. For sixty-five consecutive years it has held aloft the banners of temperance on the battlements of this Capitol. For the last half score of years or more Mr. DINGLEY has been our president. We shall sadly miss him at future meetings. But the cause must not suffer. Other hands must seize the colors he relinquished. "The workman may fall, but the work must go on."

Wherever assigned to duty he did his work well. Appropriations, commerce, and the national defense by land and sea each claimed his attention and responded to the touch of his guidance in a manner always calculated to enhance the happiness and prosperity of the people and the enduring glory of the Republic.

But his greatest achievement, for which his countrymen, and especially we of his own political party, will ever cherish his name and memory, was writing upon our statute book the revenue law of 1897, popularly, and very properly, known as the Dingley law.

All his associates on the committee labored faithfully and industriously on certain schedules; Mr. DINGLEY mastered every detail of every schedule.

When our work was concluded, he remarked one day that we had done three times as much hard work as any committee had ever done on any tariff bill before; and he knew, for he had served on the Ways and Means Committee during the revisions of 1890 and 1894.

Soon after completing these arduous tasks the Spanish war came on, necessitating the levy and collection of hundreds of millions of additional revenue. How wisely the crisis was met, both in strengthening the public credit and in levying the necessary additional taxes where they produced the least hardship, the present condition of our industries and finances amply attest.

The honor of these achievements are due, not exclusively, but largely, and I might say mainly, to Mr. DINGLEY.

Then, when summer vacation came and the rest of us scattered to the seaside, the mountains, and the prairies for rest and recreation, renewing our health and strength for the labors of another year, Mr. DINGLEY went to work harder than ever in the service of his country on the Canadian Joint High Commission.

The intellectual and spiritual man shone out brighter and stronger than ever, but the physical broke down. The pitcher was broken at the fountain.

As literally and as cheerfully as ever a soldier died in battle did this hard-working, model American statesman give up his life in the service of his country. Peace to his ashes. Blessed be his memory.

Mr. COUSINS. Mr. Speaker, when a good man dies his country feels the shock. When one who has been useful to his generation suddenly departs, mankind involuntarily say: "What shall we do now?" The Hon. NELSON DINGLEY was both good and useful in such wonderful degree that he was great. If all the people of America could know how true he was to duty, how diligent to every detail of their interests, how faithful to the country's

cause, how genuine in character, how gentle in his disposition, how solicitous for the public welfare this man at all times was, to-day would be universally observed throughout the land in paying tribute to his memory.

But he was not covetous of notoriety. His voice was not heard far, though the fruit of his intelligence and labor falls in rich abundance wherever industry prevails. He left the richest legacy of his ability and industry in the legislation of his country. Every citizen is his legatee. Men will enjoy the benefits of his toil and maybe never know his name nor comprehend his thought. The wheels were spinning and the axles whirling on the day of his demise. Labor has received increased rewards, and the faces of its children, once haggard with the marks of hunger, are gleaming now with joy—unconscious tributes to the wisdom and the usefulness of him whose loss our nation mourns.

To this faithful servant of our country, to this gentle, truthful comrade of every earnest Representative in the Congress of America, I pay the tribute of a constituency who appreciate essential worth and genuine manhood, who understand the value of good deeds, the vanity of praise, and something of the loss our country suffers in the death of one like him.

Mr. DOCKERY. Mr. Speaker, it is a melancholy duty, and yet a privilege not to be foregone, to speak a word touching the exemplary life of the friend and colleague who has so lately passed from us—of him whose amiable personal qualities, exalted attainments, and national distinction endeared him to us all in so great a degree.

What little I shall add to that which has already been so well said by others deals particularly with a phase of his career and character which came under my direct observation in my experience as a co-worker with him in the public service.

NELSON DINGLEY, Jr., entered Congress as the successor of Hon. William P. Frye, from the Second Maine District, two years before my entry here; but even those two short years had enabled him to take a prominent rank in the House. From that date until his untimely death a few weeks since, I witnessed with pleasure his rapid rise in the confidence of his party and the esteem of the House, and his continuous growth in great usefulness to the country.

He has gone from us so recently that it is hard to realize that his familiar presence is not among us still, and even harder yet to know that we shall never more see him in his customary seat in this Hall, or at his post on the floor, or in his wonted place at the committee table. It is painful to adjust ourselves to the stony reality of fact with respect to his departure—painful to think that he has gone irrecoverably on his long journey to

The undiscovered country, from whose bourne
No traveler returns.

Mr. Speaker, it is altogether idle to say merely that we miss him, that we shall always miss him, that the peculiar place he occupied in our regard and affections can never be filled by another just as he filled it. The bonds of tried friendship and the ties of warm comradeship can not be thus broken asunder in a moment without a cruel shock of surprise and grief. In the endurance of such a calamity the heart recovers but slowly, and time alone can heal the sundered ligaments and soothe the throbbing of the anguished nerves.

Yes, he has gone from us so recently that his personality is as fresh before our minds as though we had heard him bid us good morning but an hour ago. We can see before us his frail figure, clad in the scholar's black; his grave and sensitive countenance, touched with the "pale cast of thought;" his dark, eagle eye, beaming with intelligence and kindness; his black hair and beard, his nervous hands, his quick movements, his unassuming manner, his cheerful, reassuring presence.

We all know that his temperament and disposition were alikely lovable and rare. All his instincts were kindly and humane. He was utterly devoid of malice. His heart was warm and gentle as a woman's, and his conscience as delicate and keen. None of us, even in the acrimonies of debate and in the fiercest struggles in the legislative arena here, ever heard an unkind word fall from his lips. His temper was of the sweetest, inoffensive, beneficent. So far as my own knowledge and observation extend, all outward manifestations of anger, resentment, and irritation were unknown to him and to his conduct in life. He never considered or treated public questions from the personal side or from the private or individual standpoint. On the contrary, his treatment of such questions was invariably abstract and impersonal, whether they were distinctly political or public in a wider sense.

Governor Dingley had exact and accurate knowledge upon a greater variety and a wider range of subjects of public concern than perhaps any contemporary in public life. His invaluable store of knowledge was the harvest of long years spent in patient study and investigation after a manner exclusively his own. So far as his habits of work were concerned, the dominating and

distinctive characteristics were his extraordinary industry, his method, his system, his economy of time, and his utilization of opportunity. He was a tireless student, an indefatigable investigator, a close observer, a clear thinker—

Deep and slow, exhausting thought,
And hiving wisdom with each studious year.

Possessed of richest stores of information on almost all public questions, he never wasted them on unworthy objects or diverted them to idle uses, but employed them effectively and brilliantly when the suitable occasion presented. His memory was wonderful, and equally so was that complementary faculty, his power of analysis. He had the seeing eye and the trained hand; the sense to discern and grasp essential principles hidden in the mass of external wrappings. In addition he had a strong synthetic or constructive faculty, which he put to the noblest use. Indeed, his equipment for the public service, by reason of his thorough knowledge and practical experience of so many things, was such that he had few equals and no superiors in numerous lines of intricate legislative work. And he left the clear impress of his strong individuality upon much of the most important legislation enacted by Congress within the past fifteen years.

In a strictly political sense Governor Dingley was an intense and uncompromising partisan. But as a statesman, exercising his talents in a larger field, he was an ardent lover and a potent champion of good government for its own sake; and as such he was always ready on adequate occasions to subordinate partisan advantage to the public welfare.

Mr. Speaker, I had myself the best opportunities of knowing this and of becoming intimately familiar with his character and methods, through my close association with him on the Committee on Appropriations, and particularly through my still closer association with him on what is commonly known as the "Dockery Commission" to reconstruct the accounting system of the Government—when we labored together without interruption during a long interval, and always in the completest confidence and most perfect harmony.

The so-called Dockery Commission was organized by the act approved March 3, 1893, continuing for two years, and consisted, on the part of the House, of Governor DINGLEY, JAMES D. RICHARDSON, of Tennessee, and myself, as chairman, and on the part of the Senate of FRANCIS M. COCKRELL, of Missouri, SHELBY M. CULLOM, of Illinois, and JAMES K. JONES, of Arkansas, with Mr. James C. Courts and Mr. Thomas P. Cleaves, clerks respectively of the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations, serving as invaluable aids.

In pursuing its labors the Commission largely relied upon the sound judgment of Mr. DINGLEY. He united in a peculiar degree, legislative and executive capacity of the highest order. Night after night, for a period of two busy years, we met, either in the room of the House Committee on Appropriations or in some one of the rooms of the Treasury, working out, with scrupulous care, the details of the new accounting system, whose great object was to expedite the accounting methods of the Government, to secure economy, and yet to retain at the same time all necessary safeguards.

That exceedingly important work—for it must be so regarded, dealing as it does with the expenditure of more than \$500,000,000 annually—was antagonized at almost every step by those who were led to believe that the marvelous advance and progress of the century could find no exemplification in a governmental accounting system. It was also opposed by that other large class who feared displacement from public position by reason of improved and up-to-date business methods. Although confronted with this opposition, oftentimes from his own political friends, Governor Dingley never wavered. Indeed, the Commission was unanimous in all its findings—an agreement at the outset having been made that nothing should be reported to Congress unless it had the sanction and accorded with the united judgment of all the members of the commission. A great many reforms were accomplished during those two years.

The new accounting system, however, the most important fruit of the Commission's labors, went into effect October 1, 1894, and has had the indorsement of all the officials charged with its execution. The Commission, by a simplification of business methods and by dispensing with a cumbersome mass of "red tape," was enabled to effect a reduction of expenses for all time, amounting specifically to \$607,591 every year. Indirectly this saving exceeds \$800,000 each year. And it is a source of sincere gratification to me to be permitted to pay a deserved tribute to the memory of Governor Dingley for his hearty, unselfish, steadfast, and efficient cooperation in the accomplishment of this result.

Mr. Speaker, Governor DINGLEY was my personal friend. The friendship established now nearly sixteen years ago was strengthened with the passing years. Great changes in the membership of this House have occurred since I first made his acquaintance in December, 1883, at the opening of the Forty-eighth Congress. Of the Representatives of the House at that time, only seventeen

are now members of this body—Messrs. BINGHAM, ERMENTROUT, BRUMM, and HARMER, of Pennsylvania; Messrs. REED and BOUTELLE, of Maine; Messrs. CANNON and HITT, of Illinois; Messrs. PAYNE, RAY, and WADSWORTH, of New York; Messrs. HENDERSON and HEPBURN, of Iowa; Mr. BLAND and myself, of Missouri; Mr. STEELE, of Indiana, and Mr. LANHAM, of Texas.

All the others have gone—some into the busy activities of private life, but many, very many, have preceded DINGLEY to the Great Hereafter.

And now, Mr. Speaker, in concluding this tribute to the memory of my friend, Governor DINGLEY, I declare, in the language of sincere affection, that he was honest, capable, incorruptible, and faithful to every public duty.

Life! I know not what thou art,
But this I know, that thou and I must part;
And when or where or how we met,
I own to me's a secret yet.

Life! we've been long together,
Through pleasant and through cloudy weather.
'Tis hard to part when friends are dear,
Perhaps 'twill cost a sigh, a tear—
Then steal away—give little warning;
Choose thine own time: say not "Good night!"
But in some brighter clime bid me "Good morning!"

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, for nearly twelve years I was acquainted with Mr. DINGLEY as a member of this House: for nearly four years associated with him on the Committee on Ways and Means. During all that time it was my pleasure to live while in Washington at the same hotel where the distinguished leader resided. Thus I came to know him in a social and friendly way beyond what is the privilege and opportunity of Congressional association. Others may speak of his distinguished public service, his influence and direction in this House, his wise and able legislation, his eminent qualities as a statesman. We all recognize the worth and the distinction of his public career.

But I would be amiss to my own keen feeling of love and regard for the departed friend if I failed on this occasion to bring tribute to his memory because of the affectionate, kindly, helpful character of the man in all the associations and actions of his private life. Every day doing the work and carrying the burdens of public service, yet every day he was mindful of others and helpful and cheery for them. His public service was performed without parade or bluster. His friendship and his assistance to those with whom he daily met and lived was quietly and constantly given. His character and influence and encouragement all flowed out as wellsprings of vigor and stimulation into the lives and into the hopes of those who knew him and among whom he lived.

Mr. EVANS. I yield to others the pleasure of speaking of Mr. DINGLEY in more elaborate terms, and shall limit myself to a few brief remarks about him as I saw him during the four years of my active participation with him in the labors of this body and of one of its important committees.

In giving my estimate of him as a man and as a public servant I shall indulge in no mere extravagant laudation, but shall endeavor to rate him at his real worth to the country.

I knew Mr. DINGLEY for something over fifteen years, though not at all intimately until I came to the House and began my service as a member of the great committee of which he for four years was the eminent and efficient chairman. From the beginning of his chairmanship in the Fifty-fourth Congress great and important duties developed upon him, and before the expiration of that Congress, inasmuch as all the Republican members of that committee had also been elected members of the Fifty-fifth Congress, and as the Presidency had also fallen to that party, the work of preparing a tariff bill to supersede the act of 1894, known as the Wilson bill, was actively begun by those members under Mr. DINGLEY's guidance and leadership.

It was a long, a tedious, and a most exacting labor, extending over several months, but by the 15th day of March, 1897, when the Fifty-fifth Congress convened in extraordinary session, the draft of the new tariff bill, which was to take his honored name, was ready to be submitted to the new House. How skillfully he guided it through all its subsequent parliamentary stages is known to all.

It was for labors like these that Mr. DINGLEY's equipment was superb. In all the fiscal concerns of the Government he was remarkably expert and preeminently useful. These great matters of the first practical importance to the country claimed and always received his most faithful and intelligent attention. Indeed, it is much to be doubted whether within the present century any statesman has appeared more thoroughly equipped for the work involved in such legislation. His knowledge of all fiscal affairs and of all that pertained to them—statute law, practice, rules, and regulations—was astonishingly thorough and accurate.

While his powers as a mere orator were not conspicuous (measuring oratory by ordinary standards), no one commanded more

attention when speaking to the House, and this was because what he said was sure to be most thoughtful, accurate, and wise.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, I have sometimes thought that if of any man of our day it could be truly said that he had been worth his weight in gold to his country that man was NELSON DINGLEY. The value of his services, not merely in saving money to the Treasury, but in devising ways and means of getting it there without oppressing the people, was incalculable. In the list of great men who have been chairman of Ways and Means and leaders of the House he takes a high and most honored position.

He was a man not only of remarkable assiduity in the discharge of any duty, but of equally remarkable good judgment. His convictions of public duty were profound, his devotion to the public service most sincere and conscientious, and no man in the country more sedulously strove for the public welfare.

In fact, to labor for his country was his meat and drink, and his life was probably as certainly sacrificed to this as if he had died on the field of battle.

As a parliamentary leader Mr. DINGLEY had great skill and judgment, and his influence over the House was supreme. It was the leadership, too, of kindness and confidence, and not of harshness or truculency.

His private life and virtues were known to all men. No breath of scandal ever touched him.

Mr. Speaker, a truly great man has been taken from Congress and the country. The country suffers, his friends and surviving relatives deeply grieve, this body will long miss him and lament the absence of his wise counsel, but "through the gloomy portals of death" Mr. DINGLEY himself "has entered the radiant temple of enduring fame."

Mr. LINNEY. Mr. Speaker, all men would do well to talk and think much of death if they could thereby "tear one terror from the grave." The dread of death has reached and abides with all men; the thought has found its way into the elementary law books that men die intestate because they imagine that the making of a will brings them nearer the tomb. Indeed, any human condition is "a paradise to what we think of death."

On the 28th of February, 1843, the President of the United States and his Cabinet and many members of both Houses of Congress went aboard the steamer man-of-war *Princeton* to watch the workings of her two great guns, which threw balls to the weight of 225 pounds. One of her great guns exploded. The Secretary of the Navy, Secretary of State, and many other prominent men in the public service were killed. The gloom and sorrow of that day of death of the great forced reflections on the public mind of the instability and shadowy fleetingness of the pursuits and contests of life. Many who had fallen from the shock and were unconscious upon reviving testified that they had gone through the experience of a sudden death as if from lightning, which extinguishes knowledge and sensation.

Such an one knows what it is to die without feeling it, and such a death is nothing to him that revives. It is taught in the friar books that if any part of the human body is pressed or tortured we can then best imagine what the pains of death are when the whole body is corrupted and dissolved. Yet death passed, in the case of the explosion in the *Princeton* and blowing up of the *Maine*, with less pain than the torture of the finger's end. It may also be that the most vital parts are not the quickest of sense. Men too often forget in contemplating the dread monster that God has armed all his servants with forces that disarm death and extract the dreaded sting.

Stoic philosophy has lifted the black veil from death's abiding place and given to the weakest passions of the mind the power to mate and master the fear of death. Therefore, death is no such terrible enemy when a man has so many attendants about him that can win the combat over him. Revenge triumphs over death; love slights it; grief fleeth to it; and Seneca adds that "a man would die though he were neither valiant nor miserable, only upon weariness to do the same things so oft and over and over." I ask, in the light of the character and services to the Republic and humanity of our great leader here, NELSON DINGLEY, who can say that a mind fixed and bent upon the loftiest conceptions of man's duty in high places occupied by him is not in a large measure freed from the dolors of death? We all know that he that dieth in earnest pursuit is like one wounded in hot blood—he is unconscious of the hurt.

Yes, it is a blessed prerogative the Creator has given man that in the path of righteousness and lofty aims there are attendants he can summon on the last battlefield of life to mate and match death. Death hath also this glorious attendant—it openeth good fame and extinguishes envy. But as an excellent musician can not utter himself upon a defective instrument, so death in its second kind office can not open good fame nor extinguish criticism in a man without the traits of nobility of character. Evil fame deserved is blacker than death, and death can not reduce a mountain of human folly. Indeed, there is a lingering, living death,

more to be dreaded than the dissolution of the body. Who can imagine a greater calamity, a greater pain than that which overtakes a man who, though living, doth follow at the funeral of his own reputation?

'Twere long to tell and sad to trace
Each step from splendor to disgrace.

Such a life, if not a living death, is like "the young Venetian's scorpion girt with fire"—

As do the dark in soul expire,
Living like scorpion girt by fire,
So writhes the mind remorse bath riven,
Unfit for earth, undoomed for heaven.

No, 'tis not the length of days, but the goodness of them that makes a great life, that can destroy the sting of death. NELSON DINGLEY came fully up to the highest standard of a Christian philosopher's ideal of a great life. The last years of that life on the earth were his greatest.

In no sense did he follow at the funeral of his own reputation. He constantly advanced up the ladder of human excellence and usefulness to the end. I saw much of his intellectual power displayed in the Fifty-fourth and Fifty-fifth Congresses. To clip from the *Journal* and the *CONGRESSIONAL RECORD* the doings of the gentleman from Maine, Mr. DINGLEY, would mar the strength and beauty of these two sessions much more than to eliminate the work of any of his associates. The distinguished gentleman from Maine, the present Speaker of the House, once remarked to a member who inquired of him how the members from that State retained their places so long, "This, sir, is easy of solution; we increase our majority at every election."

Mr. DINGLEY deserved such continued increase of majorities at the polls because by his industry he daily increased his stock of information and enlarged his capacity for usefulness. It is indeed a high mark of merit to be named chairman of the Committee of Means and Ways of the House of Representatives of the United States. The work of the committee is perhaps greater now than at any prior period. It will possibly go into history that he was the greatest chairman this greatest committee ever had up to the day of his death. As a party leader Mr. DINGLEY possessed every quality of heart and head necessary for that delicate task. Superb reasoning powers, knowledge, and judgment were the lordly qualities that made him great. He was not an attractive speaker so far as the possession of mere oratorical gifts was concerned.

Despite certain infirmities of voice and want of a commanding presence that many of the great American orators possess, whenever he spoke he commanded to a remarkable degree the attention of this large body. In fact, no member ever gave attention to him on the most abstruse questions that have arisen here without being benefited. This vast fund of information which his indomitable energy and will placed at his command enabled him to obtain the ear of most members even in the most excited debates. His influence on the side of the House of which he was the acknowledged leader contributed much to good order. Large legislative bodies can only be kept in order by the staid judgment and steady purpose of one thoroughly equipped in parliamentary law as its presiding officer. And this would fail in a House composed of strong political organizations without a prudent, skillful leadership of each organization as an auxiliary to the presiding officer. The excitement founded in political struggles for supremacy can not always be kept without these wars. Here intemperate expressions in the heat of debate often stir both sides of the House to the point of frenzy quite as much as the debates at the hustings.

The angels were all singing out of tune
And hoarse with having little else to do,
Excepting to wind up the sun and moon
And crush a runaway young star or two.

Congressmen are not freer from excitement and tumult than Byron's "angels." The calm, philosophical temperament of NELSON DINGLEY in directing debate has often been of great value. Under his influence "tumult dwindled into calm." NELSON DINGLEY was a very great man. Often the allurements of exalted station and intellectual superiority displayed in purely mental contest, and other honors to which great minds aspire, root out of a man's life any recognition of Christianity. DINGLEY was great in the fiercest conflicts in this Chamber, but greater in his loyalty to the demands of morality and Christianity. That man is indeed an ideal statesman and Christian who stands the central figure in both politics and Christianity at the same time.

The armor which his great pure life had thrown around him possessed no weak spot that invited the shafts of malignancy. Since I have occupied a seat here I have attended two conventions, one in the interest of temperance, the other of the Sabbath. At each there were learned and pious bishops and many clergymen of exalted piety and learning. NELSON DINGLEY stood among them as he did among his fellows in this Chamber. The greatness of his public life as a patriot was more than equalled by his exalted purity of character and loyalty to truth as a Christian. It can not be

that this is the end of this great life; the spirit that tenanted the form of NELSON DINGLEY must live forever.

An ancient legend fitly presents the end of his life: The India fig tree, having grown to the period of fruitage, is said to let its branches fall down to the earth, whereof she conceived again and they became the root of their own stock. So man, having derived his being from the earth, first lives the life of this tree, drawing his nourishment as a plant, until, made ripe for death, he tends downward and is soon again in his mother earth, but receives quickening for the eternal life.

But here 'tis done—all words are idle;
Words from me are vainer still;
But the thoughts we can not bridle
Force their way—without the will.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, we honor and mourn a bright and noble character, one that all of us knew, for its burning light so shone before men that they might see his good works.

He was every inch a man in force of character and strength, activity, acumen, and accuracy of mind, yet kind, sympathetic, and tactful as a woman; the best conditioned and unwearied spirit in doing courtesies, unflinching in his firmness and energy, with the fervor and hope that know no obstacles; possessing blended dignity and simplicity, force and gentleness, fire and judgment; full of the most varied knowledge, but never proud or intolerant of the ignorance of others; always a follower of conscience, and never yielding to prejudice; eager and yet controlled; restlessly active, but always patient; devoted to the great principles of the party that he loved and led, but never partisan; adroit as a politician and parliamentary leader, but always frank and absolutely true.

Thus he commanded the unfaltering allegiance of his party and the love and trust of every member of whatever shade of opinion, each of whom feels in the death of NELSON DINGLEY that he himself has lost a personal friend and that a pillar of the Commonwealth has fallen.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, my acquaintance with the Hon. NELSON DINGLEY began in the fall of 1865, at his home in Lewiston, while I was a student at the academy in Auburn. He was then 33 years of age, strong, vigorous, cautious in business, but a spirited journalist and an enterprising publisher, intent on building up a newspaper that should meet the needs of the whole State and place before its readers editorial views pitched on the highest plane of right thinking.

Already a prominent figure in his city, in his church, and in his State, he was gradually extending his influence throughout the adjoining Commonwealths, standing out conspicuously as a type of that Pilgrim character whose influence had given New England its commanding position and whose principles had been extended across a continent.

In all respects his life conformed to the high ideals which he had early accepted for his personal guidance. He attended with conspicuous regularity the services of the church, took an active and most interested part in home and foreign missions, and performed with scrupulous care all the labor which such devotion to the cause of religion placed upon him, yet without narrowness or bigotry, and untouched with the slightest taint of cant or pharisaism. He was likewise deeply interested in charitable and reform movements, his voice and his pen being at the ready command of whatever promised good, and was in accord with the best judgment of the best men.

At this period, too, he was about entering for the fourth time the lower house of the State legislature, of which he had already been twice speaker, a position that gave him rare opportunity to reveal a character for integrity and fairness and a judgment as excellent as it was substantial. He was much interested in politics, and undoubtedly most ambitious for its honors and its opportunities. Probably no man in Maine watched or studied with keener interest the great problems of national finance and reconstruction. The editorial pages of the Lewiston Journal evidenced the serious attention its young editor and proprietor was giving to these important questions, showing that even then, although sixteen years must elapse before he was to enter this House, a foundation was being laid for great usefulness whenever he might be called to this broader and more inviting field.

But, Mr. Speaker, his ambition, however well defined and persistent, never influenced or swerved him an iota from the principles governing his daily life. He was then, as ever after, absolutely temperate in his habits, yet so modest in the application of principle to conduct that he gave no offense to those who desired for themselves larger personal liberty in a Commonwealth that had set its seal of disapproval upon the customs and habits which had formerly, though comparatively to a limited extent, obtained in the Pine Tree State.

It was at this time, too, well understood that his business and

political methods squared with his well-known character for right living. The Golden Rule governed his conduct on Monday as well as on Sunday, no business project, although illuminated by the glitter of much gold, no political scheme, however promising to present or future preferment, being allowed to divorce him from this principle. And the people sincerely loved and respected him for it.

Mr. Speaker, it may be safely asserted that no man at the age of 33, living at any time in any State, ever held a firmer place in the hearts and the confidence of the whole people of a Commonwealth than did Mr. DINGLEY in 1865 in the State of Maine. This is the more remarkable, perhaps, when coupled with the fact that he had been out of college but ten years.

Probably with equal confidence can it be asserted that such regard was based almost wholly upon his well-known character. His ability was fully recognized, and the painstaking thoroughness for which he has been conspicuous in this House had manifested itself while yet he was in college. A careful speaker and profound thinker, he shared the honors of debate with the ablest and oldest men in church council and legislative hall, while as a journalist he was easily classed with the editor and brilliant Congressman whose home was then in Augusta.

But the conspicuous regard shown Mr. DINGLEY and the people's willingness to trust and honor him, to accept his judgment, and to rely upon his leadership was due largely to the fact that he was then, as ever after, an ideal man in all that goes to make up sterling character. With him character was born, not made, and right action seemed as natural and as unconsciously taken as a breath of mountain air. Doubtless he had his temptations, but the world was not permitted to see so much as the footmarks of the struggle.

Yet he was in no sense austere or narrow or severe. He had no criticism for neighbors. If his life differed from theirs, he seemed unconscious of it. Affable, kind, remarkably sympathetic and gentle, he mingled freely with men of all sorts and conditions, without mannerism or affectation—a plain citizen whose life had been seamed with toil and sweat, who had known obscurity and battled with adversity, who claimed no superiority and sought nothing that was not readily accorded him.

Although one of the busiest men in Lewiston, he easily found time to listen to the wants of young men, students who flocked to the academy in Auburn and to the college in his own city, taking ample time, before giving advice, thoroughly to understand their situation, their needs, their aims, and their possibilities. At such times the one sentence that he oftenest repeated, drawn doubtless from his own experience, was the necessity for hard, conscientious, persistent work, without discouragement or change of purpose, along lines that offered the most attraction.

To a student of 19 Mr. DINGLEY seemed not 33 but 60 years old, so varied and important was his work, so high his standing, so interested in all movements touching life, so rich in experience, so devoted in his attentions, so wide in his acquaintance. He was already a trusted adviser in the municipal affairs of his city, a favorite of the president and trustees of the college that graduated him, an important factor in the councils of the Congregational Church, and the welcomed guest of every town and city in his State.

Mr. Speaker, it can create no surprise that such a man at 33 should be at 66 the respected, the forceful, and the patriotic leader of this House, recognized not only in Maine and New England but throughout the whole country as an able, conscientious, and conservative statesman. He was not a mosaic. He grew as the tree grows, round and full, on lines of its creation, so that the end was known from the beginning.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I bring my tribute to the memory of a great man, who, during my brief service here, was always kind, helpful, and accessible to me.

NELSON DINGLEY, of Lewiston, Me., and the United States of North America, died at Washington, D. C., Friday, January 13, 1899.

His life had been one of continuous, laborious progress, and he died at the period of his greatest usefulness.

He was a New Englander by origin, nature, and nurture.

Mr. DINGLEY's life results are an illustration of the saying that "The gods sell everything to labor."

His genius was the genius of hard work.

In his boyhood his father kept a country store at which everything except liquor was sold.

His parents were opposed to every form of strong drink, and their convictions in this behalf became their son's convictions, so that his life from beginning to end was a temperate life.

He was not only temperate as to appetite, but temperate in speech.

He could be indignant, but could rule both pen and tongue.

In the office of the Lewiston Journal, with which he first became identified editorially in November, 1854, it is remembered of

him that when any writer upon that paper was inclined to strike back because of some personal attack he would say: "Young man, write out what you have to say as hotly as you please, and then notice that such stuff is excellent to kindle the fire."

He purchased a half interest in the Lewiston Journal in 1858, and since that time, it is said, that though absent from his editorial desk, first in the legislature of Maine, second as governor of Maine, third in Congress, a week has seldom passed when the Journal has failed to receive from him contributions or advice.

He was encyclopedic and minute in his knowledge of our history. He could carry the reports of our governmental departments in his memory, and when called upon to write or speak upon some event which had suddenly projected itself for immediate and accurate consideration, without time for consultation of authorities, he was equal to the emergency.

This training, this constant studiousness, fitted and ordained him for the work he performed in his public career as governor and legislator.

He was admitted to the bar in 1856, but left the profession of law to enter upon newspaper work.

He was six times member of the Maine legislature, beginning in 1861.

In his second term he became speaker.

He held the office of speaker twice and declined it once.

He was twice elected governor of Maine and declined a third nomination.

Mr. DINGLEY first came to Congress in 1881 to fill the vacancy caused by the resignation of WILLIAM P. FRYE, and since that time he has steadily represented the Second district of Maine in this body.

Declining the position of Secretary of the Treasury under this Administration, his services as chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means are a conspicuous part of our current national history, and—

If what we call
The spirit flash not all at once from out
This shadow into substance, then perhaps
The mellowed murmur of the people's praise—

may yet ascend to him.

Mr. DINGLEY was not an orator, but he was a great debater.

He had been a debater from his boyhood up; first in the old-fashioned lyceum in his native town; next in his father's country store, where local statesmen congregated to discuss all sorts of affairs, local and national; and then in the State and national legislatures.

He had not the form or voice for oratory, but he had tremendous perseverance, inexhaustible energy, and an endless store of facts made available by a splendid memory.

His physical strength seemed frail. His voice was not far-reaching in speech, but what he said traveled far beyond more robust utterances, because of the inherent power of what he said.

It would be difficult to name any important legislation in Congress in the last fifteen years with which he has not been identified.

His long service, in cooperation with the long service of other Maine Representatives, has made the comparatively small State of Maine a power in the national councils.

In school, college, and public service he pursued the same painstaking, steady, studious, and laborious course.

As a boy, it is said, he preferred one of Webster's speeches to any novel, and mastered Whately before he was 20.

He was a religious, temperate, methodical man all his life; but his whole studious temperament was illuminated and softened by warmth of love for his family and friendly regard for his neighbors and associates.

He kept a diary in which it is said he made daily entries "from the age of 10 years to the date of his last sickness."

And no man who knew NELSON DINGLEY could fail to know that his daily entries in this book of life were all honorable and without dishonorable mental reservation.

He lived up to his designation of Honorable.

As he acted out and wrote out the story of his life day by day, he made for himself "more stately mansions" in thought and statesmanship.

He was not a creature of opportunity—he moved forward steadily and laboriously, performing the task at hand, which when finished had merged his energies into another greater task.

Life, with him, was a perpetual, studious evolution.

When opportunity knocked at the door of NELSON DINGLEY, it found him already bending over his task, not startled by the revelation of new avenues upward, but ready to move on, simply, unostentatiously, and inevitably.

Out of the mist and murk and dreariness of January weather he has gone where—

Beyond the path of the outmost sun, through utter darkness hurled
Further than ever comet flared or vagrant star-dust swirled,
Sit such as fought and sailed and ruled and loved and made our world.

Mr. LACEY. Mr. Speaker, after the elaborate reviews of the public life and services of Governor DINGLEY to which we have listened I desire only to add a few words of tribute to the fame of a man for whom I not only had a high respect, but also a warm personal affection.

One of my earliest Congressional acquaintances when I first came to this House ten years ago was NELSON DINGLEY. His death was a personal bereavement to all who knew him well.

Ready at all times to give the benefit of his advice and counsel, he was always the friend of the new member, and I esteem myself fortunate to have acquired his personal friendship at the beginning of my Congressional life.

Where any public man makes his mark he gives evidence of his previous preparation for his public career. In the hurry of official duties at every step he will show his previous preparation or its lack.

Governor DINGLEY's thoroughness was his great characteristic. He was not a meteor, but shone with the steady persistence of a fixed star.

He was always listened to by his colleagues because he only spoke when he had something to say. He showed the depth of his capacity by his continuous power of mental endurance. In private life the most lovable of men; in his public relations he was respected by all. He never yielded to the temptation to say unkind things in debate. His statements on all questions were accepted without question by his political opponents as well as by his friends. His deductions or conclusions might be controverted, but his statements of fact were never colored nor distorted.

The purest treasure mortal times afford
Is spotless reputation.

It has been noted by all old members that when Governor Sayers, of Texas, made any statement from the Democratic side of the House it was accepted without question by his political adversaries across the aisle. Governor DINGLEY's word from the Republican side passed among the Democrats with the same unquestioned verity. Two men could not be more unlike, and yet both were held in the same esteem by the opposing sides of the Chamber.

The political views of these men might be antagonized, but never was any fact misstated or its effect shaded or discolored for the purposes of debate by either. Such men do honor to political life and only lead us to regret that it is so difficult to fill their places. Maine and Texas honor themselves and the whole Union by choosing such men to represent them.

As one of Mr. DINGLEY's political associates and a firm believer in his doctrine, it was with pleasure that I heard of his selection as chairman of the Ways and Means Committee and that his name would be linked with the new legislation which I believed would result in good to our country. I hope and trust that the Dingley law will do all that its supporters have predicted, and that the name of our deceased friend may be indissolubly linked with an era of national prosperity unequalled by any in our previous history.

Even those of his colleagues who hold entirely different views from those on which Governor DINGLEY's industrial legislative work must rest will join in saying that if any such legislation can prove to be a success they would rejoice to have it known as the work of the statesman whose life and death we commemorate to-day.

This is neither the time nor the place to discuss the respective merits of the principles that Governor DINGLEY espoused.

But the friends and the enemies of his policy alike unite in saying that there has been no abler exponent of the doctrines of his cause in the history of the Republic than the principal framer of the Dingley tariff law.

In every political campaign since I have been in Congress I have circulated his speeches among the people of the district which I represent. I selected his presentation of his party principles because of their clearness, perspicacity, and eminent fairness. His plain, clear, vigorous English was understood by all, and the man who read one of those speeches, though firmly opposed to the views expressed, could not fail to admire the speaker, and to at least respect the cause that was susceptible of such generous and fair presentation.

Mr. DINGLEY wisely, I think, put aside the proffered portfolio of the Treasury to become the author of the most important legislation that Congress can be called upon to frame.

In this hour the man himself shines out from among the architecture of his life's work, and we delight to think of him as the good citizen, the faithful husband, and kind father.

Was his death timely?

He fell in the full vigor of his mental strength, loved and honored by all that knew him.

No slow decay of powers made his body a mere prison house for the soul, but when his fatal sickness came it found him full of life and eagerly at work.

His tireless mind was always busy.

Measured by what he did, his life was long indeed, for he left his impress on his country's history. His name is no longer on the roll call. He no longer leads his party; but he has left an influence upon his country's history that will endure.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. Mr. Speaker, this day has been set apart for loving tributes of friends and associates upon the life, character, and distinguished services of our great leader, NELSON DINGLEY.

Others have told you of his home life and the sweetness and all-pervading influence of his lofty character; of his early public work, and of his entire mastery of the great problems of state so vexatious to many and yet so yielding and pliable under the influence of his master mind; some have spoken of his methods of thought and his deep devotion to any duty falling to his lot.

I can not hope by any words of mine to add to this sublime summary of his life work, in which all agree with singular and spontaneous accord; but, Mr. Speaker, as a young member of this body, I desire to pay my weak tribute to this masterful mind, this storehouse of knowledge, this fountain of information, to which we have so freely gone for wisdom, instruction, and refreshment. Gentle, loving, kind, and indulgent, not a young man in this House that has not drank from his fountain of wisdom and been refreshed and instructed thereby.

In this busy forum, in which he has borne such a distinguished part, amid the distractions and perplexities of his official life, I can not now recall a single hasty dismissal, so common to busy men; but with patience, toleration, and kindness, sublime in its simplicity, he gave willing ear to our ungenerous claims upon him, until, borne down by responsibilities which no one could help him bear, his strength gave way, his lamp of life flickered and went out, casting a gloom over the official life of this nation.

In his death the young men of this House have lost a safe and willing counselor, the country a tried and true public servant, and the party with which he was identified a most sagacious, honorable, and worthy leader. In his devotion to the public service he has left us a priceless legacy, a blameless life. His memory will make this Hall fragrant for all time, and the sweetness of his character and relation to his fellow-members will prove a perpetual benediction to us all.

There are waves far out in the ocean
That never will break on the beach,
And hearts filled full of emotion
That find no expression in speech.

Mr. CLARKE of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, nothing that may be said or done here to-day can either add to or detract from the eminent abilities, the devotion to duty, or the nobility of character of the distinguished dead whose memory we all fondly cherish and whose loss we so deeply deplore. The name and fame of NELSON DINGLEY have already been made—honorably made, made by himself—and they are imperishably enshrined in the hearts of an appreciative people. We who have been his associates and friends in this Chamber may only to-day bear witness to those verities which have already been recognized by his countrymen, and thus once again pay our tribute of affection and esteem to the nation's honored dead.

It has been truly said respecting men that "some are born great, some achieve greatness, and some have greatness thrust upon them." What shall we say respecting our departed friend? What would he say if he were here to-day in his accustomed place? Manifestly there would be but one reply: "Whatever distinction or greatness that may have come to me have been acquired by a lifetime of constant, patient, persevering toil." This also, I submit, must be our conclusion. We had watched him rise in times when greatness was not won by chance, and in a manner that reflected the highest credit upon his name and memory. And now that he has been taken from our midst, his sturdy manhood, his splendid abilities, his generous heart, each and all impress us with the magnitude of our loss.

Mr. Speaker, some men attempt to rise in this world by pulling other people down. This can not truthfully be said, it never will be said, of our departed friend, for no man ever rightfully sought him who was not the recipient of his generous, helping hand. Every step in his pathway, from obscurity to greatness, was honorably, manfully won; and when at last, here amid the scenes of his greatest achievements, he laid aside his burden of responsibilities and cares, there was not a single envious or unfriendly eye cast upon it.

Mr. Speaker, it is not my province to pronounce a eulogy upon the life and character of our departed leader. That office were better bestowed upon those who have known him longer and better than I.

But I can not forget, sir, that his voice was one of the first that came to me as a new member of this House. His words were dignified, fearless, and true. They made an impression upon my mind that I shall not soon forget. And now that his lips are

silent and cold, I shall cherish his precept and example as a precious benediction and friend.

It was my sad duty, as one of the funeral committee representing this House, to accompany the remains of Governor DINGLEY to his home in the State of Maine, to the city he loved so well, to his neighbors and friends who had so signally honored him and who loved him so well.

No bray of trumpets, no glittering pageantry, witnessed the approach of the funeral train; but our precious dust was committed to tender hands and to loving hearts in a manner that was in keeping with his modest, unostentatious life.

We buried him amidst the scenes of his childhood days—days that in some respects are the happiest and dearest to us all. Not in the din of the loom and the spindle, for on that sad day the wheels of industry had ceased to revolve, the noise of business was hushed, the voice of partisanship was dumb; but we buried him in the silence of a sorrowful, stricken city, and under countless wreaths of flowers that were as pure, as sweet, and as beautiful as was his life.

Mr. FARIS. Mr. Speaker, as a Representative from Indiana, a State contributing her share of eminent men in the sweep of our national growth, I esteem it a distinctive honor to speak a sincere word of eulogy upon the life and public services of this great son of Maine. In so doing, it is proper to say that the death of no other public man except Oliver P. Morton, upon whom my youthful mind had looked as the colossal figure of my native State, has seemed so nearly a personal affliction as did the going forth of Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Speaker, trained from earliest childhood in sentiments of respect for my seniors in age, I am of those who entertain almost a reverence for a great and good man who is full of honors in a life devoted to sacrifice and service.

We can not cherish too sacredly or boast too highly a just pride in our worthy public men. A great ship propelled with its utmost capability, a limited express in its reckless whirl, cause us to start with wonder and admiration.

But see a man in action! Quickened with his conscious power, clear and regal in his equipment of knowledge, courageous in meeting his duty and faithful in its performance—this challenges and inspires praise, this suggests the force applied to evolve and develop the ship and the train—this is the demonstration of mind superior to matter. To those familiar with the long public service of Governor DINGLEY must be left the pleasing task of analyzing his great character. I can but briefly touch upon the impressions received and the estimate formed of our distinguished friend from my entry to this body in the Fifty-fourth Congress. Being small of stature and disposed to retiring manner, there was little in the outward man to betoken his greatness.

The quickness of his movements must have been noted, his indefatigable industry understood, his honest and earnest face studied, and his versatile knowledge attested by his words of wisdom in both private and public utterance to appreciate fully the real measure of the man.

With all his absorbing versatility in public affairs, he will be remembered as the leader easiest of approach. Unlike many men eminent in position, he showed an interest in the newcomer to this great body. To those of us honored with seats near him, his cordial and cheery "Good morning! How are you?" will abide in memory as a testimonial to his kind-heartedness.

Mr. Speaker, the career of NELSON DINGLEY is a most conspicuous instance of the result of a patient and painstaking industry. Born of indigent parents, his course was destined to be run and fashioned by his own effort. His mother had been a school-teacher and blessed him with encouragement to study. This early direction to the young mind, which nature had formed in a serious mold, developed the impetus, the application, and investigation which characterized him in every undertaking. He taught school to assist himself to a college education. His life began as it ended, in contact with arduous service. The last day he sat in this House, that on which we adjourned for the holiday recess, I said to him, "Governor, are you going home to enjoy the holidays?" "No," he answered, "my time has lately been so taken up with attendance in the House and with the labors of the Joint High Commission that some of my work has gotten behind and I shall stay in Washington during the recess and bring it up."

Little did we think as these words were uttered that within one short week he would be in the toils of the fatal pneumonia. It was work, work to the last with him. Thus is his an illustrious example to our youth of the excellence of great labor. Whether as editor and proprietor of the Lewiston Journal, which he owned from 1856 to his death, as member of the legislature, as governor of his native State, or as Representative in Congress, where he served above seventeen years, his paramount purpose seems to have been that his work should be performed with fidelity, thoroughness, and effect.

No man living had the grasp on the details of our revenue operations or kept more closely in touch with them than he. Since the

enactment of the great tariff law that bears his name he followed its operations with the solicitude and pride with which a father observes the growth of his child. Men of all shades of politics agree that in his passing from us a calamity has fallen upon the country. This period needs the service of our wisest statesmanship, and he was preeminent in that class.

Those who knew him best will cherish his memory most. Patient and unassuming in his relations with men, yet able, forceful, and brave on occasion, he commanded the respect and confidence of all. He was devoted to his family as husband and father as he was to his country in service. He was pure and upright in speech and life, showing forth the qualities of gentleness and kindness to the weak and the poor, thus practicing the Christianity he professed. His mind was honest, his purpose lofty, his long service dedicated to the good of his State and country. It is not surprising, therefore, that as the honored leader of his party in the American House of Representatives NELSON DINGLEY attained such distinguished position that political relations were forgotten in the genuine sorrow felt by all his colleagues at his untimely death. It is difficult to realize that he has gone not to return. I hesitate to think of such a man as dead. I believe he is exalted to a better life, and I lay this simple tribute to his memory as I would drop an immortelle at his tomb, and thank God for his sojourn among us.

Mr. LEWIS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am at this moment designated as one to give his voice in this chorus of sacred amens. I am not filling the place of an eulogist. That office is permitted to those who know of the birth and the life, who speak of the character and the work of this dead statesman whose name and memory the House mourns as it honors. Unto me alone is offered a privilege which I accept with graciousness. I am one of the new members, the "one-term member," speaking. It is as one of the young men and for them that I bring forth this tribute.

It may be that those whose impulses overcome reflection shall charge my following expression as rash. It is that I do not concur in the sentiment that death is untimely. I hold that in the great temporal theater of events each scene is shifted by a guiding hand. Never a curtain falls save in response to the bell. To me the very fixedness of earth, the race of the planets, the burning glow of heat and the cold light of the stars yield obedience to the law of order and of time.

"If the stars have their time to shine
The flowers to wither in the cold wind's breath,"
For it there is a time—
As well as all of time for death.

I would not have it understood that I hold that death is merely timely in itself. Rather would I know, rather would I feel and have it expressed that unto those who die it is timely. There can be no act of Nature or of her children that is without a purpose. Death serves some men well, both in its occurrence and in the time of its choice. In the obedience to Death's demands the subject complies with the law, and thus obedience, though inevitable, has its reward. The reward is seldom visible to the eyes of those whose loss seems irreparable. It can not be appreciated by those whose grief forbids philosophy; but time, the test of events, speaks the consolation and proves the wisdom of the end as well as the blessing of the time.

Some men live so long and under conditions which forbid their due appreciation by their fellow-man. This works a deprivation to the children of their generation following. It denies them the sacred light of exalted reflection in which to walk and be known. The deeds of such great, covered by the increase of minor events and hidden by the multiplication of increasing detail, is as have been great lights submerged in fog and beacon gleams lost in mist. When a man has lived so long that in the slow but unerring and unabating graduation of life he reaches all the perfections which the world allows and closes the best act of existence with his exit from the theater, what more is to be desired? Who of us would not rather such to be our termination than to endure the recall or to be destined to play again amidst others who are the center of the admiring eye, the sole voice of fickle praise? This seems like the philosophy of Epictetus. I place it shortly in the language of the Greek:

Let me not live an ignoble life to die, to be forgot,
Thrust foully beneath the earth, like a worm to rot;
Rather let me in some glorious deed expire,
That distant ages may the deed admire.

Mr. DINGLEY closed the most important epoch of his life with his death. He concluded the most important event that could occur in his life and bowed himself out, as the player who speaks his best and then gives to his audience the adieu. Masters of finance, ministers of revenue, creators of the muniments of the nation's wealth have invariably been cursed by their immediate generation—seldom blessed. Mr. DINGLEY created and gave to his nation the expression of the system producing the finance into the body of his nation—the two arteries which in time of war have been told us are the life springs, "money and iron."

Nocker, in France, and Peel, in England, lived to see the fulfill-

ment of their theories. No other lives of modern day can we recall who were gladdened with the sight of the realization of their own system as devised by them for the salvation of their country in the hour of peril. Those who have been given the privilege to devise the method of a country's guidance while serving here have been few. The world's greatest ministers of finance have been those who are in cabinets, who were the administrative officers.

But when in the coming years youth shall turn the pages of history to mark who in our legislative halls that laid the foundations of revenue saw the realization of their effort and obtained from the public expression of his nation the approval of his method, the indorsement of his views, and the acceptance of his results, he shall be confronted with the two epochs, the late civil war among the States, and recall Morrill, of Vermont; and then the war between Spain and America, and recall the name of NELSON DINGLEY. "A great name, next to a great act, by nature herself cemented, and joined by time; orders the act itself to die, but by the melt of time, when can an act expire without oblivion, when its event is of the glory of war or death? It survives to eternity."

Mr. Speaker, it is known that in the political differences permitted under our form of government I entertained varying views to those expressed by the distinguished dead. Therefore it is not of his views nor of his work which I memorialize; it is of the man, his manner of kindness and gentleness, of indulgence to those who needed his friendship and were dependent upon his forbearance—the new member, the young man. When one enters this House, he finds an atmosphere filled with jealousies, envies, contentions, sometimes bitterness—all times opposition and suspicion. These are born from the mutual ambitions of men, spring from the individual aspirations of the race, are natural to the zealous impulses of the man himself.

This House is well illustrated by the story of the Egyptian vipers in the Alexandrian pitcher, each struggling to get its head above the other where the room will permit but one head at a time, yet in the blind and maddening squirm careless of the death sting inflicted upon the other in the conflict. In such scenes, where shall the new member who has not yet inherited opposition or party animosity—to what source shall he turn, if not to those who may lay aside their ambitions, pause from their aspirations, stand above self-adulation, and be beyond his self-admiration in order to serve and to accommodate—yea, to befriend—those who may need?

It was this spirit of the distinguished dead which attracted me. The humblest man in this House could not address an inquiry without receiving the courteous and dignified response. The most embarrassed member in the most confusing moment could hope for the suggestion of rescue and the kindly prompting of encouragement from Mr. DINGLEY. His years of service to country and to self taught him that those who sometimes bend rise higher than ever when recovered; that they who serve are served to the best.

So thoroughly was he without the jealousies which prevent recognition of merit in others; so devoid of envy which denies the admission of capacity in others; so broad and generous in his appreciation of his fellow-creatures, that to him genius in youth was a light which was beautiful, ability in age was a source of his constant respect, and wisdom from experience was his ever unfailing refuge. All of this was to him a part of the great endowment of his Master. For these to him, particularly in others, were a part of the world's property which he always admired, ever applauded, and constantly enjoyed.

Sir, seldom given to fulsome compliments or unnecessary adulation, he yet found it often agreeable to say to the humble member struggling for little place that his work was well done. This left many a young man touched with his considerate and measured praise feeling himself—

Laudari a viro laudatus.

To be thus praised by the praised did more than flatter self-esteem; it gave confidence to strength and purpose. It was never lost to him who gave, and yet it was twice blessed to him who gave and to him who received.

Mr. Speaker, it is of these qualities in which the figures of speech are neither necessary nor defensible, the expression of which the plainest of words convey the most. Of these I speak. I speak as one of the young members and of the young men who were the recipients of some of the generous kindness in his unselfish nature, which to-day any flattery would wound, not soothe, his "dull, cold ear." For this I am compensated.

Sir, in days to come, as the recurring sessions will bring men here, and as the closing day will take them from us, as the too oft mock and ceremonious form of eulogy will be presented in this House, still, sir, no man will have more said of him, however much, than that he was a just man.

Be this writ upon the tomb. To his virtues let no higher eulogy be sought. None higher could be written on earth, none better finds its way to heaven.

Through the aisles of earth, where the lamp of character ever swings its incense, perfuming the air, no odor so rare and sweet, no gleam so gentle and so pure, as that which shall be given generations to come by the lives of such as this glorious dead, who leaves its walks filled with the memory of justice and its course bright with the light of truth. Public virtue in public life, private character above reproach, the Christian man, who looked upon mankind as brother and turned ever to God as the giver of all, surely such is after all the noblest and best example from which youth may pattern and the highest which civilization and the world's immortality can contribute to man's existence.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. Speaker, the sense of bereavement by the death of Mr. DINGLEY is not confined to those who enjoyed an intimacy with him. It is not strange that an affliction which has no lesser limit than the boundaries of the country itself should in this body excite a deep feeling of grief among all its members. It is fitting, therefore, that a sentiment so universal should find corresponding expression.

Nowhere is there a more profound sense of loss in his death than in the State of Massachusetts. He was familiar with all her activities, understood her people, and sympathized with her aspirations as fully as if he had been born and had lived upon her soil. When I entered Congress Mr. DINGLEY was the unquestioned leader of his party upon the floor of the House. The slow, steady, and laborious steps by which he attained that position have been described by others. I did not witness them. I did not see him ascending the hill. I saw him only after he had reached the summit. Yet the manner in which he conducted himself there left no uncertainty concerning the methods by which he had reached that place.

Without the arts or graces of the orator, or that indescribable quality which invokes enthusiasm and commands personal loyalty, he wielded undisputed sway through the more solid qualifications of wide and accurate knowledge, of the power of clear statement and cogent logic, and of purity of motive and character. He was a bold man who, on either side of the Chamber, dared to contest Mr. DINGLEY's position upon any public question not involving differences of party politics. He was a foolhardy Republican who ventured to dispute his leadership on questions of party policy.

Early in his life he measured with accurate foresight the possibilities of his career, and with prophetic vision foretold to himself the things which the future had in store for him. His life presents one of the few instances in our history of men who, having deliberately prepared themselves for the problems of practical statesmanship, have found the opportunity of dealing with them upon a magnificent scale; who, having accumulated an abundant store of knowledge, have been given a chance to use it all in the service of the people. He pursued the study of the law and obtained admission to the bar with no thought of practicing the profession, but with the purpose of thus best disciplining his mind and preparing himself for the activities of the life which he so clearly foresaw. The training of his profession of journalism he constantly utilized as a preparation for the public life which he entered early and followed till the end.

The sense of personal grief which oppresses us all, great as it is, is overshadowed by the conviction that his untimely death was a public calamity the extent of which can not be measured now by words, but will be felt with increasing force for many years to come. As the new problems, born of our changed conditions, come, one by one, to face us, who is there who does not miss the kindly counsel, the sagacious speech, the wise and conservative leadership of NELSON DINGLEY? For what he has done his place in our history is secure. But the need of the present and the future for him, and the void which his death has caused, can be understood alone by those who have served with him in the councils of the nation and whose undying respect and affection he had won.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I can claim no very intimate individual relationship with the lamented deceased or any knowledge of his private life except as I gathered the same from proximate circumstances surrounding his sphere of public duty. I have frequently walked with him from the House to his hotel, and learned something, in a small way it is true, of his general customs of life. I also went with his associates to assist in paying the last tribute of respect to his mortal remains at his home at Lewiston, and saw something of the adoration with which his neighbors cherished him as a citizen, neighbor, and statesman.

From the different standpoints from which I have viewed him I would say the distinguished deceased was what the world would call a phlegmatic temperament—that is, he regarded life as a chain of serious connecting links, which demanded his incessant and sincere attention.

He lived after a fixed régime. He did not poison his blood or brain with intoxicants or narcotics, avoided the gluttony of club life and the blasts of inclement weather and the coarser dissipations common to the contemporaries of his generation, and yet I

am inclined to the belief that he became a martyr to his official duties, that through constant and unyielding application of his mental powers to his official duties his nervous system was seized with a blight that invited the fatal disease that caused his untimely death, an overlooked but fatal dissipation, but an unselfish one.

His temperament was of that species which had no side tracks of diversion; he possessed no visible mirthful strain to fertilize and rejuvenate his wasting powers as his daily task proceeded. The world will not record him as one of its oratorical specimens, and yet he possessed some of the highest qualities of oratory, traits without which no one can be an orator. He had the remarkable and most choice gift of thinking clearly and logically, and therefore his statements were rare gems of concentrated clearness and specific directness of purpose. Whenever a great question was pending, all desired to hear him, a true criterion of real oratory.

He had none of the condiments or ornaments of oratory. He was not gifted with satire, a ludicrous descriptive power, or the keen shafts of repartee. He was not an actor or resonant declaimer, and therefore was not an entertainer, except as unvarnished and incisive wisdom and clear information on current topics entertained his fellows.

In many things he stands as a rare example for emulation among statesmen. He led his great party on the floor of the House without seeking to lead it. He received the designation as the most fit among his colleagues from his distinguished colleague of his own State, the Speaker, probably without request and probably without any desire on his part, but because of preeminent fitness. None envied him; none were jealous of him by reason of an acknowledged superior fitness to which all of his associates gracefully bowed.

To his exemplary temperament, persistent industry, loyalty to duty, and integrity of purpose his eminent standing was but a necessary resultant. No one claimed for him any distinctive superiority by nature over the generality of his colleagues. Nature had given him the ordinary capacity usually dealt out in a well-distributed form, and it was he that so developed and husbanded his resources that he found himself well in advance of the general procession of those inheriting like capacities and opportunities when death overtook him. He laid down his burdens after his long and laborious journey in this House with everyone of his associates a sincere and sympathetic friend and all acknowledging that in his death the nation suffered a great loss.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Speaker, representing in part the great metropolis of the nation, I would be false to my nobler impulses and to the people I have the honor to represent if I did not on this sad occasion place on record my poor tribute of esteem, of respect, of affection, and of admiration for the late NELSON DINGLEY. His death has left a void in the House of Representatives which can never be filled, and the announcement of his unexpected demise fell like a pall on the people of the Republic. His loss is a national calamity, and the country has lost a useful, an honest, a faithful, and a conscientious public servant. We miss him now, but we shall miss him more and more as the weeks and months come and go. No one can take his place.

There are many here who knew Mr. DINGLEY better and more intimately, but no one respected him more than I did. I became acquainted with him when I came to Congress four years ago. In a very short time I was impressed with his sincerity, his honesty, his courtesy, and his industry. He was an indefatigable worker, and he accomplished great results. He was patient, tireless, and methodical. He seemed to be the happiest when he was the busiest. He died a martyr to his fidelity—to public duty. He never evaded an obligation and he never shirked a responsibility.

In many respects Mr. DINGLEY was a great man, a great parliamentarian, and a great legislator. His name is connected with some of the greatest laws on our statute books, and the great legislative work he performed will live and redound to his credit as long as the Republic endures.

To those who knew him well he was a kindly, genial man. He was loved and admired on both sides of this Chamber, and his name was a household word throughout the country. I do not think he had an enemy in all the land. He had a lovable character.

Mr. DINGLEY was especially kind, considerate, and courteous to the new and younger members of the House. He made their acquaintance, and was always willing and anxious to aid, counsel, and assist them. No matter how weary or how busy he was, he never refused to listen to the inquiries of the new and inexperienced member, and he always gave him good advice and the benefit of his great knowledge, sound judgment, and vast information. Many here will never forget how kindly disposed he was to them when they first became members of this House. I do not believe he ever turned a deaf ear to any member seeking information on any subject, and this generous characteristic has left a lasting impression on us all and gives us a true insight into his noble nature.

The career of NELSON DINGLEY is one we can all be proud of, and illustrates the advantages and the opportunities of American institutions. By hard work, by industry, by sobriety, and by perseverance he rose from a poor boy to one of the most important, honorable, influential, and commanding positions in the nation. The story of his life has been truthfully and eloquently told here to-day, and demonstrates anew the possibilities of human effort and human progress in this land of equal opportunities. Every hopeful and ambitious schoolboy should read the story of his life and endeavor to emulate his shining example. It must always be a fruitful source of encouragement to every ambitious youth and struggling patriot.

Mr. DINGLEY came of sturdy New England stock, the first American Dingley having come to Massachusetts in 1638. His ancestors were nearly all traders and farmers. He was born at Durham, Me., February 15, 1832. At 17 he was a teacher of a school near his home. A little later he entered Waterville College, and subsequently Dartmouth, where he graduated in 1855 with high rank as a scholar, debater, and writer. After graduation he studied law, was admitted to the bar, but left the profession in 1856 to become the editor and proprietor of the *Lewiston Journal*, and up to the time of his death he maintained that connection. He was a member of the Maine State house of representatives in 1862, 1863, 1864, 1865, 1868, and 1873.

In 1863, when only 31 years old, he was the speaker of the Maine legislature. He was governor of Maine in 1874 and 1875, and a delegate to the national Republican convention in 1876. He was first elected to the Forty-seventh Congress in 1881 to fill the vacancy caused by the election of Hon. William P. Frye to the United States Senate, and he was a member of Congress ever since. In 1894 he received the degree of LL. D. from Dartmouth College, and at the time of his death was a member of the Joint High Commission to adjust the differences between the United States and Canada. In the Fifty-fifth Congress he was chairman of the Ways and Means Committee and the leader of his party on the floor of the House. His name is best known to the country at large on account of its association with the tariff act, which he prepared, reported, and passed at the beginning of this Congress.

This briefly sums up his career. His life was a busy one, and to the student and investigator will always be an instructive one. He was a simple Christian gentleman, and his public and his private life is without a stain. He loved books and art and science. He was a great legislator and a great statistician. He had finance and taxation at his finger ends. He was familiar with every detail of government, and his capacious mind was a storehouse of useful information. He was a deep and thorough student, and he exhausted every subject he touched. He had a wonderful knowledge of men, and his grasp of details was marvelous. To him figures and facts were as keen tools to the skilled artisan.

Mr. Speaker, many of us frequently differed with Mr. DINGLEY in regard to political and economical propositions, but we all admired his ability, his learning, his tenacity of purpose, his deep conviction, and we all respected his sincerity of purpose, the purity of his patriotism, and the inherent honesty of his motives. He was a direct man, a positive man, a truthful man, and above all and beyond all he was an honest man. In the years to come he will take high rank as an American statesman. The great work he accomplished as an orator, a writer, a lawyer, a thinker, a legislator, and a statesman will ever be a monument to human effort, human endurance, individual tenacity of purpose, and marvelous industry and perseverance.

He devoted the last years of his life to the service of the people and his country, and they owe him a debt of gratitude that never can be paid. He wrote his name high in the American temple of fame, and history will give him an immortal page. The good he did will live and will ever be a bright and beneficent heritage to all the people of all the land.

NELSON DINGLEY is no more. He fought the good fight; his race is run. He has gone to his long rest. A great nation mourns his loss, and a mighty people, shocked by his sudden death in the zenith of his fame and the ripeness of his powers, put on the garb of sorrow, grieve with those who grieve, and with bowed and reverential heads say, Well done, thou good and faithful servant—hail and farewell.

Mourn not the dead whose lives declare
That they have nobly borne their part,
For victory's golden crown they wear,
Reserved for every faithful heart;
They rest with glory wrapped around,
Immortals on the scroll of fame;
Their works their praises shall resound,
Their name—an everlasting name.

Mr. BRUMM. Mr. Speaker, some eighteen years ago I had the fortune to be associated with NELSON DINGLEY on the Committee on Banking and Currency. This was in the Forty-seventh Congress. Both he and I entered Congress at that time. There are but few left in this Congress who were with us then. Indeed,

there are not very many of the prominent ones living. Although in that Congress there were some of the most distinguished men of our country, yet there was not one man who made the impression upon me that was made by Governor DINGLEY.

It seems to me that almost the moment I became acquainted with him he struck me as being a superior man; surely not in his appearance, but there was such earnestness, sincerity, honesty, and conscientiousness in the man that impressed me with his greatness then, and this impression has grown from that day to this.

This was when the financial question was the all-absorbing issue of the day. I did not agree with him in his financial views upon general principles, yet the wisdom and knowledge he displayed would make any man respect him, while his logic was so clear and forcible that it would oft make his honest antagonist doubt and hesitate.

No question of any importance arose in committee that was not referred to Governor DINGLEY, and what astonished me most was that though there were older members on that committee, and while it was his debut in the House, yet the Comptroller of the Currency and the Secretary of the Treasury were in communication with Governor DINGLEY more than any other member of the committee. In fact, his advice was at once sought by the whole Administration on all questions of finance and revenue.

But his knowledge was not limited to finance alone, and what surprised me most was the general knowledge he had of statistics, political economy, and statesmanship.

There are many men who by laborious study can obtain a knowledge of general principles, and can master them very well; but I have never known a man who was so well versed in every detail, in the slightest minutia of every subject. On the duty to be levied upon imports, as well as internal revenue, he seemed to know the component parts of every article, the chemical composition, the cost, the price, quantity, use, and, in fact, all the most minute details.

Moreover his knowledge was not limited to the question of tariff and finance, but on the subject of the employment and the law that should govern the employment of sailors it seemed to me that Governor DINGLEY knew more about them than the sailors, shipowner, or commanders of vessels. In fact, our coastwise trade, merchant marine, ship building, commercial relations, finance, tariffs, and revenues, each seemed to be an open book to him. There was no man in my experience who had anything like the knowledge he possessed upon all these questions.

He was always so kind-hearted and patient, ever ready amid his great labors to give information. As he was when he entered Congress, so he was when he was stricken down.

It has been said that all men can stand adversity—because they simply must stand it—but it is a feature of greatness when a man can stand prosperity.

Surely Governor DINGLEY had reached a lofty elevation; he became the leader of this House in a sense perhaps never known before, and was looked upon as a safe adviser of all men; all paid homage to his judgment and counsel irrespective of party or faction. That made no difference to him. He was the same NELSON DINGLEY in the height of his prosperity that he was when he first entered this House.

It has been said of Him, who spake as never man spake, that He was so absorbed in the seriousness of His mission on this earth that He was never seen to smile. I will not say that of Governor DINGLEY. In his social relations he had a smile for everyone; but in his work so serious was he and so earnest that no frivolity could enter there. Often in the committee room he showed his aversion to witticism and sarcasm. He was a man too serious, too earnest in his work to be diverted for a moment from his path of duty.

In the death of Governor DINGLEY this House has lost its best adviser, our country its greatest political economist, humanity one of its best friends. Governor DINGLEY died as he lived, a martyr to duty.

Mr. MAHANY. Mr. Speaker, I shall neither discuss the philosophy of life and death, nor shall I presume to estimate the just measure of this man's fame. His deservings in American history the wise years will decide, and a later day will give the true as also the dispassionate judgment of his work. To that criterion I am sure he would himself prefer to appeal. One simple word alone I feel like uttering upon this occasion, and that is a tribute to the kindly and helpful courtesy with which he met the requests and made easier the burdens of new members.

As a boy, when I went to college, I was surprised at the utter lack of consideration in the treatment accorded by the older students to the newcomers. All fared alike in this regard, however; and so in the democracy of rough usage none felt any cause of personal complaint. It so happened that after a course at college I went to Harvard University, and was gratified to note that there a different spirit prevailed. Courtesy and kindness welcomed at

its portals new arrivals. And likewise, after four years of service here, among the pleasantest memories I have of the House of Representatives is the recollection of courtesies extended and kindnesses shown by men like Governor DINGLEY.

I was much struck this afternoon by the tribute paid to American homesteads by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER]. He said that the true census of a nation's greatness, the best hope of a republic's security, is not in the splendor of its wealth or the uncounted millions of its people, but in the virtues of which the dead statesman was so conspicuous an example. Governor DINGLEY's ambition was to administer with integrity, as well as ability, the high places confided to his care.

Therefore, without knowing the late chairman of the Ways and means Committee well, observing him only as a young member will note an older and more experienced legislator, I was impressed with two qualities of his character, qualities that glorify all the other attributes ascribed to him in these eulogies to-day. One was his courtesy and the other his integrity.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the sermon delivered by Rev. G. M. Howe, Mr. DINGLEY's pastor, on the occasion of the obsequies at Lewiston, Me., be published in the RECORD.

There was no objection.

The following is the sermon:

FRIENDS AND FELLOW-CITIZENS: This is not an uncommon scene, for, as some one has well said, "It is the common lot of man to be born, to live, to die, to be forgotten."

And so it comes to pass that a funeral service is one with which we are all familiar, and yet the occurrence is always a sad one.

"Three score and ten are the years of our life,
Or if our strength endure,
They may be four score years;
Yet at their best they are toil and emptiness,
For they pass swiftly and all fly away."

The shock of Mr. DINGLEY's unlooked-for death came not alone to the members of his devoted family who had watched with tender solicitude by his bedside, but to the nation in whose council chambers he had for so many years been a conspicuous figure.

The deceased by the careful development of his native gifts, his close application to public duty, his kindly spirit and noble nature, won for himself a large place in the hearts of his townsmen and in the esteem of his countrymen.

It can truly be said that it has been the fortune of but few men in the history of this Republic to be so honored and trusted by their constituency as he. This is seen in his repeated reelections to the National House of Representatives. The able manner in which he met and discharged his public duties is familiar to all.

The press has given extended notices of his life and service, and has commented freely upon the eminence which he attained as a statesman and the high regard in which he was held by his associates in Congress.

It remains for me to speak of Mr. DINGLEY as he appeared to me, and I speak of him as a pastor and a personal friend.

I am conscious that men do not estimate alike the worth of a human life, simply because they regard it from different standpoints. It is a difficult task, indeed, to judge a man impartially, for the temptation is to estimate his life in the light of its influence upon our personal interest.

The traits which impress a close friend as beautiful or strong may be considered a blemish or a source of weakness by an enemy.

It is a happy thought, however, that we sometimes come to an occasion like this, when no word of doubt or anxiety is to be either spoken or suppressed, when we feel justified in saying of the departed what we should not have felt at liberty to say to them while they were with us, and what, perhaps, they in their modesty would have us leave unsaid.

It is a relief to the heart to speak as we feel of our loss and to express, in such words as we can command, our Christian sympathy for those whose hearts are broken by this sore bereavement, for the death of a friend beloved always brings a shadow with it.

At the same time we may always gladly recall the past and look forward with bright anticipations into the veiled future, as I am certain we all do this morning, as we engage in these solemn services.

As I stand here I can but feel that he who has been so unexpectedly taken from us has been a helper and teacher to me rather than I to him.

He loved the house of God, he delighted in its services and ordinances, and when present gave thoughtful attention to the instructions given and joined reverently in every prayer offered.

And by his own upright and consistent life he has given inspiration and help to me, even more abundantly than I to him.

I first met Mr. DINGLEY in the autumn of 1883, when, as the representative of this church, he conferred with me with reference to becoming its pastor. The acquaintance there formed, as time went on, ripened into a friendship the influence and helpfulness of which will remain with me as lifelong inspiration, and I shall ever regard him as a type of the noblest manhood.

In him was conspicuously apparent the compatibility of high attainments in the realm of politics with the most unimpeachable character. As a public man Mr. DINGLEY accomplished a great work. He was a man of remarkably clear vision, possessed the highest quality of statesmanship, and exhibited great wisdom in plan and action. But it will not be for this work and for these superior qualities that he will be held in grateful remembrance by his intimate friends and the nation at large, but for the integrity and nobility of his character.

"Character," as has been well said, "is a coin that passes current and at par value in all countries. It is like a gold monetary standard whose value is universally recognized. Posterity estimates men not so much by what they do as by what they were. It honors and reveres those who under some strain have maintained their integrity, whose devotion to principle is their legacy to man and their highest claim to perpetuity of fame."

These are true words, and may be fitly applied to him whose memory we revere and cherish to-day. Few men who for so many years have been in public life and actively engaged in national affairs have made such a notable record as he.

As we contemplate his remarkable career—beginning here in the city where he has made his home—extending throughout the country, covering the State which he so ably and honorably served as governor, and there enlarging until it extended over a nation of 70,000,000 people. Nor was his

influence limited by the confines of the Republic. It swept beyond even these, commanding the respectful attention of the world's leading statesmen and affecting, directly or indirectly, the legislation of all the nation. While he was thus pressing his way upward to the high position which he filled his influence was deepening and broadening in the community where he began his eventful career. This commanding influence was not the result of fortune or adventitious circumstances, but was the legitimate outcome of a life "laid in deep and solid foundations and reared in harmonious and enduring proportions."

Such results could have been achieved by fidelity to duty and an unflinching faith in the rectitude of his purposes. From the beginning of his active life he must have been dominated by the loftiest and noblest of moral ideals. It could not have been otherwise, for while it is possible to so order one's conduct as to deceive here and there an individual, it is impossible for a public servant to deceive millions of people for a generation. No craft how skillfully employed could, for so long a time, disguise the hypocrisy or hide the corruption.

How is this constantly increasing and enduring strength with the vast majority of our people to be accounted for? What enabled our distinguished citizen to pass, without a single stain upon his fair fame, through the varied experiences of a long and peculiarly trying public life?

It was not great intellectual ability, for his was not a preeminent endowment; it was not eloquence, for he had no special gifts as an orator. It was not the charm of a polished manner, for, while he was ever affable and courteous, he had not cultivated the "arts of grace as a means to an end."

What, then, was it that enabled him to attain unto and hold so long the position he occupied in the thought, esteem, and affection of his countrymen? The answer to these queries is found in his loyalty to principle, his devotion to truth, his thorough preparation, and conscientious work. Thus he was ever ready for, and equal to, the demands of the hour and the occasion. By his earnest application to the task in hand, and by his signal success in his chosen field of effort, he proved to the young men of this Republic that—

The heights by great men reached and kept
Were not attained by sudden flight;
But they, while their companions slept,
Were toiling upward in the night.

Wherein lay the secret of his character, the strength and beauty of which all recognize? Does not the secret lie in his implicit faith in Christ and His atonement?

From early manhood to the day of his death it was his cherished and avowed purpose not only to know but to do the will of his Divine Master. What a testimony his consecrated life has been all these years to the influence and power of the Lord Jesus Christ! How forcibly we are reminded this morning of the earnest words he used to speak with us concerning the renewing, sustaining, and sanctifying power of the gospel! How vividly we recall his loving exhortation to make the word of God the mass of our counsel and the light of our pathway.

Who of us that were accustomed to meet with him in the prayer and conference room will ever forget the deep feeling he exhibited on an occasion before returning to Congress when he asked the brethren present to remember him constantly at the throne of grace that he might have the strength to meet and discharge his obligations as a public man to the honor and glory of God? And then again, on the eve of his departure for Washington for the last time, how earnestly he exhorted us all, and especially the young men present, to avail themselves of every opportunity to promote the culture of their spiritual natures, and thus build themselves up in the most holy faith, and then added: "If it were my last word to you, I would say make it the business of your lives to build up noble Christian characters, and you will never regret it."

Though his lips are sealed in death, he still speaks to us in the abiding influence of his life—a life purified and sanctified, a life made rich in resources and potent for good through his love for and faith in the crucified Redeemer.

He will be greatly missed in this community, where he was universally esteemed as a friend and a citizen. How he will be missed in religious circles, in our local and State conferences, and especially in our church home, where he loved so much to be, and which he served so loyally! How you who have been accustomed to confer with him concerning questions of state and international problems will miss him!

"His voice is silent in your council hall
Forever; and whatever tempests lower,
Forever silent. Even if they broke
In thunder, silent; yet remember all
He spoke among you, and the man who
Spoke,
Who never sold the truth to serve the hour,
Nor paltered with eternal God for power."

He will be missed in the home where, as husband and father, he was greatly beloved. The sorrow of his bereaved family is too poignant and sacred for us to intrude upon it. We can only humbly pray that the sweet comfort of faith may fall with healing grace upon each of these sorrowing hearts. The revolving years may bring to them some "surcease of sorrow," but no compensation for the bereavement which they have experienced. Out of this home to which he contributed so much of light and joy our friend and brother has passed to the untried experiences of the unseen world, there to learn the lesson of immortal being. We leave him there in the presence of the glorified Saviour, whom he loved so devotedly and served so faithfully, and before whom we, too, shall stand at no distant day. Farewell, brother beloved!

The world is lonelier and poorer for thy departure from it, but heaven is richer. The Saviour's diadem is made resplendent with such jewels as thou art. We did not realize that the harvest season was so near. Thou hast gathered thy sheaves, and great were the rejoicings in heaven at thy coming. "The song that thou hearest was the seraphim's song," a song mingled with the glad greetings of the loved ones gone before. "Blessed are the dead that die in the Lord." May it be our portion to join him in the Father's many-mansioned house when the Master shall call!

Sleep thy last sleep
Free from care and sorrow;
Rest where none weep
Till the eternal morrow.
Though dark waves roll
O'er the silent river,
Thy fainting soul
Jesus can deliver.

Life's dreams are past,
All its sins, its sadness;
Brightly at last
Dawns a day of gladness.
Under thy sod,
Earth, remains our treasure,
To rest in God.
Waiting all His pleasure.

Though we may mourn
Those in life the dearest,
They shall return,
Christ, when Thou appearest.
Soon shall Thy voice
Comfort those now weeping,
Bidding rejoice
All in Jesus sleeping. Amen.

Mr. COUSINS. Mr. Speaker, I heard the request that the funeral discourse pronounced by his pastor at Lewiston might go into the RECORD. I heard a funeral discourse in this presence upon the day of his obsequies in this House that was brief and excellent and worthy of a place in the history of this country. I ask unanimous consent that those remarks of Rev. Dr. Newman, made in this Chamber, may be printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. DALZELL]. It has already been printed.

Subsequently,

Mr. COUSINS said: Mr. Speaker, I am informed that the consent which was granted that the funeral discourse of Rev. Dr. Newman be printed in the RECORD did not extend to the memorial volume which will commemorate these proceedings. I therefore ask consent that that address be so printed.

There was no objection.

Mr. FARIS. Mr. Speaker, as the proceedings of this House on the occasion referred to were brief, might it not be proper that the prayer of the Chaplain of the House as well as the discourse referred to by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. COUSINS] be included in the memorial volume?

Mr. STEELE. If my colleague [Mr. FARIS] will allow me, I ask that both the prayers delivered on that occasion be printed in the volume referred to.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Speaker, I think it would be entirely appropriate that those entire proceedings of the House, attended as they were by the President of the United States and his Cabinet, by members of the diplomatic corps, by the justices of the Supreme Court, and other distinguished persons, as well as by the Senate of the United States, be printed in the memorial volume. I make that request.

Mr. DOCKERY. I suggest to my friend from Minnesota [Mr. TAWNEY] that under the practice of the House that will be done. The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the request will be granted.

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Speaker, upon the suggestion of the gentleman from Maine [Mr. BOUTELLE], I ask consent that all members of the House may have leave to print in the RECORD their tributes to the character and public services of Mr. DINGLEY.

There was no objection, and it was ordered accordingly.

The SPEAKER. In compliance with the resolutions already adopted by the House, and as a further mark of respect to the memory of Mr. DINGLEY, the House now stands adjourned until 12 o'clock noon Monday.

And accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, a letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a statement of certain unsettled accounts for advertising during the war with Spain, was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

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

Mr. OTJEN, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred House bill 10993, reported in lieu thereof a bill (H. R. 12084) to reimburse those who have had sent to their homes for burial the dead bodies of officers, soldiers, and sailors who died away from home while members of the Army or Navy of the United States since the 1st day of January, 1898, accompanied by a report (No. 2093); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. FISCHER, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5265) granting to the Clearwater Valley Railroad Company a right of way through the Nez Perces Indian lands in Idaho, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2095); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. FLETCHER, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 11953) to promote the efficiency of the Revenue-Cutter Service, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report

(No. 2100); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

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

Mr. MAHON, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 12080) for the allowance of certain claims reported by the accounting officers of the United States Treasury Department, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2094); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. FENTON, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 723) for the relief of William H. Sprinkle, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2097); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 2638) for the correction of muster of Adolph von Haake, late major, Sixty-eighth Regiment New York Veteran Volunteer Infantry, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2098); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 11064) to correct the muster of Benjamin F. Hasson, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2099); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DAYTON, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 5062) for the relief of Dennis Kelly, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2101); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HICKS, from the Committee on Patents, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 10880) granting an extension of Letters Patent 244898, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2102); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS INTRODUCED.

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

By Mr. OTJEN, from the Committee on War Claims: A bill (H. R. 12084) to reimburse those who have paid for sending to their homes for burial the dead bodies of officers, soldiers, sailors, and marines who died away from home while members of the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps of the United States, including trained nurses in the employ of the Government, since the 1st day of January, 1898—to the Union Calendar.

By Mr. BABCOCK: A bill (H. R. 12085) to regulate licenses for theaters and other entertainments in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HEMENWAY, from the Committee on Appropriations: A bill (H. R. 12086) making appropriations for fortifications and other works of defense, for the armament thereof, and for the procurement of heavy ordnance for trial and service, and for other purposes—to the Union Calendar.

By Mr. BABCOCK: A bill (H. R. 12087) regulating licenses in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. STALLINGS (for Mr. WHEELER of Alabama): A joint resolution (H. Res. 363) presenting the thanks of Congress to Maj. Gen. Elwell S. Otis and the officers and men under his command—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED.

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

By Mr. BURTON: A bill (H. R. 12088) to place on the pension roll the name of James G. Saint—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BOTKIN: A bill (H. R. 12089) making an appropriation for the support of the W. T. Whitaker Orphan Home, in the Indian Territory—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 12090) granting a pension to Martha A. Myers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PAYNE: A bill (H. R. 12091) to extend privileges of section 4216 of the Revised Statutes to the yacht *Andria*—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. STALLINGS (for Mr. WHEELER of Alabama): A bill

(H. R. 12092) for the relief of the estate of John H. Swift, deceased, late of Madison County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.
By Mr. BURTON: A bill (H. R. 12093) granting a pension to Clarissa Wolcott—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

By Mr. ARNOLD: Petition of the Presbyterian churches of Rimersburg and Widnoon, Pa., favoring the passage of the Ellis bill—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. BROMWELL: Petitions of fourth-class postmasters in Miami County, Ohio, urging the passage of House bills Nos. 4930 and 4931, for increase of compensation—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. BULL: Resolutions of the Board of Trade of Providence, R. I., recommending liberal appropriations for American exhibits at the Paris Exposition and a reorganization of the consular service—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. CAPRON: Resolutions of the Board of Trade of Providence, R. I., urging an increase of the appropriation for the American exhibit at the Paris Exposition, and for a reorganization of the consular service—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. DAVENPORT (by request): Petitions of citizens of Pennsylvania favoring the establishment of postal savings banks—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. ERMENROUT: Petition of the Ministerial Association of Reading, Pa., George Gaul, president, against the seating of Brigham H. Roberts as a Representative from Utah—to the Committee on Elections No. 1.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: Resolution of the Massachusetts State Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, asking that the interest of the industrial classes be considered in the maintenance of a government in the islands recently released from the power of Spain—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts: Petition of the South Bristol Farmers' Club, of New Bedford, Mass., urging measures to promote the ocean carrying trade in vessels under the American flag—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GRIFFIN: Petitions of the Congregational and Baptist churches of Mondovi, Wis., to prohibit the sale of liquor in canteens and in immigrant stations and Government buildings—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. GROW: Petitions of C. H. Dana and 201 citizens of Tunkhannock, August H. Kaul and 198 citizens of East Freedom, Patrick Campbell and 197 citizens of Amsbury, Pa., in favor of the establishment of postal savings banks—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. HULL: Petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Indianola, Iowa, Mrs. E. B. Hurford, president, favoring the Ellis bill—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. KERR: Petition of the Elyria, Ohio, Auxiliary to the Woman's Home Missionary Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church, against the seating of Brigham H. Roberts as a Representative from Utah—to the Committee on Elections No. 1.

By Mr. MARSH: Petition of 335 citizens of Plymouth, Ill., praying for the passage of House bill No. 11735, providing that no polygamist shall be a Senator or Representative—to the Committee on Elections No. 1.

By Mr. MERCER: Petitions of the Woman's Wesleyan Educational Council of Nebraska, also employees of Kingman Implement Company, of Omaha, Nebr., against the seating of Brigham H. Roberts as a Representative from Utah—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolution of the Omaha Central Labor Union, against the publication of advertisements in the Bulletins of the Bureau of American Republics—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also petitions of members of the Methodist Episcopal Church and citizens of Arlington, Nebr., asking for the passage of the Ellis bill to forbid the sale of intoxicating beverages in all Government buildings—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. MIERS of Indiana: Petition of the Interstate National Guard Association, asking for an appropriation of \$5,000,000 per annum for the National Guard—to the Committee on the Militia.

By Mr. PAYNE: Petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Stratford Corner, N. H., favoring the Ellis bill—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana: Protest of Rev. E. B. Westhaper, of Wolcottville, Ind., against the seating of Brigham H. Roberts as a Representative from Utah—to the Committee on Elections No. 1.

By Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH: Petition of Mrs. I. N. Ellwood and 54 citizens of Flint, Mich., against the seating of Brigham H. Roberts as a Representative from Utah—to the Committee on Elections No. 1.

Also, petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Haley, Mich., favoring the passage of the Ellis bill, to forbid the

sale of intoxicating beverages in all Government buildings—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. STALLINGS (for Mr. WHEELER of Alabama): Petition of George Cross, of Jackson County, Ala., praying reference of his war claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also (for Mr. WHEELER of Alabama), petition of the heirs of Sarah Derrick, of Jackson County, Ala., praying reference of her war claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also (for Mr. WHEELER of Alabama), petition of the heirs of V. Burrows, deceased, late of Lauderdale County, Ala., praying for reference of his war claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also (for Mr. WHEELER of Alabama), petition of David Derrick, of Jackson County, Ala., praying reference of his war claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also (for Mr. WHEELER of Alabama), petition of the heirs of Nathaniel Kennemer, deceased, late of Jackson County, Ala., praying reference of his war claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also (for Mr. WHEELER of Alabama), petition of Tabettha Stephens, of Jackson County, Ala., praying reference of her war claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. STRODE of Nebraska: Resolutions of Thornburg Post, Grand Army of the Republic, of Clarks, Nebr., urging the passage of Senate bill No. 3256, relating to civil-service appointments—to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. WANGER: Petitions of John S. Ross and 209 citizens of Fagleysville; W. H. Jenkins and 202 citizens of Gwynedd; D. N. Cook and 197 citizens of Edgewood; Mrs. C. S. Holcomb and 380 citizens of Newton, Pa., in favor of the establishment of postal savings banks—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Penns Manor, Pa., to prohibit the sale of liquor in canteens, in immigrant stations, and in Government buildings—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

SENATE.

MONDAY, February 13, 1899.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of Saturday last, when, on motion of Mr. FAIRBANKS, and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with.

RESERVOIRS FOR IRRIGATION PURPOSES.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 7th instant, a report from the Director of the Geological Survey on the origin, character, and extent of the surveys of reservoir sites made by the United States Geological Survey, together with a brief memorandum as to present conditions of water storage, etc.; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Select Committee on the Geological Survey, and ordered to be printed.

PERSONNEL OF NAVY AND MARINE CORPS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 10th instant, estimates of the total annual cost of the personnel of the officers of the Navy under House bill No. 10403 as reported with amendments to the Senate from the Committee on Naval Affairs on February 8, compared with the cost of the personnel under existing laws and excluding any additional force employed during the late war; and also a like estimate of the cost of 22,500 seamen and apprentices, compared with the cost of the regular force of seamen and apprentices; and a further like estimate of the cost of the personnel, including the officers and men, of the Marine Corps under the bill, compared with the cost of such personnel under existing laws, excluding any temporary increase during the late war; which was read.

Mr. HALE. I move that the communication and accompanying statement be referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs and printed.

The motion was agreed to.

PRESIDENTIAL APPROVAL.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. O. L. PRUDEN, one of his secretaries, announced that the President had on this day approved and signed the act (S. 4070) to amend an act granting to the St. Louis, Oklahoma and Southern Railway Company a right of way through the Indian Territory and Oklahoma Territory, and for other purposes.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. PENROSE presented a memorial of the Monthly Meeting of Friends of New Garden, Pa., remonstrating against the sale of intoxicating liquors in Government buildings; which was referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.