of Hamilton, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Indiana, favoring the passage of a bill to establish a Branch Soldiers' Home near Johnson City, Tenn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of C. W. Heitz, of New Era, Ind., to abolish the Army canteen—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RUSSELL: Petition of the New Haven (Conn.) Chamber of Commerce, favoring House bill No. 9243, providing regulations to limit length and width of tows in inland waters—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. SHAFROTH: Petition of citizens of Weld County, Colo., in favor of the bill to tax oleomargarine—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SHATTUC: Papers to accompany House bill No. 3953, granting honorable certificates of discharge to certain officers and enlisted men of the United States volunteer service who were called out by the proclamation of Gen. Lewis Wallace issued September 5, 1862—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, papers to accompany House bill granting a pension to Elizabeth Springer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SPERRY: Resolutions of the Chamber of Commerce of New Haven, Conn., favoring House bill 9243, providing for regulations to limit the length and width of tows in United States inland waters—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, resolutions of the Merchants' Association of Waterbury, Conn., urging the passage of the bill for a public building at Waterbury, Conn.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. STARK: Petition of W. F. Barry Post, No. 159, Etna, Pa., Grand Army of the Republic, favoring the establishment of a Branch Soldiers' Home for disabled soldiers near Johnson City, Tenn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, papers to accompany House bill No. 7812, granting a pension to Lydia Strang, dependent foster mother of William P. Lewis, late of Company I, First Nebraska Volunteer Infantry, Spanish war—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SULLOWAY: Petition of Oliver B. Pettee and 32 other citizens of Francestown, N. H., in favor of the Grout bill taxing oleomargarine—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, protests of Miss Vera Cate and others, of Charmingfare, and Edward M. Hoyt and others, of Dover, N. H., against the Loud bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. SUTHERLAND: Petition of Louis Sawyer and 10 citizens of Madrid, Nebr., against the Loud bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of Gettysburg Post, Grand Army of the Republic, of Trenton, Nebr., in support of House bill No. 7094, to establish a Branch Soldiers' Home at Johnson City, Tenn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WILSON of New York: Resolutions of the New York Board of Trade and Transportation, in relation to the Puerto Rican tariff—to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WRIGHT: Resolutions of Posts 582, 584, 211, and 389, Department of Pennsylvania, Grand Army of the Republic, in favor of the establishment of a Branch Soldiers' Home near Johnson City, Tenn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. YOUNG: Resolutions of the New York Board of Trade and Transportation, expressing confidence in the wisdom of the Administration and of Congress in relation to legislation in the interests of the island of Puerto Rico—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ZENOR: Petition of Captain W. W. Sloan Post, No. 318; W. L. Sloan Post, No. 191, and Delahunt Post, No. 152, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Indiana, indorsing the bill to establish a Branch Home for disabled soldiers at Johnson City, Tenn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SENATE.

TUESDAY, *March 27, 1900.*

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. GALLINGER, and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Journal will stand approved.

AGES OF EMPLOYEES IN EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Postmaster-General, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 16th instant, certain information relative to the number of persons employed in the several bureaus of the Post-Office Department between certain specified ages, etc.; which, on motion of Mr. GALLINGER, was ordered to lie on the table and 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; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

A bill (H. R. 240) granting an increase of pension to George W. Wakefield;

A bill (H. R. 301) granting a pension to James T. Donaldson, jr.;

A bill (H. R. 457) granting a pension to Clara L. Harriman;

A bill (H. R. 493) granting a pension to Fanny M. Hays;

A bill (H. R. 548) granting a pension to Edward Harris;

A bill (H. R. 625) granting an increase of pension to Wesley Reed;

A bill (H. R. 642) granting an increase of pension to Charles C. Doolittle;

A bill (H. R. 657) granting a pension to Francis A. Kitchen;

A bill (H. R. 737) granting a pension to Cyntha A. Middleton;

A bill (H. R. 741) granting an increase of pension to Zedock C. Andrews;

A bill (H. R. 1147) granting an increase of pension to Luke H. Cooper;

A bill (H. R. 1172) granting a pension to Rebecca J. Jones;

A bill (H. R. 1677) granting an increase of pension to Missouri B. Ross;

A bill (H. R. 1681) granting an increase of pension to Isaac M. Locke;

A bill (H. R. 1800) granting a pension to Lutheria H. Maynard;

A bill (H. R. 1946) granting a pension to Jane F. Chalmers;

A bill (H. R. 2076) granting an increase of pension to Horace N. Brackett;

A bill (H. R. 2203) granting an increase of pension to John M. Garrett;

A bill (H. R. 2397) granting a pension to Eliza S. Redfield;

A bill (H. R. 2623) granting a pension to Melville Oliphant;

A bill (H. R. 2728) granting a pension to Thomas T. Garrison;

A bill (H. R. 2748) granting an increase of pension to Henry Schnetberg;

A bill (H. R. 2999) granting an increase of pension to George M. Brown;

A bill (H. R. 3021) granting a pension to Eliza H. Getchel;

A bill (H. R. 3131) granting a pension to Matilda O'Connor:

A bill (H. R. 3214) granting a pension to John S. Dukate;

A bill (H. R. 3225) granting a pension to Elizabeth Bent Cooper;

A bill (H. R. 3268) granting an increase of pension to James W. Kessler;

A bill (H. R. 3307) granting a pension to Matilda Hennessy;

A bill (H. R. 3312) granting an increase of pension to Ellen V. Myer;

A bill (H. R. 3454) granting a pension to Joseph E. Baldwin;

A bill (H. R. 3563) granting an increase of pension to Julia A. Floyd;

A bill (H. R. 3635) granting an increase of pension to Timothy B. Eastman;

A bill (H. R. 3642) granting an increase of pension to Adolphus Lavine;

A bill (H. R. 3654) granting a pension to Calvin E. Myers;

A bill (H. R. 3693) granting an increase of pension to Abraham Sanford;

A bill (H. R. 3758) granting an increase of pension to Joshua Ricketts;

A bill (H. R. 3775) granting an increase of pension to Robert Boston;

A bill (H. R. 3821) granting an increase of pension to Frances D. Best;

A bill (H. R. 3869) granting a pension to Joseph H. Hamrick and Ella G. Hamrick;

A bill (H. R. 3941) granting a pension to Samuel B. Weeks;

A bill (H. R. 3962) granting an increase of pension to Alanson C. Eberhart;

A bill (H. R. 4030) granting an increase of pension to Margarett L. Coleman;

A bill (H. R. 4089) granting a pension to Emily Burke;

A bill (H. R. 4138) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth A. Hyatt;

A bill (H. R. 4180) granting an increase of pension to Austin J. Pickett;

A bill (H. R. 4247) granting an increase of pension to Francis S. Wolfe;

A bill (H. R. 4267) granting an increase of pension to Ezra A. Bennett;

A bill (H. R. 4276) granting an increase of pension to John R. Eggeman;

A bill (H. R. 4398) granting a pension to Julius Vogt;

A bill (H. R. 4562) granting a pension to Lois A. Fields;

A bill (H. R. 4654) granting an increase of pension to Simon Van Der Vaart;

A bill (H. R. 4657) granting a pension to Laura S. Pontious;

A bill (H. R. 4675) granting an increase of pension to Robert H. Jones;

A bill (H. R. 4681) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Keiff;

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

A bill (H. R. 4696) granting an increase of pension to Ruthven W. Houghton;
A bill (H. R. 4791) granting a pension to Catharine A. Schwunger;
A bill (H. R. 4805) granting a pension to Isaac Price;
A bill (H. R. 4828) granting a pension to Susie E. Johnson;
A bill (H. R. 4832) granting an increase of pension to Martha E. Graves;
A bill (H. R. 4991) granting a pension to Maria V. Sperry;
A bill (H. R. 5067) concerning the boarding of vessels;
A bill (H. R. 5088) granting an increase of pension to William G. Willoughby;
A bill (H. R. 5110) granting an increase of pension to Edward T. Kennedy;
A bill (H. R. 5127) granting a pension to John Lafollett;
A bill (H. R. 5134) granting an increase of pension to Joseph F. Allison;
A bill (H. R. 5169) granting an increase of pension to Charles Weed;
A bill (H. R. 5170) granting a pension to Cyrus Johnson;
A bill (H. R. 5171) granting an increase of pension to William R. Wallace;
A bill (H. R. 5209) granting an increase of pension to Samuel A. Greeley;
A bill (H. R. 5211) granting a pension to Lizzie M. Dixon;
A bill (H. R. 5435) granting an increase of pension to Alexander P. Baugher;
A bill (H. R. 5552) for the relief of Northrup & Chick, and also of Thomas N. Stinson;
A bill (H. R. 5886) granting a pension to William H. Lane;
A bill (H. R. 5961) granting an increase of pension to Charles A. Hausman;
A bill (H. R. 5970) granting a pension to Phebe S. Riley;
A bill (H. R. 6019) granting a pension to Mrs. Therese W. Hard;
A bill (H. R. 6089) granting a pension to Alfred T. Moreland;
A bill (H. R. 6159) granting an increase of pension to Arnold Bloom;
A bill (H. R. 6195) granting a pension to Livingston B. Gregory;
A bill (H. R. 6240) for the preparation of plans or designs for a memorial or statue of Gen. Ulysses S. Grant on ground belonging to the United States Government in the city of Washington, D. C.;
A bill (H. R. 6304) granting an increase of pension to James J. Lyons;
A bill (H. R. 6344) to remove the charges of desertion from the records of the War Department against Frederick Mehring;
A bill (H. R. 6372) granting a pension to Abbie E. Webster;
A bill (H. R. 6375) granting an increase of pension to Chester Willis;
A bill (H. R. 6486) granting an increase of pension to Orange F. Berden;
A bill (H. R. 6624) granting an increase of pension to John C. Bradley;
A bill (H. R. 6731) granting an increase of pension to William F. Tait;
A bill (H. R. 6784) granting an increase of pension to Henry H. Neff;
A bill (H. R. 6785) granting an increase of pension to Maria Egan;
A bill (H. R. 6885) granting a pension to Horace B. Durant;
A bill (H. R. 6900) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Kurtz;
A bill (H. R. 6952) granting a pension to Carrie P. Dale;
A bill (H. R. 6995) granting a pension to Catharine Harris;
A bill (H. R. 7177) granting an increase of pension to John N. Breed;
A bill (H. R. 7488) granting a pension to John C. Ray;
A bill (H. R. 7535) granting an increase of pension to Clare H. Burleigh;
A bill (H. R. 7596) granting an increase of pension to Eliza Wight;
A bill (H. R. 7599) granting an increase of pension to John F. Crawford;
A bill (H. R. 7767) granting a pension to Alice D. Roatch;
A bill (H. R. 7799) granting an increase of pension to Franklin M. Burdoin;
A bill (H. R. 7939) to amend an act approved June 10, 1880, governing the immediate transportation of dutiable merchandise without appraisement;
A bill (H. R. 8045) granting an increase of pension to Wilford Cooper;
A bill (H. R. 8079) granting a pension to Bertha M. Jordan;
A bill (H. R. 8083) granting an increase of pension to James Winnie;
A bill (H. R. 8112) granting a pension to John Vogler;
A bill (H. R. 8120) granting an increase of pension to David L. Wentworth;
A bill (H. R. 8339) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Gates;
A bill (H. R. 8378) granting an increase of pension to Mary Steffens;
A bill (H. R. 8390) granting an increase of pension to Joshua Mitchell;
A bill (H. R. 8395) granting an increase of pension to Henry Johns;
A bill (H. R. 8405) granting a pension to Sophronia Seely;
A bill (H. R. 8599) granting a pension to Ellen J. Williams;
A bill (H. R. 8605) granting a pension to Joseph Champlin Stone;
A bill (H. R. 8610) granting an increase of pension to Abner S. Crawford;
A bill (H. R. 8669) granting an increase of pension to Eliza A. Lake;
A bill (H. R. 8800) granting an increase of pension to Bell Fries; and
A bill (H. R. 9070) granting an increase of pension to Daniel H. Kent.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills; and they were thereupon signed by the President pro tempore:
A bill (H. R. 206) granting an increase of pension to Isaac D. Smith;
A bill (H. R. 539) granting a pension to Louisa S. Wilson;
A bill (H. R. 541) granting a pension to Ellen Norwood;
A bill (H. R. 1944) granting an increase of pension to Eli C. Walton;
A bill (H. R. 1989) granting a pension to Marie Wiersang;
A bill (H. R. 2382) granting an increase of pension to Eli Overhultz;
A bill (H. R. 2389) granting an increase of pension to Edward Boyle;
A bill (H. R. 2792) granting a pension to Peter Cummings;
A bill (H. R. 2802) granting an increase of pension to John W. Brisbois;
A bill (H. R. 3470) granting an increase of pension to George W. Weeden;
A bill (H. R. 3809) granting an increase of pension to Elisha B. Seaman;
A bill (H. R. 3966) granting an increase of pension to David Talmon;
A bill (H. R. 4298) granting an increase of pension to John M. McCord;
A bill (H. R. 4441) granting an increase of pension to Samuel C. Krickbaum;
A bill (H. R. 4854) granting a pension to James L. Whidden;
A bill (H. R. 4961) granting an increase of pension to Margaret Gangloff;
A bill (H. R. 5126) granting an increase of pension to James J. McManes;
A bill (H. R. 5180) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Adams;
A bill (H. R. 5229) granting a pension to Sarah Potter;
A bill (H. R. 5544) granting a pension to Loua A. Morgan;
A bill (H. R. 5546) granting an increase of pension to George White;
A bill (H. R. 5949) granting a pension to Frederick Weber;
A bill (H. R. 6028) granting a pension to John H. Meeker;
A bill (H. R. 6031) granting an increase of pension to James W. Carmody;
A bill (H. R. 6092) granting a pension to Louisa Stearns;
A bill (H. R. 6139) granting a pension to Lucinda Haggard;
A bill (H. R. 6144) granting an increase of pension to Margaret A. Porter;
A bill (H. R. 6911) granting an increase of pension to James R. Sawtell;
A bill (H. R. 7114) granting an increase of pension to John S. Parker;
A bill (H. R. 7368) granting an increase of pension to Sherman D. Plues;
A bill (H. R. 7622) granting an increase of pension to Peter M. Heaton; and
A bill (H. R. 7896) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Lybarger.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. PLATT of New York presented a memorial of Local Union No. 86, National Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, of Rochester, N. Y., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to regulate electrical wiring in the District of Columbia; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented a petition of sundry druggists of Fredonia and Jamestown, N. Y., praying for the repeal of the stamp tax upon proprietary medicines, perfumeries, and cosmetics; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of the congregation of the Presbyterian Church of Dryden, N. Y., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors in Army

canteens and also in any of the new possessions; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a petition of Dorpian Lodge, No. 204, International Association of Machinists, of Schenectady, N. Y., praying for the enactment of legislation granting thirty days' annual leave of absence to navy-yard and arsenal employees; which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also presented a petition of the Manufacturers' Association of New York, and a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Utica, N. Y., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the reorganization of the consular service; which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of the Manufacturers' Association of New York, praying for the adoption of certain amendments to the interstate-commerce law; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of Typefounders' Union, No. 1, of New York, praying that the Public Printer be authorized to print the label of the Allied Printing Trades on all publications issued by the Government; which was referred to the Committee on Printing.

He also presented a memorial of the German Insurance Journal, of Brooklyn, N. Y., and a memorial of E. L. Kellogg & Co., of New York City, remonstrating against the passage of the so-called Loud bill, relating to second-class mail matter; which were referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce, of Utica, N. Y., praying that an appropriation be made to continue the work of the Philadelphia Commercial Museum; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a petition of Syracuse Lodge, No. 381, International Association of Machinists, of Syracuse, N. Y., and a petition of Lock City Lodge, No. 439, International Association of Machinists, of Lockport, N. Y., praying for the enactment of legislation to increase the salaries of machinists employed in the Government Printing Office; which were referred to the Committee on Printing.

He also presented a petition of Madison County Pomona Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, of Earlville, N. Y., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the adulteration of food products, for the election of United States Senators by a popular vote of the people, for the construction of the Nicaragua Canal, etc.; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented a petition of the New York Zoological Society, of New York City, praying for the enactment of legislation relative to the protection and preservation of wild birds and quadrupeds; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a memorial of the Kings County Medical Association, of Brooklyn, N. Y., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation for the further prevention of cruelty to animals in the District of Columbia; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented a petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Dunkirk, N. Y., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the importation, manufacture, and sale of intoxicating liquors in Hawaii; which was referred to the Committee on Pacific Islands and Puerto Rico.

Mr. SEWELL presented resolutions adopted at a mass meeting of sundry citizens of Flemington, N. J., extending sympathy to the people of the South African Republic and Orange Free State in their struggle for independence; which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Haddonfield, N. J., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors in our new possessions, and also in our Army; which was referred to the Committee on Pacific Islands and Puerto Rico.

He also presented sundry memorials of the members of the District Medical Society of Mercer County, N. J., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation for the further prevention of cruelty to animals in the District of Columbia; which were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. GALLINGER, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (H. R. 5503) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Hanson;

A bill (H. R. 2681) granting an increase of pension to Calista F. Hall;

A bill (H. R. 2865) granting an increase of pension to Louis H. Gein; and

A bill (S. 3536) restoring to the pension roll the name of Mary J. Calvin.

Mr. GALLINGER, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 3206) granting an increase of pension to Moses King, jr., reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally with amendments, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 3306) granting an increase of pension to Lucinda D. Dow;

A bill (S. 1593) granting an increase of pension to Clara H. Inch;

A bill (S. 1907) granting an increase of pension to Rebecca Paulding Meade;

A bill (S. 1822) granting an increasee of pension to Isaac M. Shup;

A bill (S. 1226) granting a pension to George G. Kemp;

A bill (S. 2550) granting a pension to C. W. Hobart;

A bill (S. 3508) granting an increase of pension to Edward F. Phelps; and

A bill (S. 3293) granting a pension to Helen Harlow.

Mr. GALLINGER (for Mr. KYLE), from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 292) granting an increase of pension to Martha G. D. Lyster;

A bill (H. R. 3167) granting an increase of pension to Thomas H. Cook;

A bill (H. R. 2170) granting a pension to Angeline Eyestone;

A bill (H. R. 153) granting a pension to Elizabeth Johns; and

A bill (S. 3502) granting a pension to Elizabeth Whisler.

Mr. GALLINGER (for Mr. KYLE), from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 3630) granting an increase of pension to J. N. Smith, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. GALLINGER (for Mr. PRITCHARD), from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 1890) to increase the pension of John Houk, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also (for Mr. PRITCHARD), from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2994) granting a pension to Fanny F. Robertson, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. GALLINGER (for Mr. TURNER), from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 306) granting an increase of pension to Warren L. Eaton, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also (for Mr. TURNER) from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 3049) granting an increase of pension to Mary U. Wilmarth, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. ALLEN, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (H. R. 434) granting an increase of pension to Jesse Smith;

A bill (H. R. 1754) granting a pension to Helen M. Hull; and

A bill (H. R. 3694) granting an increase of pension to James Bottoms.

Mr. ALLEN, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them each with an amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (H. R. 4655) granting a pension to Elizabeth C. Rice; and

A bill (S. 682) granting a pension to Wilhelmina Hippler.

Mr. ALLEN, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally with amendments, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 1207) granting a pension to Levi Chandler;

A bill (S. 1627) granting a pension to George B. Hayden; and

A bill (S. 2110) to restore John R. McCoy to the pension roll.

Mr. ALLEN, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, submitted adverse reports thereon; which were agreed to, and the bills were postponed indefinitely:

A bill (S. 1672) granting a pension to Susie Gilbert; and

A bill (S. 647) granting an increase of pension to John Sirrine.

Mr. SHOUP, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 3079) granting an increase of pension to William Oliver, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. McCUMBER, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 92) granting a pension to William M. Ferry, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 1463) granting an increase of pension to Jasper Pitts;

A bill (H. R. 1458) granting an increase of pension to John E. Whinnery; and

A bill (H. R. 1507) granting an increase of pension to William H. La Count.

Mr. McCUMBER, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2001) granting a pension to John M. Essington, submitted an adverse report thereon; which was agreed to, and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

Mr. QUARLES, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 3154) granting an increase of pension to Kate Cadwell, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. BAKER, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 480) granting an increase of pension to Juliet Gregory;

A bill (S. 3748) granting an increase of pension to Washington Baker;

A bill (H. R. 2809) granting an increase of pension to Moses F. Woods;

A bill (H. R. 7322) granting an increase of pension to Frederick E. Vance; and

A bill (H. R. 5346) granting a pension to Elizabeth B. Norris.

Mr. BAKER, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1734) granting a pension to Mary S. Belding, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them each with an amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (H. R. 1201) granting a pension to James McNutt; and

A bill (H. R. 6527) granting an increase of pension to George Myers.

Mr. CARTER, from the Committee on Public Lands, to whom was referred the bill (S. 390) to regulate the taking of proofs and filings in certain land cases, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. HANSBROUGH, from the Committee on Public Lands, submitted a report to accompany the bill (S. 3421) to grant lands to the State of Alabama for the purposes of education of colored students at Montgomery, Ala., heretofore reported from that committee.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. SEWELL introduced a bill (S. 3803) granting a pension to Cecelia B. Chauncey; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. PLATT of New York introduced a bill (S. 3804) to amend section 4965, chapter 3, Title LX, of the Revised Statutes, relating to copyrights; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Patents.

Mr. BAKER introduced a bill (S. 3805) for the relief of Sylvester S. Van Sickel; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. HARRIS introduced a bill (S. 3806) granting an honorable discharge to John W. Tiffany; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. MARTIN introduced a bill (S. 3807) making appropriation for the removal of an obstruction in the naval channel of Elizabeth River, Virginia, in the approach to the navy-yard, known as Hospital Point; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also introduced a bill (S. 3808) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in favor of R. L. Pritchard & Co., of Page County, Va.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 3809) for the relief of E. H. Murrell; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. BARD introduced a bill (S. 3810) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide ways and means to meet war expenditures, and for other purposes;" which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. LODGE introduced a bill (S. 3811) authorizing the Postmaster-General to consolidate the Quincy and Wollaston post-offices, in the city of Quincy, in the State of Massachusetts; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. McMILLAN introduced a bill (S. 3812) to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. CLAY introduced a bill (S. 3813) for the relief of R. B. Goodman; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 3814) for the relief of W. L. Barnes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. MONEY introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Claims:

A bill (S. 3815) for the relief of Patrick J. Finley;

A bill (S. 3816) for the relief of the estate of John T. Rawlings, deceased;

A bill (S. 3817) for the relief of W. A. Hopper, administrator of David Hopper, deceased;

A bill (S. 3818) for the relief of Joseph S. Acuff;

A bill (S. 3819) for the relief of James H. Knox;

A bill (S. 3820) for the relief of Henry M. Cobb;

A bill (S. 3821) for the relief of the estate of T. J. McFarland, deceased;

A bill (S. 3822) for the relief of Jacob Joiner;

A bill (S. 3823) for the relief of Lewis Jones;

A bill (S. 3824) for the relief of James T. Blair;

A bill (S. 3825) for the relief of Aquila Bowie;

A bill (S. 3826) for the relief of the estate of Jane N. Gibson, deceased;

A bill (S. 3827) for the relief of Patrick Foley;

A bill (S. 3828) for the relief of the estate of Benjamin Hawes, deceased;

A bill (S. 3829) for the relief of U. Lunenburger;

A bill (S. 3830) for the relief of the estate of Dr. J. P. Davis, deceased;

A bill (S. 3831) for the relief of the estate of Mary H. Moore, deceased;

A bill (S. 3832) for the relief of the estate of Thomas P. Young, deceased;

A bill (S. 3833) for the relief of Susan C. Robinson;

A bill (S. 3834) for the relief of Solomon Geisenberg;

A bill (S. 3835) for the relief of Elizabeth Johnson;

A bill (S. 3836) for the relief of Mrs. Ann M. Brown;

A bill (S. 3837) for the relief of Louis Sommer;

A bill (S. 3838) for the relief of the estate of Mrs. C. L. Shaifer;

A bill (S. 3839) for the relief of the estate of William R. Tinsley, deceased;

A bill (S. 3840) for the relief of the estate of D. B. Downing;

A bill (S. 3841) for the relief of the estate of W. S. Hyland, deceased;

A bill (S. 3842) for the relief of D. O. Perkins;

A bill (S. 3843) for the relief of the estate of Z. C. Offatt, deceased;

A bill (S. 3844) for the relief of the estate of Landon L. Lea;

A bill (S. 3845) for the relief of L. B. F. Champion;

A bill (S. 3846) for the relief of the estate of J. K. Morrison, deceased; and

A bill (S. 3847) for the relief of Robert Moss.

Mr. WOLCOTT introduced a bill (S. 3848) granting an increase of pension to Azariah S. Elwood; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 3849) granting a pension to John D. Vaughan; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. CULLOM introduced a bill (S. 3850) to establish and maintain, in connection with the Department of Justice of the United States, a division to be known as the Bureau of Criminal Information, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CASSIUS M. BARNES, GOVERNOR OF OKLAHOMA.

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

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, directed to furnish to the Senate all papers on file in the Department of the Interior, including all charges, affidavits, letters, protests, and exhibits against Cassius M. Barnes, governor of Oklahoma Territory, filed since March 4, 1897, prior and subsequent to his appointment as such governor, together with the opinion of the Assistant Attorney-General and recommendation of the Secretary of the Interior, if any, concerning such charges.

STENOGRAPHER FOR COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. McMILLAN submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on the District of Columbia be, and is hereby, authorized to employ a stenographer from time to time, as may be necessary, to report hearings upon matters that may be pending before said committee, the expense to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate, and that the necessary expenses of the inquiries already made by said committee be paid from said fund.

READJUSTED SALARIES OF POSTMASTERS IN MAINE.

Mr. FRYE submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads:

Resolved, That the Postmaster-General be, and he hereby is, directed to report upon a schedule to the Senate the readjusted salaries of all postmasters who served in the State of Maine between July 1, 1864, and July 1, 1874, whose names as claimants appear in the Court of Claims in the case entitled David Vinal and others *vs.* The United States, No. 18236, each such stated account to conform in all respects to the order of the Postmaster-General published by circular under date of June 9, 1883, and to the requirement of the act of March 3, 1883, as said requirement was published by the Postmaster-General in the newspapers of the country under date of February 17, 1884, and with such report transmit to the Senate a full copy of the text of the construction by the Postmaster-General of the act of March 3, 1883, embodied in the said circular and publication in the newspapers and in circular form No. 1223, the text of each of which under date of November 8, 1897, was transmitted by the Postmaster-General to the Attorney-General for use in the case of Jane Yarrington and others *vs.* The United States, No. 16345.

PUBLIC SCHOOLS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. STEWART. I submit an order for which I ask immediate consideration. I will state that I have had an estimate of the cost

of printing the report referred to, and am informed that it can be done for $500.

The order was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Ordered, That there be printed for the use of the Senate 4,000 copies of Senate Report No. 711, Fifty-sixth Congress, first session, on the public schools of the District of Columbia.

LEVI C. FAUGHT.

Mr. COCKRELL. I ask that the bill returned from the House granting a pension to Levi C. Faught may be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate the following bill, recalled from the House of Representatives.

The SECRETARY. A bill (S. 477) granting a pension to Levi C. Faught.

Mr. COCKRELL. I ask that the motion to reconsider the votes by which the bill was read a third time and passed be now acted upon.

The motion to reconsider was agreed to.

Mr. GALLINGER. This is a bill for a blind ex-soldier. It has passed in a form that probably would result in the Bureau of Pensions not granting the pension. I move to amend it by adding to the bill the words: "and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Hampshire proposes an amendment, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. After the word "Guards," in line 7, insert "and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GALLINGER. I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be put upon its passage.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CIVIL GOVERNMENT FOR ALASKA.

Mr. CARTER. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (S. 3419) making further provision for a civil government for Alaska, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question before the Senate is on the amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota. [Mr. HANSBROUGH]. The amendment will be again read.

Mr. CARTER. At the time the motion was made to proceed to the consideration of executive business yesterday afternoon the Senator from Nevada [Mr. STEWART] was addressing the Senate on this amendment. I observe that he is not at the present moment in the Chamber, and I therefore ask that the amendment be temporarily laid aside, to the end that he may be present when it is further considered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana, that the motion to amend be temporarily laid aside? The Chair hears none. It is so ordered.

Mr. CARTER. I present an amendment to be inserted as indicated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be read.

The SECRETARY. On page 23, at the end of section 26, insert the following additional proviso:

Provided further, That, subject only to such general limitations as may be necessary to exempt navigation from artificial obstructions, all land and shoal water below mean high tide on the shores, bays, and inlets of Bering Sea, within the jurisdiction of the United States, shall be subject to exploration for gold and other precious metals by citizens of the United States, or persons who have legally declared their intention to become such, under such reasonable rules and regulations as the miners in organized mining districts may have heretofore made, or may hereafter make, governing the temporary possession thereof for exploration and mining purposes, until otherwise provided by law; and all permits heretofore granted authorizing any person or persons, corporation or company, to excavate or mine under any of said waters are hereby revoked and declared null and void.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. President, the amendment just read relates to a subject on which some comment was made a few days ago in the Senate Chamber in connection with a resolution presented by the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. TURNER], calling upon the Secretary of War to advise the Senate what, if any, permits or privileges had been granted to any person or corporation to mine upon the coast of Alaska. In reply to that resolution the Secretary of War, by a communication dated the 23d instant, explains the conditions under which permits were issued, the extent or scope of such permits, and the purpose he had in view in issuing them.

The conditions existing at Cape Nome and along the coast of Bering Sea are unique. They were not in contemplation at the time certain laws were enacted for the regulation of persons or companies desiring to excavate under the shoal waters of the sea. For the purpose of preventing encroachments upon the navigable waters, the erection of structures tending to obstruct navigation, or excavations intended to injuriously affect navigable waters, Congress, it seems, from the report of the Secretary of War, passed this law on the 3d of March, 1899, to wit:

It shall not be lawful to excavate or fill, or in any manner to alter or modify the course, location, condition, or capacity of any port, roadstead, haven, harbor, canal, lake, harbor of refuge, or inclosure within the limits of any breakwater or of the channel of any navigable water of the United States, unless the work has been recommended by the Chief of Engineers and authorized by the Secretary of War prior to beginning the same.

The Secretary then proceeds to show the penalty provided by law for any violation of the section which I have just quoted. The penalty, in short, is that on conviction thereof—that is, of any of the acts enumerated in the statute—the person shall be punished by a fine not exceeding $2,500 nor less than $500, or by imprisonment not exceeding one year, or by both such punishments, in the discretion of the court.

The Secretary of War, believing that this act would injuriously affect and unnecessarily restrain citizens of the United States desiring to explore the shoal waters of Bering Sea for minerals, determined deliberately, as a course of policy, to issue permits to any citizens of the United States upon recommendation of the Chief of Engineers to explore this gold-bearing coast within the 3-mile limit. That his purpose was a laudable one and in harmony with the general sentiment existing in Congress there can be no question. He merely exempts by the permit a citizen who may desire to mine on that coast from the penalties which would be inflicted under the law if the permit were not granted previous to the beginning of the work.

In a personal interview I inquired of the Secretary of War the reason why a general order had not been promulgated authorizing all persons to prosecute investigations and explorations on that coast. In reply he cited the law, which provides that the work must be recommended by the Chief of Engineers, and in consequence of this recommendation being a prerequisite, each application must pass through the office of the Chief of Engineers and be separately passed upon by him. Under the law as it now stands the Secretary of War, in the exercise of the discretion given by the law, will exempt all citizens who may apply to him in the regular manner prescribed by the statute from the penalties inflicted on those who do not secure permits.

It is obvious that upon arriving in Bering Sea hundreds of persons may desire to avail themselves of the privileges of mining along the coast, but will be deprived of so doing unless at the hazard of incurring the severe penalties prescribed by the statute until they shall have had time to send an application to the Chief of Engineers, to be by him passed on to the Secretary of War.

Mr. ALLEN. I should like to ask the Senator a question. I did not hear the beginning of his remarks. What remedy does the Senator propose for the evil that is complained of?

Mr. CARTER. The remedy proposed is embodied in an amendment which I have presented, and which is now under consideration.

Mr. ALLEN. Will the Senator be kind enough to have it read? I did not hear it.

Mr. CARTER. I would be glad if the Secretary would again report the amendment for the information of the Senator from Nebraska.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be again read.

The Secretary again read Mr. CARTER'S amendment.

Mr. ALLEN. I should like to suggest to the Senator that this amendment ought to include a provision nullifying any permits hereafter granted by the Secretary of War.

Mr. CARTER. No permit can hereafter be granted under the terms of the amendment in those waters, because by the express terms of the amendment——

Mr. ALLEN. Under what provision of law does the Secretary profess to have this power?

Mr. CARTER. The provision I have heretofore cited. I will cite it again for the Senator's benefit. In the act of Congress approved March 3, 1899, this provision occurs:

It shall not be lawful to excavate or fill or in any manner to alter or modify the course, location, condition, or capacity of any port, roadstead, haven, harbor, canal, lake, harbor of refuge, or inclosure within the limits of any breakwater or of the channel of any navigable water of the United States unless the work has been recommended by the Chief of Engineers and authorized by the Secretary of War prior to beginning the same.

On the next page of the report the Senator will find that a drastic penalty is provided for any violation of this law by the individual.

Mr. ALLEN. But what I was calling for is the law that gives the Secretary of War authority to grant mining permits between high and low tide.

Mr. CARTER. No permit has ever been granted by the Secretary of War for mining purposes. It so happens—it is a matter of common knowledge, indeed—that the purpose of dredging in those waters would be for gold, but the same permit is granted there that would be granted along the New Jersey coast to a farmer, or builder, or a person having use for sand, to excavate and carry away loads of sand from along that coast.

Mr. ALLEN. I should like to ask the Senator another question. Are not all the mining lands of the United States, upland and tide lands, withdrawn from permits of this kind by other statutes?

Mr. CARTER. Not at all. The jurisdiction of the Secretary

of War is extended over the navigable waters of the United States for the purpose manifestly of protecting navigation.

Mr. ALLEN. For the purposes of navigation and commerce.

Mr. CARTER. And in connection with navigation the right is given to protect the bottom of the sea, the lakes, the inlets, and shoal waters from excavation or intrusion or invasion by any person except by a permit from the Secretary of War.

Mr. ALLEN. If the Senator will permit me, suppose there is no necessity for improvement at this harbor, but a man goes to the Secretary of War and says, "There is gold underlying the waters there; there is no necessity for improvement for navigation purposes, but I should like to have a permit to go there and deepen the harbor and receive my compensation in the gold or precious minerals that I can find in the sand," does not the Senator realize that a permit granted under those circumstances is a mere subterfuge and does not come within the purview of this statute?

Mr. CARTER. I think that the permit comes within the purview of this statute precisely as a permit granted to a farmer on the New Jersey coast to build a pier out into the sea a hundred feet for his own accommodation would come within the authority of the Secretary of War under this section of the statute.

Mr. COCKRELL. But it gives no monopoly of that right.

Mr. CARTER. No monopoly was granted here. None was pretended to be granted.

Mr. ALLEN. If the Senator will permit me, the power granted by this statute is a power to improve the harbor for commercial purposes.

Mr. CARTER. The Senator in that respect is in error. The authority granted here is for the purpose of preventing injury to the navigable waters of the United States and not for the improvement of them.

Mr. ALLEN. Injury in what respect?

Mr. CARTER. By placing obstructions, making injurious excavations, or in any one of the many ways in which navigation might be injuriously affected.

Mr. ALLEN. But, if the Senator will bear with me, it is not claimed that in any one of these instances there was any necessity for improvement or a necessity for any repairs to that harbor at that time.

Mr. CARTER. None whatever; nor was it expected that any repairs would ever be made along that coast.

Mr. ALLEN. Now, then, if there was no necessity for improvement, why does the Secretary of War, under this slimsy power or slimsy statute, which does not cover his case at all, grant permits the primary and sole purpose of which is to go into those waters and disturb commerce by mining?

Mr. CARTER. The Secretary of War did not give a mining permit, but gave such a formal permit as would relieve the individual obtaining it from the penalty of the statute that was manifestly not intended by Congress to apply under such conditions.

Mr. ALLEN. I suppose he knew that the permit was valuable only in consequence of the minerals, and that that was the chief purpose in taking out the permit. Is not that knowledge to be construed as a part of the permit, and is it not to be construed into a permit to mine?

Mr. COCKRELL. And excluding everybody else.

Mr. ALLEN. And excluding other persons from doing so?

Mr. CARTER. Mr. President, there was no exclusion and no intention to exclude.

Mr. COCKRELL. Did it not operate in that way?

Mr. CARTER. The Secretary of War merely relieved the individual who received the permit from the penalties of a statute which would inevitably and by operation of law apply to the individual if not protected by the permit.

Mr. ALLEN. Did not the Secretary of War thereby say, "You may go on and mine those sands ad libitum?"

Mr. WOLCOTT. May I interrupt the Senator from Montana to answer the Senator from Nebraska, as the Senator from Montana and I have both looked more or less into this question?

Mr. CARTER. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. WOLCOTT. In the waters of Cape Nome, below the low-water mark, where developments have shown that the soil is rich and the sands are gold bearing, they have to be reached by boats and dredges, for, as a matter of fact, there is no navigation there; there is no channel to help or to injure. Those sands are far away from the possibilities of development by helping the channel by excavation or injuring navigation by their presence; but when prospectors for gold reached those waters they found the presence of a statute upon our books which never was intended to apply to such a case as this, for in the whole history of the world there never was a time when the rich alluvial sands under the ocean bore gold until here.

But this statute existed. It was a form of prohibition along our coast forbidding anybody to excavate or dredge except under the authority of the Secretary of War. It was a fiction so far as its applicability to these soils went; but it was an existing statute forbidding work. Whereupon the Secretary of War issued these permits, Congress not having acted. He issued the permits indifferently to every responsible person who applied for them, to do away with the formality of the statute. There seems to have been no favoritism, no desire on anybody's part to exclude anybody, but to open the land so far as could be in this anomalous condition, and to do away with the prohibition of the statute by giving permits alike to every responsible person who asked for them.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I wish the Senator would read that statute.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I have it not with me, but the Senator from Montana [Mr. CARTER] has it.

Mr. CARTER. The statute refers to the prohibition and likewise to the penalty, and will be found in Senate Document No. 239, the response of the Secretary of War to the resolution of the Senate of March 21, 1900.

Mr. ALLEN. Will the Senator from Montana, in the kindness of his heart, indulge me a moment, that I may reply briefly to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. CARTER. Most assuredly, and with great pleasure.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, there is nothing in this statute, not a word, that would give the Secretary of War the power to issue mining permits. It simply provides that—

> It shall not be lawful to excavate or fill, or in any manner to alter or modify the course, location, condition, or capacity of any port, roadstead, haven, harbor, canal, lake, harbor of refuge, or inclosure within the limits of any breakwater, or of the channel of any navigable water of the United States, unless the work has been recommended by the Chief of Engineers and authorized by the Secretary of War prior to beginning the same.

It is not claimed that the Chief of Engineers recommended this.

Mr. CARTER. It is claimed that the Chief of Engineers recommended it in every case. That is the fact.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, without consuming too much of the time of the Senator from Montana, who has been kind enough to give way to me, let me drop this observation: The purpose of this statute was to control the harbors, rivers, havens, bays, etc., within the limits of the United States, for the purposes of navigation. They were put under the charge of the War Department that they might be systematically improved where improvement was necessary, and that individuals and corporations might not run indiscriminately into the navigable waters of the United States, and by excavations disturb the channels and waters, thereby impeding navigation.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. WOLCOTT], I think, correctly states the fact that this condition is anomalous. There has been nothing in the history of the world like it. But, Mr. President, when these parties applied for permission to disturb the waters and the sands beneath them at Cape Nome, it was known that those sands were valuable for mining purposes solely. No person had recommended the dredging at that cape; there was no purpose on the part of Congress to make appropriation to dredge or to widen it, or in any respect to change it from its natural condition; but it was known that the wash of the rivers and creeks from the mainland had put into the sands of Cape Nome large deposits of valuable gold; and when these persons applied to the War Department to secure these permits, that knowledge, at least presumptively, was in the possession of the Secretary of War; and when he granted the permits, he granted them with the full knowledge that the purpose of the licensees was to go into the waters there and dig into those sands for minerals.

Now, do not both the Senator from Colorado and the Senator from Montana believe that it would have been more in keeping with the dignity of a great Cabinet officer to have said, "This harbor does not need improvement at this time; there is no purpose of improving it; let this matter rest until Congress convenes, and let these sands be treated as a part of the mineral reserve of the United States," and withheld these permits and not given these special privileges?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. President, may I remind the Senator from Nebraska that we have by law again and again declared that the mineral lands of the United States are open to entry, prospecting, and occupation by citizens of the United States or those who have declared their intention to become such; and does not the Senator from Nebraska know that the lust for gold stops at nothing? Wherever there are valuable metals to be found—the Arctic region is not too far north, nor the Torrid region too hot for men to search for them—and to say to such men, to these hardy prospectors, "Until Congress acts you shall not get at these shifting sands under the water" would have been, first, to deny to the people their rights, and second, would have been a useless effort to prevent those hardy prospectors from doing what they would be sure to attempt. Does not the Senator think that what the Secretary of War did was the wisest possible thing—to issue permits, and not leave those people in the technical position of violating the law?

Mr. ALLEN. No, Mr. President, the Secretary of War simply perverted a statute which was intended to protect the harbors and navigable waters of the United States and territory under the jurisdiction of the United States Government from disturbance

by interlopers. He simply perverted that statute, which has no relation whatever to mining, into granting mining permits to a few individuals to go into the harbor and mine without restraint. However much it may be glossed over, that is what it is.

Mr. DAVIS. I should like to know whether any of these permits covered any particular area of surface or are they general?

Mr. CARTER. The permits protect the persons within certain specified limits. The Secretary of War very wisely refrained from granting to any person an unlimited right as to the extent of country to disturb the waters of Bering Sea.

Mr. DAVIS. Was it to equally protect every person having a permit within certain limits?

Mr. CARTER. Unquestionably.

Mr. DAVIS. And not giving any exclusive privileges?

Mr. CARTER. Not giving any privileges or exclusive rights. It was not a permit to mine, and by no kind of contortion can it be made to appear so. It was an exemption from the penalties of the statute.

Mr. ALLEN. Suppose some other person had gone on to the 2-mile limit granted to this particular individual. What would have happened to him?

Mr. CARTER. If he had a permit he would be exempt from prosecution—simply that, and nothing more.

Mr. ALLEN. Suppose one man was granted a 2-mile permit, and possibly some interloper, having the lust for gold to which the Senator from Colorado [Mr. WOLCOTT] has referred, and which I presume exists, had gone on to that 2-mile limit. What would have happened to him?

Mr. CARTER. Why, Mr. President, 100 permits might have been granted to as many persons for excavating within the same square mile.

Mr. ALLEN. I know; but here are 2 miles granted to one individual.

Mr. CARTER. The individual in that permit named can not be prosecuted by the authorities of the United States for excavating sand within that limit; and if another person without a permit should go on it, he would become liable to the penalties provided by law.

Mr. ALLEN. Suppose some other person having a permit had gone on the sands of a person holding a permit; what would have been his status?

Mr. CARTER. His status would have been that of any other person who disregarded the laws of the United States. Having the possibility of getting a permit, and having neglected so to do, he would incur the penalty, of course.

Mr. ALLEN. Was not the permit really the granting of an exclusive easement in the licensee?

Mr. CARTER. It was not, and can not be so considered. The licenses granted would have been granted to any citizen of the United States, or any person having declared his intention to become such, upon application to the Secretary of War in the manner prescribed by the law of the country.

Mr. ALLEN. The Senator does not apprehend my question. A receives a permit extending over 2 miles——

Mr. CARTER. Certainly.

Mr. ALLEN. And B, without a permit, trespasses upon the land embraced within A's permit. The Senator says B would be a trespasser and amenable to the law.

Mr. CARTER. Not as against A. He would be a violator of the laws of the United States, and could not protect himself, if prosecuted, by showing a permit.

Mr. ALLEN. Does not the Senator think it would have been wiser for the Secretary of War to have declared that all these lands, if they were to be opened by an order of his, should be open to the public indiscriminately?

Mr. CARTER. But if the Senator will read the statute to which I have repeatedly referred, he will find that the permit can only be granted on application presented through the Chief of Engineers and recommended by him. Permits can not be made by invisible people; the action of the Secretary of War can not have been based upon a dream.

Mr. ALLEN. No; but could not the Chief of Engineers have recommended the opening of the whole tide lands or the whole bottom of the cape?

Mr. CARTER. Not upon his own motion.

Mr. ALLEN. I know; but in the same way he did recommend it, could he not have recommended it to be opened up to all persons?

Mr. CARTER. I think the Secretary of War fairly construed the law, and I think the Senator will perceive that his contention is not well founded in that behalf.

Mr. ALLEN. I claim this law has no application whatever to the case.

Mr. CARTER. That is what the Secretary of War thought, and he thought therefore the penalties of the law ought not to be applied to persons going upon that coast.

Mr. ALLEN. Why did not the Secretary of War open the whole thing up to the people to go there indiscriminately, as miners go into any other mining camp?

Mr. CARTER. The Secretary of War undoubtedly felt that Congress, having given him warrant for action, expected him to act in all proper cases. It is not the province of the Secretary of War or of any other Cabinet minister or officer of the Government to do more than execute the law as passed by Congress and approved by the President.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I should like to call attention to the language of the law in question. It does not seem to me that there was any occasion for any permit to be asked from the Secretary of War or from anybody else to excavate those sands. The law quoted by the Secretary of War himself is as follows:

> It shall not be lawful to excavate or fill or in any manner to alter or modify the course, location, condition, or capacity of any port, roadstead, haven, harbor, canal, lake, harbor of refuge, or inclosure within the limits of any breakwater, or of the channel of any navigable water of the United States, unless the work has been recommended by the Chief of Engineers and authorized by the Secretary of War prior to beginning the same.

I do not believe by any legitimate construction that can be held to apply to every particle of shore line of the United States away from a harbor or the mouth of a river or a breakwater or a canal. One of these permits here given states that it is 12 miles away from the mouth of Snake River. It seems to me the operation of the permit is simply this: Where there is no law to forbid persons going and excavating these sands, the Secretary of War has been induced to issue an order which, in effect, says that under this law no one, except by permission, may go and excavate these sands. He issued an order to Mr. George Max Esterly, of Seattle, Wash., in these words:

> And whereas Mr. George Max Esterly, of Seattle, Wash., has applied to the Secretary of War for permission to excavate or fill within the following-described area in Bering Sea, near the mouth of Snake River, Alaska, commencing at a point 200 feet east of the junction of mean low-tide water on Bering Sea and the mean low water at the mouth and on the east bank of Snake River, which latter empties into Bering Sea about 12 miles a little north of west of Cape Nome, in Alaska; then extending along on the said mean low-tide line in a general westerly direction for a distance of 2 miles, and extending out 500 feet from the mean low-tide line, which work has been recommended by the Chief of Engineers:
>
> Now, therefore, this is to certify that the Secretary of War hereby gives permission to said George Max Esterly and assigns to excavate or fill within the area described above in Bering Sea, near the mouth of Snake River, Alaska, upon the following condition:
>
> That the work herein permitted to be done shall not interfere with navigation or the rights of riparian owners, and shall be subject to the supervision and approval of the commanding general, Department of Alaska.

This permit begins 200 feet away from low water, at the mouth of Snake River, and runs 2 miles along the coast, where there is no river, no harbor, no canal, nothing on the face of the earth but open coast line. The Secretary of War has been induced to issue this order; and this Mr. Esterly will go in and say, "The Secretary of War says it is not lawful for any man to come here and excavate unless he does it by my permission. I am the only one who has permission; and you people who propose to come here and excavate and mine must, under the law, get out." The order of the Secretary of War has been obtained to put a meaning on the law that it has not, that it can not have, and that no court of justice anywhere in the world will give it.

It seems to me to be an absolutely indefensible outrage. I can not imagine any excuse for it. There is certainly nothing in the law to justify it, because it does not apply to an open coast line such as this, and can not be made to apply to it.

The next permit says:

> And whereas F. S. Wood, of Alliance, Ohio, has applied to the Secretary of War for permission to excavate and fill within the following-described area in Bering Sea, near the mouth of Snake River, Alaska, commencing at mean low tide 3 miles east of the mouth of Snake River, which latter empties into Bering Sea about 12 miles a little north of west of Cape Nome, in Alaska; and from said point extending 1 mile east along shore at mean low tide and extending out into Bering Sea 500 feet, thus covering a space of 1 mile by 500 feet, which work has been recommended by the Chief of Engineers, subject to the condition hereinafter set forth:
>
> Now, therefore, this is to certify that the Secretary of War hereby gives unto said F. S. Wood and assigns permission to excavate and fill within the area described above, it being understood that this instrument is simply a permission to excavate and fill under said act, and is not exclusive within said area—

That language is not in the first permit. The first permit has no such words; and we all understand that a man thousands of miles away from the seat of government, hundreds of miles away from any court of justice, will claim that the order of the Secretary of War, putting those words in one permit and not putting them in the other, would mean that the other man had the right to claim that his privilege was exclusive, and to use it for himself alone, to the exclusion of everybody else. In addition, this second permit, this exemption from penalty by prosecution, makes it assignable, allows the holder to transfer his indemnity, which he derives from the Secretary of War, to anybody else who chooses to take it. It goes to F. S. Wood and his assigns, anybody to whom he proposes or chooses to transfer his immunity from prosecution.

It can go from him by assignment. That is a valuable right. What would be the use of having it assignable if any other man

had the same right and there was nothing exclusive in it, excepting it be claimed that this man having gone to the Secretary of War and got this right, the other man could not come in? There would be nobody there to protect such people, no court there to vindicate their rights, but only such laws as the miners may choose to enact. It is a simple means of driving honest miners out of an opportunity to labor and to confer the prosecution of this whole business on a handful, or at least a few, people who are considered responsible.

I did not finish reading that paragraph. It continues:

and that it may be withdrawn as to future work at the discretion of the Secretary of War.

Why has the Secretary of War the right to withdraw this sort of a permit and forbid people the right of excavating sands along the shore line of the country? The law he quotes only authorizes him to interfere where there is a likelihood of injury being done to some navigable water, to a harbor, to a breakwater, to a canal, to a river. It is not intended, never was intended, and can not by any violence of construction be held to apply to the simple shore line of the United States.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. President, the statement of the Secretary of War very clearly sets forth the reasons why the permits were granted, and, with the permission of the Senate, I will insert in my remarks the portion of the statement which is explanatory.

WAR DEPARTMENT, *Washington, March 23, 1900.*

To the Senate of the United States:

I have the honor to reply to the following resolution of the Senate, dated March 21, 1900.

"*Resolved*, That the Secretary of War be directed to inform the Senate whether any concessions or grants to excavate the gold-bearing bed of the sea at or in the vicinity of Cape Nome, in Alaska, or in other Alaskan waters, has been made to any individual or individuals, or to any corporation or association of individuals, by the Secretary of War, or by any other official of the War Department, and, if so, to inform the Senate upon what theory of power or authority, if any, such concessions or grants were made."

No concessions or grants to excavate the gold-bearing bed of the sea at or in the vicinity of Cape Nome, in Alaska, or in other Alaskan waters, have been made by the Secretary of War or any other official of the War Department. Numerous applications have been received by the War Department for permits to excavate in the bed of the ocean in the vicinity of Cape Nome, in Alaska, in the exercise of the authority conferred upon the Chief of Engineers and the Secretary of War by section 10 of the act of Congress approved March 3, 1899, which provides:

"* * * It shall not be lawful to excavate or fill, or in any manner to alter or modify the course, location, condition, or capacity of any port, roadstead, haven, harbor, canal, lake, harbor of refuge, or inclosure within the limits of any breakwater, or of the channel of any navigable water of the United States, unless the work has been recommended by the Chief of Engineers and authorized by the Secretary of War prior to beginning the same."

Section 12 of the same statute makes it a criminal offense to excavate without the required authority, however lawful the work may otherwise be, and provides that the offender "on conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine not exceeding $2,500 nor less than $500, or by imprisonment not exceeding one year, or by both such punishments, in the discretion of the court." As this statute was designed solely for the protection of navigation, it has been the practice of the War Department to grant permits to persons desiring to excavate for any purpose when the work is not such as to injuriously affect navigation and is otherwise lawful. Permits thus granted are not exclusive; they do not preclude any number of similar permits applicable to the same territory; they are not grants or concessions, and they confer no rights whatever except immunity from prosecution under the statute above quoted secured in accordance with the terms of the statute and by reason of a compliance with the provisions thereof.

As there seems to be no legal reason why all citizens of the United States should not have the same opportunity to prospect for gold and acquire mining rights under the mining laws upon land under water as they have upon lands not under water, the Department determined, as a general policy in the exercise of the discretion vested in the Chief of Engineers and Secretary of War by this statute, to relieve all citizens applying from the obstacle interposed by this statute so long as their proposed operations do not in fact interfere with navigation. All applications made under this statute have accordingly, so far as it has been possible to dispose of them, received favorable action. No application of this description has been denied. Upon two, permits have been granted. Upon a third, papers have been prepared and were awaiting the Secretary of War's signature at the time of the passage of your resolution. Three others were approved by the Chief of Engineers and were in the hands of the Judge-Advocate-General for the preparation of the necessary papers. Eleven others are still in the office of the Chief of Engineers in process of examination upon the question whether they interfere with navigation. Four more just received are in the office of the Secretary of War, and will to-day be sent to the Chief of Engineers.

Unless otherwise directed by Congress, the Secretary of War will deem it his duty, in the exercise of the discretion vested in him by law, to grant permits in all of these cases and upon all other similar applications by citizens of the United States, provided that the work proposed does not injuriously affect navigation.

I annex hereto a copy of the form of permit prepared by the Judge-Advocate-General and used by the first two cases, and also an amended form which has been prepared by the Judge-Advocate-General for the Secretary of War's signature in the three cases mentioned, and which is being followed in the preparation of the papers in the other cases.

Very respectfully,

ELIHU ROOT,
Secretary of War.

It is true this permit was made to the person named and to his assigns. That was a very proper thing to do.

Mr. COCKRELL. One question. Does the Chief of Engineers, then, pass upon the right of that assignee or does the Secretary of War thus delegate this right of the Chief of Engineers and himself to this one man, so that he can pick out anybody he chooses?

Mr. CARTER. Mr. President, I have no doubt the Secretary of War intended the most liberal issue and the most liberal and unrestrained use of the privileges of mining within the waters under his jurisdiction without any possibility of prosecution by the Federal authorities.

It has been the settled policy of this Government since gold was discovered in the country on the public domain to encourage the exploration, location, and development of mines. In the Cape Nome country the miners, in prospecting, came down to the waters of the sea, and there found that the rich gravel extended far beyond and under the water; but, as the Senator from Colorado [Mr. WOLCOTT] has stated, at that point they were confronted by a penal statute of the United States, which said "thus far, but no farther." They found in the laws of the country what they believed constituted an authority in an executive officer to exempt them from the penalties to be inflicted if they invaded this sacred soil under the sea. They applied to the Secretary of War. Whereupon, recognizing the settled policy of the country to encourage rather than to retard the development of its mineral resources, and acting upon the inspiration drawn from that settled policy, the Secretary of War concluded that this penal statute was not intended to restrain the legitimate development of the mining industry. Actuated by that view, he issued these permits.

Now comes the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. JONES], and in glowing terms he informs us that the jurisdiction of the Secretary of War is complete over some of the navigable waters of Bering Sea, but not complete over other navigable waters of Bering Sea; or, in other words, the theory of the Senator from Arkansas would compel us to take a sounding line and determine by depth of water, if you please, where the jurisdiction of the Secretary of War ended and where nobody's jurisdiction applied. Are you to stop the Secretary of War where the water is 10 feet deep or 20 feet deep or 30 feet deep? Is his jurisdiction to be limited to 1 fathom or 10 fathoms? If the theory of construction and limitation upon his authority contended for by the Senator from Arkansas be true, then the exact line of his jurisdiction can never be determined until you have actually determined, first, the depth of the water which shall be the test, and then the depth of the water at the place where the party proposes to mine.

No, Mr. President, that is not a correct conception of the law nor a correct construction of it. The United States Government intended that some officer should have jurisdiction over navigable waters. In the wisdom of Congress that jurisdiction was placed in the Secretary of War; and it extends over all bodies of water within the 3-mile limit of the seashore and within the jurisdiction of the United States.

Mr. President, it would seem that the exemption of an American citizen from a penalty, simply that, because nothing else was done, constituted a heinous offense, an outrage of the most gigantic proportions, according to the version of the Senator from Arkansas. These permits, according to the declared purpose of the Secretary of War, have been issued without limitation as to persons, to citizens of the United States or persons who have declared their intention to become such; and, further still, the Secretary of War says, in a clear, straightforward, manly, and unmistakable way, relying for authority upon the law, believing that under his oath of office it is his duty to execute it according to the light given him, he will continue to issue these permits until Congress shall otherwise direct.

Now, in the amendment here proposed we think we otherwise direct. We relieve the citizen upon that extensive coast of Bering Sea from the necessity of coming forward in each and every case and making an application through the Chief of Engineers; we allow every citizen and every person who has declared his intention to become a citizen to mine, explore, and excavate below mean high tide on the shores of Bering Sea within our jurisdiction, subject only to such reasonable limitations as may be necessary to prevent the actual obstruction of commerce, and subject to such reasonable rules and regulations as the miners themselves may prescribe. That is the sum and substance of the amendment. Its adoption is in harmony with the purpose of the Secretary of War, and will obviate the necessity for the issuance of innumerable permits, because it will give him general authority.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Mr. President, the Senator from Montana always sheds light on any question he discusses; and I find that I see very much more clearly, and I think I understand much more fully the purpose and the origin of this permit system than I did before the Senator submitted his last remarks. He says, as I understand him, that these people in Alaska found this law, which would prevent their making these excavations, and they came down here and asked permission of the Secretary of War to be allowed to excavate. I had supposed up to this time that this thing was simply a blunder of somebody in the War Department. I think now it is perfectly clear that it was a deliberate scheme on the part of a few people who wanted to monopolize the whole of those rich gold-bearing sands, that they found this section of the statute, and choose to put a construction upon it which no court will put upon it, and which I do not believe the Senator from Montana himself will say that any Senator would put upon it, to wit, that it should cover and protect from excavation the sands along all the coasts of the country.

I wish to read that section of the statute again, and to call the special attention of Senators to it. It is as follows:

It shall not be lawful to excavate or fill, or in any other manner to alter or modify the course, location, condition, or capacity of any port, roadstead, haven, harbor, canal, lake, harbor of refuge, or inclosure within the limits of any breakwater, or of the channel of any navigable water of the United States, etc.

Will any man say that this piece of open coast line is either a port or a roadstead?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Why not a roadstead?

Mr. LODGE. Why not a roadstead?

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Because, being between the low-water mark and 500 feet below, it is utterly impossible for it to be a roadstead. You could not make a roadstead of it or conceive it to be a roadstead. A roadstead goes farther out to sea. A roadstead never comes within 500 feet of the shore line, because it is very shallow and it is utterly impossible to have a boat on it. I do not believe it is possible for that sort of construction to be put on that at all, but I do believe that this section of the statute was picked out as a pretext for the purpose of enabling these people, who wanted to monopolize all of this gold-bearing sand, to do so. They came down and got their permits from the Secretary, and one of which went to the extent of 2 miles away from the river, not touching the channel of the river, not going anywhere where this law would apply, and running 2 miles up the coast line. Then he will claim that every other man who chooses to shovel a shovelful of sand within those 2 miles is a trespasser, because he has not the permission of the Secretary of War. He therefore makes it his own and holds it.

After this had gone on some time it seems the Secretary of War put into another permit, application for which came along afterwards, that it was not exclusive; that he himself had the right to allow other people to go there, but that they could not go there unless they had the right from him. It seems to me to be the most unfair proposition I ever heard of to undertake to make this law, which was never intended to apply to such a situation as this, but was intended to protect the navigable waters of the United States, apply to a condition of this kind.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. President, with some of the observations of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. JONES] I personally am in agreement. It is a fact, however, that for months and months citizens of the Cape Nome district have been actively urging upon Congress and upon those of us who come from mining States some legislation—the devising of some method whereby this soil and the deposits under the low-water mark could be worked. I agree, and so I have no doubt the Secretary of War would agree, that any attempt by the summoning of this statute to his assistance to give to anybody an exclusive mining right would be in violation of law and unjustifiable.

Perhaps he might have met it. The obvious way to meet the situation would have been to issue a general proclamation declaring that outside of certain streams, or outside of certain portions of the harbor or the roadstead, the statute should not be deemed and held to apply; but there was an excellent reason for not doing this. That reason was that in the crowd and press of people in that district, where the law is imperfectly administered, where they are not yet enjoying a civil government, it might have led to friction and to trouble and to all sorts of contests and injury. There is land enough up there that is rich, I am told, and so I suppose the Secretary of War, to avoid the clashing of interests, sought not to grant exclusive rights, but sought to give everybody the right, and so to cover the ground that there should be as little conflict as possible. That is all. He was working under an imperfect statute concerning a case to which the statute did not apply. But all that the Senator from Arkansas has said is an argument in favor of the amendment offered by the Senator from Montana. I think all will agree to that.

But, Mr. President, I am compelled to suggest an amendment to the amendment offered by the Senator from Montana. The amendment offered by the Senator from Montana provides that the miners of the mining district may make such rules and regulations as they see fit for governing the working of these deposits. As has been said before, the policy of the law, the open declaration of our statutes, is that the mineral lands of the United States are open to exploration and occupation and possession by all of its citizens or those who have declared their intention to become citizens of the United States. This is an anomalous case. All of our mining statutes apply to lodes and to placer claims.

In lode mining the length of the claim is limited to 1,500 feet and its width to 600, but the law gives permission to the States and Territories and the rules of miners in the district to make the parallelogram smaller. The law also limits placer grounds to 20 acres in the possession of one person, or says an association of people may take a hundred and sixty acres, the policy of the law being to limit the mining claim to a small but sufficient area to secure its active development. The policy of this Government is, of course, to get out the precious metals from the earth, and prospecting is encouraged by limiting the area so as not to make it too small, but enough to protect the miner in its use. The law provides that these rules and customs of miners shall prevail subject to the general law which limits the maximum of the areas.

Now, the amendment of the Senator from Montana says that the rules as to the development of this area shall be in accordance with the rules and customs of miners in the district. If it should be so that but comparatively few people are there now to those who shall come hereafter, and if it should be that the policy of those now upon the ground should be to enlarge greatly the area which might be taken, the policy of our law in that respect might be overridden; and therefore I hope the Senator from Montana will permit an amendment providing that they shall secure the approval of the Secretary of War of the rules and customs of the miners in the district, and which, although, as I have said, the situation is entirely anomalous, shall perhaps as well provide that the rules and regulations for mining shall be, so far as is feasible, in accordance with existing law.

I do not suppose out in the open sea you could limit a man to 20 acres, but you could perhaps limit an association to a hundred and sixty acres. I do not know how they could anchor their claims. The boundaries would be difficult and fluctuating, and yet there ought to be an ability to declare some law that would be, so far as feasible, in accordance with existing statutes, and I do not think the miners of the district ought to arbitrarily make a final rule as to the area, the work required, and the other regulations which shall govern mining, but it should be done by the experts of the Interior Department, until after further investigation and development Congress may pass the necessary legislation.

Mr. COCKRELL. Will the Senator from Colorado yield for a question?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Certainly.

Mr. COCKRELL. What would be the effect of that amendment on the regulations that the miners there have already prescribed and laid down?

Mr. WOLCOTT. The regulations as to mining in any territory where the laws of the United States prevail could not now exceed the existing area, I should think; but this amendment authorizes them to make rules which will arbitrarily govern.

Mr. COCKRELL. The Senator would then hold that any rule made up to this time——

Mr. WOLCOTT. Must be in accordance with existing law.

Mr. COCKRELL. Could not be in contravention of the provisions of existing law?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Certainly.

Mr. STEWART. I suggest that they would form companies to work in the sea and get 160 acres, and that ought to be ample.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I wonder if it is. I do not know how those seas are. I have seen waves that high; they looked so.

Mr. STEWART. I think if the Senator would amend it so that the extent should not exceed——

Mr. WOLCOTT. Let me ask the Senator, who is an experienced mining lawyer, whether he does not think the rules and regulations of miners should be first approved and regulated by the Secretary of War, and should be, so far as feasible, in accordance with existing law?

Mr. STEWART. I think you can do it in a word here. I think I would not confine them as to shape, the rectangular shape, by the law.

Mr. COCKRELL. Why not?

Mr. STEWART. I will tell you why. The areas should not exceed a certain maximum. Take so much front and go on down. Fifteen hundred feet might not be sufficient in length, because the water might be shallow. I would let them vary the shape, but they should not increase the area above that allowed by statute.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Let me suggest an amendment.

Mr. STEWART. That was very common in California, I will say, where they had a mountain that had an ore bed in the gravel, and they would locate along for miles and miles, so many feet front, running into the hill without limit. They might have so many feet on the beach, running down without limit.

Mr. WOLCOTT. As far as the Sandwich Islands?

Mr. STEWART. But the area should not exceed the amount allowed by law—a hundred and sixty acres. They might make it, say, 10 feet wide, and arrange all that.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Just keep right around the earth?

Mr. STEWART. Yes.

Mr. WOLCOTT. And come out at the other end?

Mr. STEWART. Limit the area, but let them fix the shape. I think I can amend it.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I suggest this amendment to the consideration of the Senator from Montana and the consideration of the Senate, and let us see if it meets the views of those interested in the mining feature of this bill:

It shall be the duty of the Secretary of the Interior to declare and publish proper rules and regulations whereby the auriferous deposits in Alaska which lie below the low-water mark of the ocean and its tributaries shall, if feasible, be open to exploration and development by citizens of the United States, which said rules and regulations shall, so far as is practicable, be in accordance with existing statutes as applicable to placer mining. The rules and customs of miners in mining district nearest said deposits shall, when not inconsistent with such regulations, be recognized and shall govern the working

of said deposits. The authority of the Secretary of War respecting said auriferous deposits shall be limited to policing the same, and to protecting navigation as he is now by law empowered. Any grants or rights heretofore granted respecting said deposits by any authority are hereby declared void and of no further effect.

Mr. STEWART. The objection to the proposed amendment is that it can not be carried into effect speedily enough. The idea is very good, but we must reflect that there are ten or fifteen thousand people there who must be provided for before the Secretary could get the rules and regulations out there.

Mr. WOLCOTT. You can not telegraph them. Something has got to get there. A fellow has to carry them out. Why could he not carry the regulations out just as well as a copy of the law?

Mr. STEWART. I doubt whether the Secretary will be able to make rules until after he has made further examination. I think very likely he would be as much in the dark about the regulations as we, and if he were to take time, as such officers always do, to correspond, these regulations would not get there for six months or a year after the passage of the act. Many acts have been passed requiring the Secretary to make regulations, and I never knew them to get out inside of six months, and we could not wait for that delay.

I would suggest, and perhaps it can be framed, an amendment to limit the area, and allow the shape to be elastic; and with that addition I think the amendment of the Senator from Montana is perfect.

Mr. COCKRELL. Why not make it a parallelogram of some kind?

Mr. STEWART. Well, a parallelogram.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BACON in the chair). Has the Senator from Colorado offered an amendment?

Mr. WOLCOTT. No; I do not offer it. I was merely suggesting it to the Senator from Montana; but I apologize for having interfered with his course of conduct of the bill.

Mr. BATE. Is the area indicated in the amendment to the amendment?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I say it shall be as far as practicable in accordance with existing law, and shall be under regulations declared by the Secretary of War, and that, subject to these rules and regulations, the rules and customs of miners shall govern.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I was somewhat surprised to hear the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. JONES] say that it could not be a roadstead because it is within 500 feet of the shore. I know a number of roadsteads which are within my own personal observation every summer where boats ride, and they are roadsteads within 50 yards of the shore and sometimes much nearer. A roadstead—I find my impression is correct—is a place near the shore where vessels may anchor, differing from a harbor in not being sheltered. A roadstead may be an open roadstead, or it may be a sheltered roadstead. Hampton Roads is sheltered, but it may be an open road. It is merely a place where vessels may anchor. That is all it amounts to, and it may be within 500 feet or 500 yards or 2,500 yards. It is a very general expression. There are plenty of places where there are cities with ports which are merely open roads—that is, nothing but the open shore—and the vessel only gets anchorage.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I was not conscious of saying it could not be a roadstead because it was within 500 feet of the shore.

Mr. LODGE. I so understood.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I am sure ports may be within 500 feet of the shore. My understanding was that this permit was given to excavate for 500 feet from the shore, because that was about the width in which the sand could be easily reached and from which the water would in great measure recede, and the water would be very shallow in that place, along the coast, and I inferred that it could in no sense be a roadstead. If there is any statement that this is a roadstead, then, of course, the Secretary might have the right to grant these permits, but I do not suppose there is any roadstead or that anybody would say that there is a roadstead on any part of this ground. It would have to appear affirmatively that there is a roadstead before that could be the case. The definition of a roadstead, as I see it in Worcester's Dictionary, is an anchorage at some distance from shore, which, I think, is correct, and which, it seems to me, would not bring any of the proposed territory within this law, as quoted by the Secretary of War.

Mr. LODGE. The only defined point about a roadstead is that it is an anchorage. Judging from the map, there are no harbors within 50 or 60 miles of Cape Nome. There is nothing near the gold-mining strip. They have to take vessels there to land passengers and all that, and if vessels anchor off that region in Cape Nome, as they doubtless will, in order to land passengers and freight and all that, that constitutes it a roadstead.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I have no doubt about that, but I had no idea that where a vessel can anchor such permits would be granted.

Mr. LODGE. Anywhere where a vessel can anchor is a roadstead.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. This would not reach any such place.

Mr. LODGE. I do not know about that.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I say if it does not, the law does not apply.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. President, the amendment presented by the Senator from Colorado I have read and glanced at merely, but in a general way I may state now the obstacles in the way of Congress in legislating upon this question. It has been held over and over again that the Government of the United States holds the tide lands along the shores of navigable waters of Territories in trust for the future State. We can not without a violation of that trust apply the general mining laws in such manner as to attempt to give a fee-simple title to the locator. This rule would apply not only to tide lands, but to the lands beyond the tide or low mean tide mark. The amendment pending provides for only temporary possession by the miners. It avoids reference to the mining laws because of the apprehension that by some course of construction it might hereafter be contended that title could be obtained to the tide lands under the general mining laws of the United States.

This amendment as presented merely grants unrestrained permission to miners to temporarily explore and possess these tide lands and shallow waters for mining purposes until otherwise provided by law. We allow a mere easement. It is true that in the enjoyment of the easement the estate may be to some extent despoiled, but we do not pretend to give a fee-simple title, nor do we use any language calculated so to imply. I believe that in the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado we might at some time in the future encounter construction which would lead to widespread litigation relative to this trust property. I think we ought to hold the trust sacred. Yet we are confronted by a condition where hundreds and thousands of our citizens are going forth to explore that country for gold, and it is the desire that we should permit them to go unrestrained upon the tide lands and over the shallow waters for that purpose.

In the Seattle tide-land cases the Supreme Court of the United States held that the land within the limits of the tide flats was not subject to disposition by Congress. We do not pretend to dispose of the fee or of the soil, but to permit a mere temporary use of both. I believe it is better to leave the disposition of matters of detail to the miners on the ground than to undertake to allow a clerk in the office of the Secretary of the Interior, 6,000 miles away, to deal with conditions of which he has little or no knowledge. From last December until this the residents of Alaska district have been importuning Congress to pass some law which would govern and regulate the operations of miners on the tide lands. We have steadily refrained from attempting any legislation, because of a lack of knowledge concerning the subject. In our ignorance of what to do we might do that which would trouble the miners there and come back to trouble us here.

This amendment transfers from Congress to the American citizens directly in charge of the subject the power, which is but temporary, to govern and control their workings from day to day. No title can be obtained save of a possessory kind. That title the miners may provide, and I believe will provide, shall hang from day to day upon the possession of the individual in the actual work of mining. It would be a calamity; it would be an injury and an injustice to the prospectors in the country to permit A, B, C, and D, under general rules and regulations of the Secretary of the Interior, to stake out a portion of the shallow water and tide lands and then move back into the States after performing trifling assessment work. It is an inclement climate. It is not a pleasant place to remain any great length of time, if all reports be true, or if half of what is said be true.

The miner will go there by the earliest boat moving out from Seattle, Tacoma, Portland, or San Francisco; will press his way through the gorging ice of Bering Sea and reach the gold coast of Cape Nome. He will desire to go to work at once. Not a day can he afford to lose, because the summer will be short and a severe winter will drive him home. In the meantime, Mr. President, he will meet others situated exactly as he is situated; he will meet these other men from everywhere—from the States and Territories of the Union—men familiar with miners' meanings, men familiar with their system of legislating, and in the meeting which will result from common impulse rules and regulations will be evolved permeated with justice and specially suited to the situation.

Mr. COCKRELL. When is that meeting to be held?

Mr. CARTER. That meeting comes together in a mining camp as naturally as the rain falls from the sky.

Mr. COCKRELL. Suppose that, as soon as this bill passes, there are, say, fifty or a hundred men there on the ground. They immediately hold a meeting and lay down their rules and regulations to suit themselves only. What will become of the others who may come there?

Mr. CARTER. There is no place in this world where true democracy so prevails without taint of any sort as in a mining camp. The majority rules. Laws are modified and holdings are limited, claims are reduced according to the supreme will of the majority. And when the larger crowd come in and find upon

the records of the miners' meetings of days or weeks before some rules or regulations in the interest of a job or a clique, they will assemble and wipe out such rules without ceremony or faltering. That is the way they do it. The Senator from Nevada knows of that. He passed through the early days of Nevada and California. My colleague, the Senator from Montana, knows of it, as does the senior Senator from Colorado. A dozen witnesses in this Chamber can bear testimony to the fact that in the miners' meeting you get the quintessence of simple justice.

The junior Senator frem Colorado would transfer this to an $1,800 clerk in the Interior Department, who I am sure does not know as much about it as any Senator in this Chamber, and there is not a Senator in the Chamber to-day who would dare sit down at his desk and attempt to prescribe rules and regulations to govern conditions of which he has only speculative knowledge. I think the amendment presented here may well and safely be adopted. I think its operation will prove satisfactory. The Senator from Nevada suggests, as does the Senator from Colorado, that we might provide that in no case shall rules and regulations allow the possession of a larger area than that prescribed by the placer-mining laws of the United States.

Mr. COCKRELL. Is not that right?

Mr. CARTER. I think the Senator from Nevada is preparing such an amendment. I will gladly accept it, because it will be a limitation in the right direction. It will fix the maximum and the miners will fix the minimum.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. CARTER. I yield.

Mr. TILLMAN. Will the Senator give us some information on this matter, if he has it? I have seen it in the papers somewhere, I do not recall where—I am interested in this matter only as one Senator here who has been listening to the debate—that the holders of these permits from the Secretary of War had been subletting them by issuing licenses to men at so much a day or something like that, and all others are arrested by the soldiers—Uncle Sam's bluecoats—who are there. If that be true, it would follow that anything the miners might do in a public meeting would have no effect upon the War Department.

Mr. CARTER. If the Senator will permit me a moment, by referring to the document he will find that these permits were issued at a recent date. It will be impossible for any human being to reach the country to which they refer before the 1st day of next June.

Mr. TILLMAN. No; it was last fall that I saw the statement about the soldiers arresting men who did not hold permits of the licensees, licenses, or permits that had been granted by the War Department.

Mr. CARTER. There were no permits granted. I will state, however——

Mr. STEWART. Will the Senator allow me? I suggest an amendment to his amendment, to insert after the word "law:"

Provided, That the rules and regulations of miners shall not authorize larger claims than are allowed by the placer-mining laws of the United States.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. President, I desire to say a word or two in reference to some of the remarks which the Senator from Montana has made respecting this measure. It disturbs me to be compelled to differ with him upon any of the features of this bill concerning Alaska, over which he has spent so much time and which he has so intelligently presented to the Senate, but I hope Senators will consider before they vote on this amendment. When it comes to dealing with the waters of the United States below low-water mark, I think the executive department of the Government should supervise the rules and regulations touching its development. I do not think it should be left to the miners at miners' meetings to declare areas or to declare rules, except subject to the approval of the Government.

It is common and it is unjust to talk about an $1,800 clerk determining the action of one of the great Executive Departments of the Government. The amendment I offered was that the Secretary of the Interior should prescribe the rules and regulations governing the working of these claims. The Senator from Montana assumes that that means an $1,800 clerk. He served for three years as Commissioner of the General Land Office of the United States, and we had some very important promulgations of rules very ably done. Were they done by an $1,800 clerk?

Mr. CARTER. Well, generally so.

Mr. WOLCOTT. If they were, an $1,800 clerk is very competent to deal with this question. But I know they were not. They were done by the Senator from Montana. Our officers who administer the affairs of that Department of the Government are able and intelligent.

The only suggestion I have heard that would militate at all respecting this amendment is the question of time. If the pressure is great, the Department will act with promptitude. I have no question, Mr. President, that everybody will be more contented if the Government of the United States here holds its hand upon the final control of the rules and regulations which may be made for working those claims. I therefore feel impelled to offer the following as a substitute for the amendment of the Senator from Montana. I ask to have it read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

It shall be the duty of the Secretary of the Interior to declare and publish proper rules and regulations whereby the auriferous deposits in Alaska which lie below the low-water mark of the ocean and its tributaries shall, if feasible, be open to exploration and development by citizens of the United States, or those who have declared their intention of becoming such citizens, which said rules and regulations shall, so far as is practicable, be in accordance with existing statutes as applicable to placer mining, and shall limit the area of each claim to the acreage now allowed by law.

The rules and customs of miners in the mining district nearest said deposits shall, when not inconsistent with such regulations, be recognized, and shall govern the working of said deposits.

The authority of the Secretary of War respecting said auriferous deposits shall be limited to policing the same and to protecting navigation, as he is now by law empowered.

Any grants or rights heretofore granted respecting said deposits by any authority are hereby declared void and of no further effect.

Mr. PETTUS. Mr. President, it seems to me that the amendment proposed by the Senator from Montana (Mr. CARTER) ought to prevail. I had some little experience about these matters in old times. The miners, as the Senator from Montana says, are about as just a set of men as I have ever seen assembled together. Rough, self-willed, they govern themselves by a vote of the mining camp. They will govern themselves in that same way in spite of any enactment that we make here, and they govern as justly as Congress could possibly do. They submit to the ruling of the majority. It is a rough rule, but, as a general thing, so far as I have ever observed, and I had more than two years' experience with them as a part of them. They administered their own laws fairly and equally, and they punished the man who violated them with a promptness that would be worthy of all imitation in the courts of the United States. It was done promptly. It is true there was not very much of the statute law in their conduct.

But what the Senator from Montana is aiming at is the right thing to do, because we ought to give sanction to a good government wherever we find it, and we ought to make that lawful which will take place whether you make it or not. Remember that the miners are separated from all other communities; they are off by themselves; they are a community to themselves; they are not interfering with people at a distance; they are not interfering with what is taking place 5 miles off. Their rules have no influence or control, except that they might be imitated. Mr. President, I want the amendment of the Senator from Montana to pass because it is going to be the law in Alaska whether you pass it or not, and I want their conduct to be lawful.

Mr. BATE. In view of what has been said, as many of us know knothing about mining interests or the mode of operating them and want to do what is right in this matter, I think it is proper now to have the amendment of the Senator from Montana read in connection with the one which has just been read, so that we may understand the question clearly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee calls for the reading of the amendment offered by the Senator from Montana. It will be read.

Mr. CARTER. I suggest that in that connection the amendment proposed by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. STEWART], which tends to perfect the amendment offered by me, should be read. I am willing to accept the amendment.

Mr. STEWART. It is, after the word "law," to insert the following:

Provided, That the rules and regulations established by the miners shall not allow the location of mining claims larger in area than placer claims under the laws of the United States.

Mr. CARTER. I accept that, and it may be read in connection with and as part of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read the amendment of the Senator from Montana as modified.

The SECRETARY. On page 23, at the end of section 26, insert the following:

Provided further, That, subject only to such general limitations as may be necessary to exempt navigation from artificial obstructions, all land and shoal water below mean high tide on the shores, bays, and inlets of Bering Sea within the jurisdiction of the United States shall be subject to exploration for gold and other precious metals by citizens of the United States, or persons who have legally declared their intentions to become such, under such reasonable rules and regulations as the miners in organized mining districts may have heretofore made, or may hereafter make governing the temporary possession thereof for exploration and mining purposes, until otherwise provided by law: *Provided further*, That the rules and regulations established by the miners shall not allow the location of mining claims larger in area than placer claims under the laws of the United States, and all permits heretofore granted authorizing any person or persons, corporation or company to excavate or mine under any of said waters are hereby revoked and declared null and void.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I have offered a substitute, which I ask may be read, so that the two may be compared together, and then I shall ask for a vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Colorado will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

It shall be the duty of the Secretary of the Interior to declare and publish proper rules and regulations whereby the auriferous deposits in Alaska which lie below the low-water mark of the ocean and its tributaries shall, if feasible, be open to exploration and development by citizens of the United States or those who have declared their intention of becoming such citizens, which said rules and regulations shall, so far as is practicable, be in accordance with existing statutes as applicable to placer mining, and shall limit the area of each claim to the acreage now allowed by law.

The rules and customs of miners in the mining district nearest said deposits shall, when not inconsistent with such regulations, be recognized, and shall govern the working of said deposits.

The authority of the Secretary of War respecting said auriferous deposits shall be limited to policing the same, and to protecting navigation as he is is now by law empowered.

Any grants or rights heretofore granted respecting said deposits by any authority are hereby declared void and of no further effect.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I much prefer the amendment of the Senator from Montana for several reasons. One is that much time will necessarily be consumed before any regulation can be made, and that will be very prejudicial, inasmuch as there is a large immigration now rushing there, and it is imperative to have at once law and order and the ascertainment of rights. Besides, I believe in leaving as much of the regulation and government of the people to themselves as possible. I have seen a good deal of what has occurred where the people made their own rules and regulations. In September, 1850, the question came up, What shall be done with the California miners?

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. President—

Mr. STEWART. Do not interrupt me now.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. STEWART. No; not now.

Mr. LINDSAY. I only want to ask a question.

Mr. STEWART. I do not want to be asked a question now. I want to finish.

Mr. LINDSAY. All right.

Mr. STEWART. The question came up in the Senate of the United States what to do, and there was quite a discussion as to rules and regulations for leasing the mining land, etc. Finally it was suggested by Mr. Benton, and Mr. Seward concurred, and so did Governor Chase, who was in the Senate at the time, and after a colloquial discussion had gone on in the Senate, they concluded to let the miners alone. They were let alone for about twenty years. They built up a system of laws, and they met every emergency reasonably well. They made their own rules and regulations. Finally, after a lapse of about twenty years, those rules and regulations were adopted by Congress and they are now the law of the land, Congress making some maximum limitations and providing for obtaining patents, but still adopting the rules and regulations. That was done in 1866. Then it was perfected in 1872 as it now stands.

At that time there was a strong desire to have the law administered here. Those of us who live in that country contended, and contended very strenuously, that inasmuch as we were adopting the miners' laws we ought to leave the administration, the ascertainment of the right of possession, to local authority. So it was provided that the local court should have jurisdiction; that wherever there was a contest the case should be tried before the local court, and only that should come up here. It was intended that all the Department would have to do with it would be merely administrative. It is impossible for any person here, however intelligent, who has not been a part of the creation of those laws to administer them. The miners know a good deal more there than the lawyers do here about the laws, their application, and whether they are beneficial or otherwise. Even as to the regulations, they will make better regulations than can be made here.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Let me ask the Senator if he did not help devise the present mining law?

Mr. STEWART. I did.

Mr. WOLCOTT. And advocate it?

Mr. STEWART. I did.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Then what is the matter with it?

Mr. STEWART. I drew it. What is the matter with it? It is a good law. Of course it is a good law if I drew it. I worked hard to procure it. That law recognizes the rules and regulations of the miners and enacts them into law. Congress did make more rules and regulations, but they are based on those. Their right to legislate is preserved in that law right through, and it has been most beneficial.

It has been so beneficial that there has been no disposition to change it. There has been no power to change it. Whenever there is any attempt to change it, even in some little matters where it is thought it would be proper to make a change, we find the people so jealous of it that they come in and protest. They are satisfied with it; it is based on their rules and regulations. That is the basis of it. I recollect very well when a case was before the Supreme Court whether there was any property involved, so as to give the United States courts jurisdiction. I simply stated the case and nothing else. I showed what we had done, and, in opposition to everybody, the court said they could not shut their eyes to what had occurred for twenty years of nonaction by the Government, and they affirmed it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nevada will suspend one moment while the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. A bill (H. R. 8245) temporarily to provide revenues for the relief of the island of Puerto Rico, and for other purposes.

Mr. FORAKER. Mr. President——

Mr. STEWART. Just one minute. Let me finish a sentence.

Mr. FORAKER. I will yield for a minute.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The unfinished business will be laid aside for a moment.

Mr. STEWART. The court recognized the persons who had gone there as trespassers as having legal rights contrary to law on account of what had grown up. So I think we had better trust the people. Inasmuch as the amendment of the Senator from Montana is in line with what has been so thoroughly successful, I am disposed to follow that Senator.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will be compelled to ask the indulgence of the Senator from Ohio for a few moments. The Chair lays before the Senate a message from the President of the United States.

INQUIRIES RELATIVE TO THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS.

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

To the Senate of the United States:

In further response to the resolution of the Senate of January 17, 1900, requesting copies of communications between the Executive Departments of the Government and Aguinaldo or other persons undertaking to represent the people in arms against the United States in the Philippine Islands, together with other official documents relating to the Philippine Islands, and the conduct and events of the insurrection against the authority of the United States in the Philippine Islands, and having reference to my message to the Senate of March 5, 1900 (Senate Document, Fifty-sixth Congress, first session, No. 208), and that paragraph of the resolution of January 17, 1900, reading as follows:

"And that the President be further requested to communicate, without delay, so much of such information as is now in his possession, or in that of any Department at Washington, without waiting to obtain so much of said information as may require considerable delay or communication with the Philippine Islands, and to communicate the remainder of the information as soon thereafter as it can be obtained"—

I transmit herewith the following additional papers:

First. Copies of English translations of minutes of insurgent meetings held at Hongkong, China, February 24 and May 5, 1898, respectively, and of a certain other paper, appended hereto, marked "I," said documents being found in insurgent public records recently captured by our troops in the Philippine Islands.

Second. Copies of documents containing information of the treatment of prisoners, either Spanish or American, by the people in arms against the authority of the United States. Said copies of documents are appended hereto, marked "II."

Third. Copies of papers and documents, or English translations of the same, found in insurgent records recently captured by our troops in the Philippine Islands, containing information as to aid or encouragement received by Aguinaldo and his followers from persons in the United States; as to what pamphlets, speeches, or other documents emanating from the United States and adverse to its authority and to its policy were circulated in whole or in part among the Filipinos in arms against the United States, among the other inhabitants of the islands, or among the soldiers of the United States. Said copies of documents are appended hereto and marked "III."

WILLIAM McKINLEY.

EXECUTIVE MANSION, *March 27, 1900.*

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED.

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

A bill (H. R. 240) granting an increase of pension to George W. Wakefield;

A bill (H. R. 301) granting a pension to James T. Donaldson, jr.;

A bill (H. R. 457) granting a pension to Clara L. Harriman;

A bill (H. R. 493) granting a pension to Fanny M. Hays;

A bill (H. R. 548) granting a pension to Edward Harris;

A bill (H. R. 625) granting an increase of pension to Wesley Reed;

A bill (H. R. 642) granting an increase of pension to Charles C. Doolittle;

A bill (H. R. 657) granting a pension to Francis A. Kitchen;

A bill (H. R. 737) granting a pension to Cyntha A. Middleton;

A bill (H. R. 741) granting an increase of pension to Zedock C. Andrews;

A bill (H. R. 1147) granting an increase of pension to Luke H. Cooper;

A bill (H. R. 1172) granting a pension to Rebecca J. Jones;

A bill (H. R. 1677) granting an increase of pension to Missouri B. Ross;

A bill (H. R. 1681) granting an increase of pension to Isaac M. Locke;

A bill (H. R. 1800) granting a pension to Lutheria H. Maynard;

A bill (H. R. 1946) granting a pension to Jane F. Chalmers;

A bill (H. R. 2076) granting an increase of pension to Horace N. Brackett;

A bill (H. R. 2203) granting an increase of pension to John M. Garrett;

A bill (H. R. 2397) granting a pension to Eliza S. Redfield;
A bill (H. R. 2623) granting a pension to Melville Oliphant;
A bill (H. R. 2728) granting a pension to Thomas T. Garrison;
A bill (H. R. 2748) granting an increase of pension to Henry Schnetberg;
A bill (H. R. 2999) granting an increase of pension to George M. Brown;
A bill (H. R. 3021) granting a pension to Eliza H. Getchel;
A bill (H. R. 3131) granting a pension to Matilda O'Connor;
A bill (H. R. 3214) granting a pension to John S. Dukate;
A bill (H. R. 3225) granting a pension to Elizabeth Bent Cooper;
A bill (H. R. 3268) granting an increase of pension to James W. Kessler;
A bill (H. R. 3307) granting a pension to Matilda Hennessy;
A bill (H. R. 3312) granting an increase of pension to Ellen V. Myer;
A bill (H. R. 3454) granting a pension to Joseph E. Baldwin;
A bill (H. R. 3563) granting an increase of pension to Julia A. Floyd;
A bill (H. R. 3635) granting an increase of pension to Timothy B. Eastman;
A bill (H. R. 3642) granting an increase of pension to Adolphus Lavine;
A bill (H. R. 3654) granting a pension to Calvin E. Myers;
A bill (H. R. 3693) granting an increase of pension to Abraham Sanford;
A bill (H. R. 3758) granting an increase of pension to Joshua Ricketts;
A bill (H. R. 3775) granting an increase of pension to Robert Boston;
A bill (H. R. 3821) granting an increase of pension to Frances D. Best;
A bill (H. R. 3869) granting a pension to Joseph H. Hamrick and Ella G. Hamrick;
A bill (H. R. 3941) granting a pension to Samuel B. Weeks;
A bill (H. R. 3962) granting an increase of pension to Alanson C. Eberhart;
A bill (H. R. 4030) granting an increase of pension to Margaret L. Coleman;
A bill (H. R. 4089) granting a pension to Emily Burke;
A bill (H. R. 4138) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth A. Hyatt;
A bill (H. R. 4180) granting an increase of pension to Austin J. Pickett;
A bill (H. R. 4247) granting an increase of pension to Francis S. Wolfe;
A bill (H. R. 4267) granting an increase of pension to Ezra A. Bennett;
A bill (H. R. 4276) granting an increase of pension to John R. Eggeman;
A bill (H. R. 4398) granting a pension to Julius Vogt;
A bill (H. R. 4562) granting a pension to Lois A. Fields;
A bill (H. R. 4654) granting an increase of pension to Simon Van Der Vaart;
A bill (H. R. 4657) granting a pension to Laura S. Pontious;
A bill (H. R. 4675) granting an increase of pension to Robert H. Jones;
A bill (H. R. 4681) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Keiff;
A bill (H. R. 4696) granting an increase of pension to Ruthven W. Houghton;
A bill (H. R. 4791) granting a pension to Catharine A. Schwunger;
A bill (H. R. 4805) granting a pension to Isaac Price;
A bill (H. R. 4828) granting a pension to Susie E. Johnson;
A bill (H. R. 4832) granting an increase of pension to Martha E. Graves;
A bill (H. R. 4991) granting a pension to Maria V. Sperry;
A bill (H. R. 5088) granting an increase of pension to William G. Willoughby;
A bill (H. R. 5110) granting an increase of pension to Edward T. Kennedy;
A bill (H. R. 5127) granting a pension to John Lafollett;
A bill (H. R. 5134) granting an increase of pension to Joseph F. Allison;
A bill (H. R. 5169) granting an increase of pension to Charles Weed;
A bill (H. R. 5170) granting a pension to Cyrus Johnson;
A bill (H. R. 5171) granting an increase of pension to William R. Wallace;
A bill (H. R. 5209) granting an increase of pension to Samuel A. Greeley;
A bill (H. R. 5211) granting a pension to Lizzie M. Dixon;
A bill (H. R. 5435) granting an increase of pension to Alexander P. Baugher;
A bill (H. R. 5886) granting a pension to William H. Lane;
A bill (H. R. 5961) granting an increase of pension to Charles A. Hausman;
A bill (H. R. 5970) granting a pension to Phebe S. Riley;
A bill (H. R. 6019) granting a pension to Mrs. Therese W. Hard;
A bill (H. R. 6089) granting a pension to Alfred T. Moreland;
A bill (H. R. 6159) granting an increase of pension to Arnold Bloom;
A bill (H. R. 6195) granting a pension to Livingston B. Gregory;
A bill (H. R. 6304) granting an increase of pension to James J. Lyons;
A bill (H. R. 6372) granting a pension to Abbie E. Webster;
A bill (H. R. 6375) granting an increase of pension to Chester Willis;
A bill (H. R. 6486) granting an increase of pension to Orange F. Berden;
A bill (H. R. 6624) granting an increase of pension to John C. Bradley;
A bill (H. R. 6731) granting an increase of pension to William F. Tait;
A bill (H. R. 6784) granting an increase of pension to Henry H. Neff;
A bill (H. R. 6785) granting an increase of pension to Maria Egan;
A bill (H. R. 6885) granting a pension to Horace B. Durant;
A bill (H. R. 6900) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Kurtz;
A bill (H. R. 6952) granting a pension to Carrie P. Dale;
A bill (H. R. 6995) granting a pension to Catharine Harris;
A bill (H. R. 7177) granting an increase of pension to John N. Breed;
A bill (H. R. 7488) granting a pension to John C. Ray;
A bill (H. R. 7535) granting an increase of pension to Clare H. Burleigh;
A bill (H. R. 7596) granting an increase of pension to Eliza Wight;
A bill (H. R. 7599) granting an increase of pension to John F. Crawford;
A bill (H. R. 7767) granting a pension to Alice D. Roatch;
A bill (H. R. 7799) granting an increase of pension to Franklin M. Burdoin;
A bill (H. R. 8045) granting an increase of pension to Wilford Cooper;
A bill (H. R. 8079) granting a pension to Bertha M. Jordan;
A bill (H. R. 8083) granting an increase of pension to James Winnie;
A bill (H. R. 8112) granting a pension to John Vogler;
A bill (H. R. 8120) granting an increase of pension to David L. Wentworth;
A bill (H. R. 8339) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Gates;
A bill (H. R. 8378) granting an increase of pension to Mary Steffens;
A bill (H. R. 8390) granting an increase of pension to Joshua Mitchell;
A bill (H. R. 8395) granting an increase of pension to Henry Johns;
A bill (H. R. 8405) granting a pension to Sophronia Seely;
A bill (H. R. 8599) granting a pension to Ellen J. Williams;
A bill (H. R. 8605) granting a pension to Joseph Champlin Stone;
A bill (H. R. 8610) granting an increase of pension to Abner S. Crawford;
A bill (H. R. 8669) granting an increase of pension to Eliza A. Lake;
A bill (H. R. 8800) granting an increase of pension to Bell Fries; and
A bill (H. R. 9070) granting an increase of pension to Daniel H. Kent.

The bill (H. R. 5552) for the relief of Northup & Chick, and also of Thomas N. Stinson, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

The bill (H. R. 6240) for the preparation of plans or designs for a memorial or statue of Gen. Ulysses S. Grant on ground belonging to the United States Government in the city of Washington, D. C., was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Library.

The bill (H. R. 6344) to remove the charge of desertion from the records of the War Department against Frederick Mehring was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The bill (H. R. 7939) to amend an act approved June 10, 1880, governing the immediate transportation of dutiable merchandise without appraisement, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

H. K. CARROLL'S REPORT ON PUERTO RICO.

Mr. COCKRELL. I hold in my hand a document entitled "Report on the island of Porto Rico; its population, civil government, commerce, industry, productions, roads, tariff, and currency, with recommendations, by Henry K. Carroll, special commissioner for the United States to Porto Rico. Respectfully

submitted to Hon. William McKinley, President of the United States, October 6, 1899. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1899." "——" "Treasury Department, Document No. 2118. Office of the Secretary."

This document has never been furnished to Congress, so far as I have been able to discover. It has never been in our document room. I think if it is of such value as to justify a special commissioner to go there and collate these data and submit them to the President and the Secretary of the Treasury, and to have the Government pay for its publication, it ought to be published so that it may reach at least Congress and all its members.

I therefore ask that 3,000 copies of this document shall be printed for the use of Congress, 1,000 of which shall be for the use of the Senate and 2,000 for the use of the House. I will prepare a resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Has the Senator any idea what the cost might be?

Mr. COCKRELL. I have sent for Mr. Smith, the Printing Office clerk, who can tell us, hoping that he would get here before I had to call it up. If it costs over $500, it will have to be a concurrent resolution. If it costs under $500, the Senate can pass a simple Senate resolution. I will make the resolution to correspond with the cost. I will get the information in a few minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will present the resolution later on, then.

Mr. COCKRELL. Yes, sir.

Mr. COCKRELL subsequently said: I submit a resolution which I prepared after consultation as to the cost of the document. We can print 1,200 copies for $500 or less.

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

Ordered by the Senate, That there be printed for the use of the Senate and placed in the Senate document room, 1,200 copies of "The report on the island of Porto Rico; its population, civil government, commerce, industries, productions, roads, tariff, and currency, with recommendations, by Henry K. Carroll, special commissioner for the United States to Porto Rico. Respectfully submitted to Hon. William McKinley, President of the United States, October 6, 1899."

PENSION APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. SHOUP submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6627) "making appropriations for the payment of invalid and other pensions of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1901, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 1, 2, 3, and 4.

That the House recede from its disagreements to the amendments of the Senate numbered 5 and 7, and agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

"*And provided further*, That the report of such examining surgeons shall specifically state the rating which in their judgment the applicant is entitled to, and the report of such examining surgeons shall specifically and accurately set forth the physical condition of the applicant, each and every existing disability being fully and carefully described.

"The reports of the special examiners of the Bureau of Pensions shall be open to inspection and copy by the applicant or his attorney, under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of Interior may prescribe."

And the Senate agree to the same.

GEORGE L. SHOUP,
J. V. QUARLES,
JAMES P. TALIAFERRO,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

S. S. BARNEY,
J. T. McCLEARY,
JOHN C. BELL,
Managers on the part of the House.

The report was agreed to.

GOVERNMENT FOR PUERTO RICO.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 8245) temporarily to provide revenues for the relief of the island of Puerto Rico, and for other purposes.

Mr. FORAKER. Mr. President, before proceeding with the consideration of the unfinished business, I think I should state to Senators that I have concluded not to ask a separation of the two propositions—one the House bill and the other the Senate substitute providing a civil government for Puerto Rico—but have concluded to proceed with the unfinished business in the state in which it is. In order that Senators might be fully advised as to the committee amendments, about which there was some complaint made the other day—in a good-natured way, of course—I had the bill reprinted, so as to show in the text all the amendments which have been adopted by the Senate, and also to show, in the way indicated in the note at the head of the bill, the amendments yet to be proposed, upon which I shall ask the judgment of the Senate as rapidly as they can be considered.

I understand the Senator from Nevada [Mr. STEWART] desires to speak on this bill. I do not know to what particular point he desires to speak; but there is one amendment under consideration, which has been discussed to some extent, which I should like to have disposed of. Still if the Senator would prefer to speak first, I will yield to him.

Mr. STEWART. I will make what remarks I have to make now.

Mr. FORAKER. Very well; then I will yield to the Senator at this time to submit his remarks.

Mr. ALLEN. I should like, if I may be permitted, to offer an amendment.

Mr. STEWART. Certainly.

Mr. FORAKER. I should have called the attention of Senators to the fact that each Senator will find on his desk the reprint of the bill in the form which I have indicated.

Mr. ALLEN. I desire to offer and to have pending the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. There is now an amendment pending. The Senator can have his amendment printed and have it lie on the table.

Mr. ALLEN. Can there not be more than one amendment pending at the same time to different parts of the bill?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. No two amendments can be actually pending at the same time. The Senator's amendment will be printed and lie on the table, subject to his call.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, has the expenditure of blood and treasure in the Spanish war and in the war with the Filipinos been a criminal blunder? Will Puerto Rico, Cuba, and the Philippines, if acquired and held by the United States, be a blessing or a curse? Will William McKinley be regarded by posterity as a benefactor for adding to the United States islands abounding in tropical products, or will he be execrated for a criminal attempt to subvert the Constitution and injure the industries of the people by the acquisition of pestiferous, poisonous, and worthless lands beyond the sea? These questions are now being discussed in the public press, in the pulpit, and at the firesides of the people.

The same sentimentality and narrow prejudice which embittered the discussion in the time of Jefferson, Monroe, and Polk, on account of the acquisitions of territory made by them, are potent factors in the opposition to the acquisition of the most productive and valuable islands in all the seas. Such opposition was anticipated. Fault-finders as well as broad-minded and practical citizens are the outgrowth of free institutions.

ELEMENTS WARRING AGAINST NATURAL GROWTH.

Unfortunately, there are other elements warring against national growth and expansion which never before appeared in discussions of this character. No agricultural interest ever before opposed the acquisition of more good land because it would produce what the people consumed at less cost than any land hitherto owned by the United States. The Louisiana purchase and the territories acquired from Spain and Mexico were much better adapted to the production of many farm products than the States of the Northeast, but no one opposed those acquisitions because the land was too good. The sentimental objectors contended that the land was worthless for any purpose whatever.

The strange phase of the present controversy is the opposition of the sugar and tobacco interests. It is asserted that those commodities can be produced in these islands for less than one-half the expenditure required in their production in other sections of the United States. This argument is about as reasonable as it would have been for Massachusetts to have opposed the Jefferson purchase because it would cheapen breadstuffs. Would the great mass of the people of the United States be injured if what the advocates of the sugar interests assert were true? If the price of sugar could be reduced 50 per cent, would the poor complain? The people of the United States are now compelled to pay to foreigners between ninety-five and one hundred million dollars annually for sugar which they could produce themselves if the islands wrested from Spain were in the peaceable possession of the United States. A protective tariff is maintained for the purpose of encouraging home production by keeping out foreign sugar. Why not protect the sugar growers of this country by the acquisition of islands where our people can produce sugar at less cost than any other people on the face of the globe? These arguments apply equally to the production of tobacco and all other commodities which are the natural growth of the new acquisitions.

THE ISLANDS FURNISH RICH MARKETS.

The export of gold, so long as that commodity is the only material upon which money can be stamped, is a standing menace to the business of the country and is watched with more anxiety than any other cause affecting the price of property. The buying of tropical products in foreign lands now absorbs more than two hundred and fifty millions of our annual exports. If this ever-increasing obligation to foreigners could be avoided by the production of tropical products in our island possessions, the United States would have the advantage, both financially and commercially, of any other country on earth. The people could then produce everything they consume, except luxuries to indulge the pride and vanity of the rich.

These islands, notwithstanding the robbery, tyranny, and extortion of Spanish misrule, imported annually more than $120,000,000 in value of foreign merchandise. It would be safe to anticipate with honest and stable government that American enterprise and

capital would increase the consuming capacity of the islands more than fourfold, and the people of the United States would in the near future enjoy a market of from three hundred to five hundred millions a year for their surplus manufactures and farm products, and they would receive in exchange tropical products of equal value, including sugar, tobacco, and many other staple commodities.

Would not such a market furnish more employment for labor and benefit the farming and manufacturing interests of the country more than can possibly be done by tariff walls to force the production of tobacco and sugar on land designed by nature for the cultivation of the cereals, fruits, grasses, and other products of the temperate zone? Why turn these islands over to anarchy, discord, and ruin, or, what would be more injurious to the United States, to be occupied and their resources developed by some European power which would take advantage of their great productive capacity to compete with the tariff-nursed sugar and tobacco of the United States? Why should anyone argue that cheap sugar and tobacco produced in our own country would injure our consumers, or that the vast demand for our manufactures and farm products in these islands would be prejudicial to the laboring man by diminishing his opportunities for employment?

TERRITORIAL GOVERNMENTS ADAPTED TO ISLANDS.

No promise has been made and no obligation will exist to create States in these islands until such time as the people shall determine through their representatives in Congress that new States beyond the seas would be beneficial to the United States. No reasonable person will pretend that our successors will not be as wise and patriotic as ourselves. No one denies that Congress has power to do many harmful things which might subvert the Government, but if the time ever arrives when patriotism is dead in the Congress of the United States, the danger of admitting new States will not be the most alarming danger.

Our Territorial forms of government, which have grown and developed with the growth and development of the country, are admirably suited to the government of these islands. It is the established practice of our Government to accord to the Territories as much self-government as they are capable of enjoying. Although by the treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo the United States agreed to form States out of the newly acquired territory, New Mexico has remained for more than fifty years under a Territorial form of government. The greater part of Alaska, measured by the time of communication, is vastly more remote than the Philippines. Congress has no difficulty in governing Alaska and applying to it so much of our Territorial system as circumstances justify. The only voice a Territory has in the government of the country is the voice of advice and consultation through a Delegate elected by the people, who has no vote in Congress.

The natives of these islands at the time of the acquisition from Spain will never be citizens of the United States without the action of Congress. The treaty with Spain expressly referred the matter of citizenship to Congress. But it can make no difference whether *or not they* are citizens; they will have no power to injure the Government of the United States until they have a voice in that Government by the admission of their islands as States. The citizenship of persons born in the islands after the acquisition can not injure our Government as long as such persons are not allowed to participate in its control.

NO FEAR OF CHINESE COMPETITION.

The attempt to alarm the laborers of this country by the false assertion that the acquisition of these islands will let in Chinese laborers is demagogism. Our exclusion laws apply to Chinese from whatever country they may come. The law that excludes Chinese immigration to this country can be made applicable to all our possessions and the Chinese residents of the Philippines may be treated in the same manner as the Chinese residents of the United States.

The suggestion that laborers from the islands who are not Chinese may migrate to this country and compete with American labor has no foundation to support it. Nature marks the line which laboring migration must follow. Witness our own country. The Swedes and the Norwegians find congenial homes along the Northern Lakes and Canadian borders. Germans follow along a little farther south. The Irish prefer the central regions of the United States as corresponding more nearly to the climate of their native land. The Italians generally go farther south and on the Pacific coast to find climatic conditions similar to balmy Italy. Never in all the ages has the population of the Tropics crossed the isothermal lines to inhabit and cultivate the soil of the temperate zones, nor have laborers from the north succeeded in cultivating tropical lands. Merchants, traders, bankers, and business men readily accommodate themselves to the climate of the torrid, temperate, or frigid zone. Business and professional men from the north enjoy southern climes, and the same is true of business and professional men of the south when they emigrate to the north. Successful labor follows but does not cross the line separating the tropical from the temperate zone.

MUTUAL BENEFITS RESULTING FROM RETENTION OF ISLANDS.

The resources of the United States in everything found in the temperate zones are inexhaustible and practically untouched. Modern machinery and the genius of American people can always produce more of the products and manufactures of the temperate zone than the people can use. These islands under American control and enterprise will produce vastly more tropical products than they can consume. The interchange of the products of the farm, the mine, and the factory for the sugar, coffee, tobacco, fruits, and other products of these islands will give employment to millions in the United States as well as in the islands. The storm of criticism and the rancorous vituperation of disappointed ambition will soon pass away, and when the American people are in full enjoyment of the new acquisitions they will view them as serenely and with as much satisfaction as they now contemplate the teeming population and the wonderful productions of the countries acquired during the Administrations of Jefferson, Monroe, and Polk, and posterity will wonder why anybody could have opposed the rich inheritance which the war against Spanish cruelty brought to the United States, as they now wonder why it was that the acquisitions of territory which we have heretofore made were opposed by persons otherwise considered sane and sensible.

The establishment of self-government and the inauguration of industry under the benign influence of the principles of the Declaration of Independence in the gems of the sea, which good fortune has placed within the reach of the American people, are delayed and embarrassed by the timidity of the friends of expansion and progress. The suggestion that there is some nebulous, open-door policy in the far East which would prevent the United States from extending our customs laws over the Philippines is a dream of folly which will not disturb the American people. The idea that the United States will hold the Philippines and maintain their ports free to all the world and at the same time separate them from our country by a tariff wall which would exclude them from our markets and deprive us of the benefit of their trade can not be seriously considered.

The contention that any of the islands which we wrested from Spanish rule would injure American industries on account of their productions is a pure invention. Some gentlemen seem to regard it as a matter of no consequence that the consumers are compelled to pay $250,000,000 a year for tropical products which these islands will produce, and that the farmers and manufacturers of this country would be deprived, by the loss of these acquisitions, of an annual market of from three hundred to five hundred million dollars.

SCHEMES OF AMBITIOUS STATESMEN.

Perhaps the most unfortunate opposition to expansion comes from the schemes of ambitious statesmen to connect their names with original methods of government unknown to the fathers of the Republic. They seem to assume that the principles of freedom and local self-government which have spread over the vast areas of territory already acquired are not suited to land surrounded by water; that human rights and the principles of government are different on islands from what they are on broad continents, and that while Jeffersonian Territorial governments were good enough for Orleans, Florida, and the great West, it is the duty of a rising statesman to invent some new form of government for the islands never before tried in the history of man. I implore them to consider if it is not possible that the heroic struggles for liberty and self-government which have established on the American continent the freest, the grandest, and the greatest Government of ancient or modern times may not furnish some lessons in the establishment of governments for the islands which it might be useful to study.

Impatience and haste are also obstacles to the accomplishment of the great work of establishing free and stable governments in our island possessions. It was a military problem in the beginning and must remain so until civil governments can be formed. The great virtue of the American system is that civil governments grow out of military enterprises, and God forbid that this order of things should be reversed and military government be established on the ruins of the Constitution. The government of Louisiana in 1803, after the acquisition of that country from France, was a combination of military and executive power while the President of the United States was inaugurating civil government. Florida was acquired in 1819, and it remained a purely military government until 1822, when Congress legislated, establishing civil rule, which had been previously inaugurated by Monroe.

California was acquired in July, 1846, when Commodore Sloat, at Monterey, raised the American flag, and the country remained under military rule without any interference on the part of Congress and very little on the part of the President until the admission of the State in September, 1850. The military officers in that country governed it, inaugurated the present State government without any action by Congress, and finally, when Congress was called upon to act, California had a firmly established State government with a constitution and a system of laws which compare favorably with the constitution and laws of any State in the

Union. On the 9th of September, 1850, Congress accepted what the military officers and people had done and admitted California as a State of the Union.

UNWISE TO LEGISLATE WHILE CONDITIONS ARE UNKNOWN.

It is unwise to legislate for any of these newly acquired islands until it can be ascertained what legislation is necessary and beneficial. The war and the executive power of the Government have been and must continue to be the pioneers in establishing law and order and developing the condition of newly acquired territory before Congress can be possessed of the necessary information for appropriate legislation. Let the arm of the President be strengthened by Congressional authority, as was done in the case of Jackson and Monroe, and let the responsibility of initiating local self-government in the islands remain with the President, where the necessity of the situation requires it to remain. Leave him untrammeled, as other Presidents have been under like circumstances, and let him be responsible for progress in the right direction.

The appointment of a commission to aid in the establishment of local self-government in the Philippines is wise and necessary. Let Congress make it effective by arming the President with legislative sanction, that Aguinaldo and his deluded followers may know that the United States is determined to put down the rebellion and maintain its jurisdiction in every island of the archipelago. Already we hear that guerrilla warfare has been commenced under the belief that the United States is not in earnest, that the President will not be sustained, and that Aguinaldo's dictatorship will ultimately be recognized.

QUESTION ABOVE PARTY.

This is a question above party. It is a question of country. Whatever of hesitation, of selfish or unreasonable opposition may be made to acquiring Puerto Rico, Cuba, and the Philippines, there can be but one result. These islands will, with the approbation and consent of the American people, become a most important and valuable part of the United States. When all questions of the acquisition of these islands shall have been settled, peace, order, and local self-government established, the United States will have inexhaustible resources in everything needful and useful which can be found in any part of the world. The people of the United States will then be as proud of their whole country as they are today of any part thereof, and will enter into friendly commercial competition with all the nations of the earth without the slightest apprehension or fear of the triumph of free institutions for the benefit of the human race. The necessities of our people will then be supplied in our own country without depending on foreigners for moral, material, or military support.

The Jeffersonian bill introduced by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. SPOONER] and reported by the committee will give President McKinley the same support in the Philippines as Jefferson and Monroe had in the countries acquired during their Administrations. The bill should become a law with Puerto Rico included and remain in force until the pioneer work in the new acquisitions is done and before any form of government or system of revenue is provided by Congress. The premature contention over details, without a full knowledge of what ought to be done, has already created excitement and unrest in the country prejudicial to the peaceful, speedy, and successful establishment of law, order, and local self-government in our new possessions. If I were permitted to give advice, I would suggest the propriety of amending the Spooner bill so as to include Puerto Rico, pass the appropriation bills and other necessary legislation, and adjourn Congress, and let the people decide whether the policy of expansion inaugurated by the fathers of the Republic shall be continued until the United States is as independent of all other countries for material resources as she is and has ever been independent in her political career.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment submitted by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. FORAKER], which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 19, line 23, after the word "also," it is proposed to insert "as to railroad, telegraph, and telephone franchises."

Mr. FORAKER. Since Senators now have a different print of the bill, I will state that the proposed amendment is in line 3, on page 24, according to the reprint.

Senators may remember the nature of this amendment. Possibly some of them were not in the Chamber when it was under consideration a few days ago; and for the benefit of those, let me say that this is the clause as to the granting of franchises. The provision on that subject, as found in the bill reported by the committee, was that franchises in Puerto Rico should be granted by the executive council, subject to the approval of the governor, and subject also to the approval of the President. That required every franchise, whether it was important or otherwise, to be sent here to be acted upon by the President.

It was thought, after some consideration had been given to the subject, that it would not be necessary to send here for the President to act upon any but the most important ones, such as railroad, telegraph, and telephone franchises; and the purpose of this amendment is to make it unnecessary to send here for the action of the President any franchises granted in Puerto Rico excepting only those relating to these three subjects—railroads, telegraphs, and telephones. All other franchises, such as those for electric lighting, gas lighting, or any other kind which may be thought of, will be acted upon and disposed of by the executive council, with the approval of the governor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment submitted by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. FORAKER].

Mr. PETTUS. Mr. President, I desire to know what will be the effect of passing these amendments in this way, whether the Senate will be thereby concluded; in other words, whether the action of the Senate in making these amendments is a final action?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is not. The amendments now being made to the bill are being made in the Senate as in Committee of the Whole, but it will be open to amendment after the bill goes into the Senate; and, then again——

Mr. PETTUS. But not as in Committee of the Whole?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is now before the Senate as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. PETTUS. I ask is it conclusive on the Committee of the Whole, as the Chair rules?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. No; it is open to all manner of amendments as in Committee of the Whole; to any amendment.

Mr. PETTUS. I have some amendments to propose—that is, amendments which I have had printed and which are now upon the table, in reference to this very matter—and I want to know whether I can have them acted upon when the committee get through with their amendments?

Mr. FORAKER. With the permission of the Chair, if the Senator will allow me, I understand the amendment which the Senator has given notice he will propose is one requiring all these franchises to be acted upon by the legislative assembly.

Mr. PETTUS. And the governor and the President of the United States.

Mr. FORAKER. And the governor and the President of the United States—by all of these officials. I think, therefore, it relates to this same matter, and that our present action would include action also upon the Senator's amendment. I did not speak of his amendment, because I supposed the Senator from Alabama would present his amendment in this connection.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, I understand the force of the amendment of the Senator from Ohio is to place in charge of the territorial council and the governor all franchises excepting those for railroads, telegraphs, and telephones, which are to be in their charge and in the charge of the President of the United States—that is, as respects the three last named, they will require the approval of the President of the United States before they can become effective. So that the force or the legal effect of the amendment is to deprive Congress of all jurisdiction over the subject of granting franchises in the island of Puerto Rico. Is that correct?

Mr. FORAKER. Well, Mr. President, that is probably the result of it, though that never occurred to me before in connection with the amendment. Of course, all legislation by the legislative assembly is subject to the approval of Congress and may be annulled by Congress when reported, but there is no provision here as to franchises that would be granted by any authority other than the executive council and the President. This provision requires that all these franchises that the President may approve shall be reported to Congress.

Mr. ALLEN. I know; but what has Congress to do after they are reported, if they are first approved by him?

Mr. FORAKER. The Congress, I presume, could do whatever it might see fit to do about the matter.

Mr. ALLEN. Under the terms of this bill, if it shall become a law, a franchise can be granted to a railroad or a telegraph or telephone corporation by the council and governor of Puerto Rico and approved by the President, and that deprives the Congress of all jurisdiction, and there would be no revisory power in Congress whatever, because it amounts to a contract between the Government and the recipient.

Mr. FORAKER. I supposed when we were drafting the bill, and that is the opinion the committee had, that the safeguards provided were sufficient. If the Senator thinks that Congress also ought to be empowered to take action in the matter, I personally have no objection to that kind of a provision being inserted in the bill.

Mr. ALLEN. Section 30 provides:

Provided, however, That all grants or franchises, rights and privileges, or concessions of a public or quasi-public nature shall be made by the executive council, with the approval of the governor, subject also, as to railroad, telegraph, and telephone franchises, to the approval of the President of the United States, who shall report the same to Congress.

It leaves it in this condition, that if the council and governor of Puerto Rico and the President of the United States shall approve a charter for a railroad, or a telegraph, or a telephone company, it is conclusive upon the Government irrevocably, and can not be amended or altered or changed in any respect during the life of

the charter; and Congress has nothing to do with the matter, except to receive a mere nominal report from the President of the United States, which he may or may not make. We have no power to require him to make it.

Mr. FORAKER. If the Senator will allow me to interrupt him, I will say that I have no objection to this provision being amended so as to read as does the conclusion of the preceding section with respect to legislation:

Provided, however, That all laws enacted by the legislative assembly shall be reported to the Congress of the United States, which hereby reserves the power and authority, if deemed advisable, to annul the same.

I have no objection to having those words inserted at the end of the section.

Mr. LINDSAY. Or modify.

Mr. FORAKER. So that it shall read:

Who shall report the same to Congress, which hereby reserves the power to annul or modify the same.

If that will answer the objection, let those words be inserted. I think the objection is well taken.

Mr. ALLEN. I suggest this:

Shall report the same to Congress; and said franchises shall not have any legal force or effect until approved and ratified by Congress.

Mr. FORAKER. I would only suggest this difficulty about that phraseology: It might unreasonably delay enterprises and the development of the island. I think if we put it in the form in which the power of Congress to annul is usually reserved, and that is the form that comes at the end of the preceding section——

Mr. ALLEN. I would be perfectly willing to trust the Senator from Ohio to reform it at his leisure, so as to preserve the right of Congress to pass upon these franchises.

Mr. FORAKER. I can insert it now if that language will be satisfactory to the Senator, and I will say to him that I should have inserted it without any suggestion if it had occurred to me.

Mr. ALLEN. I do not pretend to know what the force of that language will be; but I do want to observe——

Mr. FORAKER. I do not hear the Senator from Nebraska, there is so much noise in the Chamber.

Mr. ALLEN. I do not profess to know what the force of the language will be which the Senator proposes to use in the amendment; but I think, all the way through this bill, in every section and in every provision, most ample safeguards ought to be preserved to Congress to revise and control the government of Puerto Rico and its domestic institutions in all respects. There can be nothing clearer than that the government of Puerto Rico must be such as Congress may prescribe.

Congress has the sole power of prescribing a government for the island. It is not within the power of the President of the United States to prescribe a government for Puerto Rico or for any other of these newly acquired islands except as he derives the power to institute a military government incident to military occupation. Now, if that be true, and we being in the transition state from a military to a civil government in Puerto Rico, the greatest caution ought to be observed in the drafting and passage of bills affecting the people and territory of that island in preserving our revisory control.

Mr. PETTUS. Mr. President, I will read the amendment which I propose about this matter. It is lying on the table. It is in this section to insert "legislative assembly" instead of "executive council." My purpose in proposing that amendment was the very matter that is being talked about. This section in reference to the action of the legislative assembly provides that Congress may repeal any action of the legislative assembly, and I wanted to have these franchises granted by the legislative assembly and thereby subject them to the revision of Congress. Now, if the Senator will add at the end of that section that all franchises granted in Puerto Rico shall be subject to revocation or modification by Congress, I do not care anything about this amendment.

Mr. FORAKER. Let me ask the Senator if he would require that as to minor, unimportant ones, or simply as to the important ones?

Mr. PETTUS. Yes, sir; as to all of them. These franchises are more the subject of fraud than any other species of property in the United States. They are more the subject of fraud in the cities than anything else in the cities, and they ought all to be subject to the revision of Congress, and to put that sort of power into a council without having any control is simply to abandon these valuable properties, because they are properties, to those who succeed in having influence over the men in power in that island. They ought to be subject to the revocation and modification of Congress.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's amendment will be in order as soon as this amendment is disposed of.

Mr. FORAKER. The Senator from Alabama has stated that if I would make a certain change he would withdraw his amendment. I am perfectly willing to do so. I want to ask the Senator if the language which I propose to offer now will be satisfactory; and I am obliged both to the Senator from Nebraska and the Senator from Alabama for calling my attention to the matter. It was the purpose of the committee to guard the granting of franchises, because they appreciate that that is a very important matter, and they would have left it to the legislative assembly except for the fact—I think I ought to say this in justice to the committee—that the legislative assembly can not be in session more than sixty days in any one year. The granting of franchises is something that may come up at any time, and the executive council and the governor will always be there to act upon such applications.

I propose, if the Senator will follow me, so to amend that the clause will read as follows:

Subject also as to railroad, telegraph, and telephone franchises to the approval of the President of the United States; and all franchises granted in Puerto Rico shall be reported to Congress, which hereby reserves the power, if deemed advisable, to annul or modify the same.

Mr. PETTUS. Why "if deemed advisable?" Just say it reserves the power.

Mr. FORAKER. I do not object to that. I took the language out of the other statute. That is how that came in. I will say:

And all franchises granted in Puerto Rico shall be reported to Congress, which hereby reserves the power to annul or modify the same.

I ask that it may be read at the Secretary's desk, so that there may be no mistake about it.

Mr. PETTUS. I have no objection to that, and withdraw my amendment.

Mr. MONEY. I should like to ask the Senator from Ohio who has charge of this bill if it would not be well enough to strike out subject "to the approval of the President of the United States." It is not usual for Territorial legislation that comes here to be revised or approved by Congress to be treated in that way.

Mr. FORAKER. I have no objection to its being stricken out, as we propose now to bring it under the review of Congress.

Mr. MONEY. I think it better, if the Senator will permit that amendment. It is putting the cart before the horse. The President's approval comes after the Houses have acted and not before.

Mr. FORAKER. I presume it would have to be transmitted through some official. The provision as to the President approving came about in the way I have indicated. It was thought impracticable to give the power to the legislative assembly, because it is in session only sixty days in the year, and here were the executive council, and the governor, a part of the council, in session all the time, so that applications might be granted at any moment, or rather might be acted upon at any moment.

Mr. MONEY. Then it will come just as it does in the case of legislation from other Territories.

Mr. FORAKER. I wanted to say to the Senator that my purpose in offering this amendment was to avoid imposing upon the President the necessity to deal with every minor franchise.

Mr. MONEY. I will suggest, if the Senator will accept the amendment, to strike out "to the approval of the President of the United States, who shall report the same to Congress." Let it come through the usual channels.

Mr. FORAKER. Very well.

Mr. MONEY. Of course you can arrange the phraseology so as to make it conform. That is the idea, that it is to be reported in the usual way, as in the case of other Territories.

Mr. FORAKER. Then it will be unnecessary to say anything about railroad, telegraph, and telephone franchises, but let the provision read, commencing in the middle of line 2:

With the approval of the governor; and all franchises granted in Puerto Rico shall be reported to Congress, which hereby reserves the power to annul or modify the same.

That is satisfactory to me, if it is to others. Now let the Secretary state it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Ohio will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 19, line 22, section 30, after the word "governor," it is proposed to strike out the rest of the paragraph and insert:

And all franchises granted in Puerto Rico shall be reported to Congress, which hereby reserves the power to annul or modify the same.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FORAKER. Mr. President, inasmuch as the bill has been reprinted, and that was the last of the amendments that had been brought before the Senate when we were formerly considering the bill, I ask that we may go back to the beginning of the bill as now reprinted and consider amendments as indicated in their order. The first amendment proposed will be found on page 4, and it is to insert, in line 16, after the word "citizens," the following:

Of Puerto Rico, and as such entitled to the protection.

This is the clause that fixes the civil and political status of the inhabitants of the island.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerks at the desk have no copies of the new print.

Mr. MORGAN. I wish to make an inquiry of the Senator from

Ohio. We have been over this bill once and put into it the amendments that are called committee amendments. Now the bill seems to be perfected in such form as the committee want it, as I understand.

Mr. FORAKER. Not yet. We went over the bill considering only such amendments as were not contested. Now I am taking up the amendments proposed by the committee about which there will no doubt be more or less debate. I asked consent that the committee amendments might be first considered. That was given, and then I announced that I would first ask the consideration by the Senate of such amendments as I supposed would not be contested, and if when one was offered there was a contest I passed it. Now I am going back to take up those passed over upon objection being made, with a view of having them considered and finally disposed of.

Mr. MORGAN. Many amendments have been presented and many of them have been contested. We have been occupied in this peculiar kind of labor here for about three or four days on this bill, and other Senators who have amendments that they want to offer to the text of the bill it seems will never get an opportunity.

Mr. FORAKER. I have no objection if the Senator wants at any time to offer an amendment. I do not wish to cut him out or cause him to postpone. I will yield at any time when a Senator may wish to offer an amendment or speak upon it.

Mr. MORGAN. If I offer an amendment I want it to be the subject of the action of the Senate.

Mr. FORAKER. Certainly.

Mr. MORGAN. Then I will offer an amendment to the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Alabama will be stated.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to insert after section 7 the following:

SEC. —. That any citizen of the United States who shall deposit for coinage, at any mint in the United States, silver bullion of the value of not less than $100, estimated at the rate of 371¼ grains of pure silver per dollar, and at the same time and as a part of the same deposit shall also deposit gold bullion for coinage of equal or greater value, estimated at the rate of 23.22 grains of pure gold per dollar, shall be entitled to have such gold and silver bullion coined in such lawful denominations of gold and silver coins of the United States as he shall designate, and after such deposit none of said bullion shall be withdrawn as bullion from such mint, but such gold and silver bullion shall be coined and the coin shall be delivered to the depositor, his or her assigns or legal representatives, in discharge of the certificate of deposit issued for such deposit.

The superintendent of such mint shall issue to such depositors certificates of deposit, in accordance with this act, and shall refine and coin such bullion of gold and silver for and on account of such depositors in the same manner as if the same was owned by and was coined on account of the Government of the United States, and the charges for refining and coining such bullion shall be the same as are lawfully made in such cases.

No gold or silver bullion shall be deposited for coinage under this act that has been coined or manufactured as an article of commerce, or that is not the product of mines in the United States.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. President, the committee has unanimously reported section 7 of this bill, which contains virtually, if not expressly, a free proposition for the coinage of silver. I will read it:

SEC. 7. That for the purpose of retiring the Puerto Rican coins now in circulation in Puerto Rico and substituting therefor the coins of the United States, the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized to redeem, on presentation in Puerto Rico, all the silver coins of Puerto Rico known as the peso and all other silver and copper Puerto Rican coins now in circulation in Puerto Rico, not including any such coins that may be imported into Puerto Rico after the 1st day of February, 1900, at the present established rate of 60 cents in the coins of the United States for 1 peso of Puerto Rican coin, and for all minor or subsidiary coins the same rate of exchange shall be applied.

The Puerto Rican coins so purchased or redeemed shall be recoined at the expense of the United States, under the direction of the Secretary of the Treasury, into such coins of the United States now authorized by law as he may direct, and from and after three months after the date when this act shall take effect no coins shall be a legal tender, in payment of debts thereafter contracted, for any amount in Puerto Rico, except those of the United States; and whatever sum may be required to carry out the provisions hereof, and to pay all expenses that may be incurred in connection therewith, is hereby appropriated, and the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized to establish such regulations and employ such agencies as may be necessary to accomplish the purposes hereof: *Provided, however*, That all debts owing on the date when this act shall take effect shall be payable in the coins of Puerto Rico now in circulation, or in the coins of the United States at the rate of exchange above named.

We have recently passed what is called the gold bill. It is now the law. My opinion in regard to that bill is that it is entirely radical in its effect upon the coinage system of the United States as well as other parts of our financial system. It is claimed on this side of the Chamber and by those who opposed that bill that the effect of it was to make the legal-tender silver coins of the United States now in existence redeemable at the Treasury of the United States in gold, not by a direct operation dependent upon a direct demand of the holder of the coin, but by the incidental arrangement of converting the silver coin into silver certificates and then taking those certificates to the Treasury and having them redeemed in gold.

I have accepted that law as fixing upon this country that condition. If that is a correct interpretation of the present condition, the silver dollars or other silver coins in use in the United States, amounting to some eight hundred and odd million dollars, are all that will ever be obtained by the people of the United States of that description of coinage so long as that law shall remain in force. It closes the door forever to the coinage of legal-tender silver dollars.

There is now no possibility, under the law as it exists, of having any silver dollars coined, either by a purchase on account of the Government, or as the personal right of the holder of silver bullion. I was much gratified to find that, in view of that condition of affairs, this honorable committee, a majority of whom are Republicans, have brought forward a measure, in section 7 of this bill, which gives to the holder of the Puerto Rican coins, or Spanish coins in Puerto Rico, the right to go to the Treasury of the United States and have them redeemed, and to have the bullion of which they consist coined; that is, the coinage of silver bullion by the Government of the United States after it has exchanged silver dollars for that bullion on the demand of its owner.

The right that is given by this bill is given to the holders of these Spanish coins whoever he may be. It is not even limited to citizens of the United States. Any holder of a Spanish peso or peseta or any other form of Spanish silver coin will have, under this bill if it becomes a law, the personal right to carry it to the Treasury of the United States and have it exchanged for silver coin at a certain fixed per cent per peso.

That is the free coinage of silver on the demand of the man who holds the Puerto Rican coin, and it is nothing else. There is nothing in the bill which indicates that anything else is the purpose. The committee have come to the conclusion that it is a right that belongs to the holder of the Spanish coins in that island, and of course it must equally belong to the holders of Spanish coins in other islands acquired from Spain, to bring their Spanish money to the Treasury of the United States and exchange it for silver coin, and then to have the bullion coined. It is the free coinage of silver bullion held by Spanish people, or Puerto Ricans, or anybody else on the demand of the holder.

Mr. LODGE. Will the Senator from Alabama allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. MORGAN. Certainly.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator speaks of bringing Spanish bullion. This bill provides, I understand, only for the coinage of the Puerto Rican peso, which circulates only in the island, and the amount of which is absolutely limited. It does not provide for the coinage of the Spanish peseta. This is special coinage, the Puerto Rican peso, existing only in the island and circulating nowhere else in the Spanish possessions.

Mr. MORGAN. It is none the less silver bullion because it is a Puerto Rican coin. It may have been coined in Puerto Rico, but it is none the less bullion than if it had been coined in Spain. It is bullion and nothing else. It is not money in the view of our statutes. It has no money value here as a coin. Its bullion value is its only value.

Mr. FORAKER. There is this provision in the bill, which possibly the Senator from Alabama overlooked. It authorizes the recoinage of only Puerto Rican coins now in circulation in Puerto Rico.

Mr. MORGAN. Very good. That is, to say, Puerto Rican coins now in circulation, which means simply the silver bullion in circulation as coin. That is all it means. It is not coin according to our statutes. It goes the whole length of opening our mints to the free coinage of Spanish bullion, coined under Spanish law in Puerto Rico, at a fixed price of 60 cents an ounce. The right given for the free coinage of this bullion would be the same in law, if the price fixed was 100 cents per ounce. It is a right given to compel the mints of the United States to coin certain silver bullion, and this is all that the phrase, "the free coinage of silver" means.

It adopts the principle, and I approve it, and I am greatly gratified at it. The same principle was carried in the bill which was reported by a commission of which I had the honor to be a member, for the government of Hawaii. We reported a bill, and when it came to the Senate it was separated from the main measure and sent to the Committee on Finance, and it is pending there now. That provision was to take the bullion as we found it in Hawaii and convert it into coin of the United States. It was the same principle precisely that is found in this bill. It is the whole doctrine of the free coinage of silver on the demand of the holders of bullion, and is not anything else.

Now, inasmuch as we have asserted that right as a correct principle of government in this bill, which I thoroughly approve, I propose to extend it to the people of the United States, not on terms of equal liberality that we extend it to the holders of Puerto Rican pesos or pesetas, but on terms that are somewhat more circumscribed. This step takes us far in the direction of the good we must ultimately reach in our necessary return to the constitutional duty of providing for the coinage of gold and silver on equal terms.

But, before I proceed to define and to explain as well as I can the situation in regard to that particular duty and necessity, I wish to call attention to another state of facts. In these Spanish possessions we have acquired thirteen million of population, or thereabouts, all of whom have transacted almost the entire business of

all the islands, great as it is, upon the basis of silver money. Now, one of two things we ought to do. We ought either to let stand in those islands the Spanish laws that make these coins a legal tender and that provide for their increased coinage, or else we ought to convert them into American coins, as is done in this bill, on the demand of the holder of the Spanish coins, for we can not put those people to a worse disadvantage or inflict upon them greater trouble than to deprive them of the silver coin which they are using in their business and refuse to supply our coins in place of it.

There is nothing that we could do which would give greater distress, bring more serious ruin and disaster upon those people, than to refuse to legalize the silver coins that they have now, and then refuse to supply their places after having stricken them down. No duty the Government of the United States owes to humanity, even to say nothing of its treaty obligations and its obligations under the laws of nations, surpasses in its imperious demand for our consideration this duty of supplying those people with money to carry on their business. It is the vital point. In all their business it is the one indispensable thing. Not only is it cruel, but, Mr. President, it is a reproach to us, that we should undertake to set up a government there and, in doing that duty, destroy the coinage of those people in which their business has been conducted for centuries and provide nothing to supply the place of it.

This bill wisely supplies the place of it, so far as that coinage is concerned. It ought to go further, and it ought to permit coins to be made at the mints of the United States for the purpose of using them in the governmental operations in all these islands, every one of them. We can not take these islands and skim the cream of commerce off of them and supply nothing to them in the way of facilities for conducting that commerce without destroying our own reputation amongst the nations of the earth for ability to govern them wisely. We can not break those people down and leave them a wreck in their financial and commercial condition without providing some substitute for what we are taking away from them.

I do not find any provision here for establishing national banks in Puerto Rico; and I suppose there is none in contemplation for establishing national banks in the Philippine Islands or in Hawaii.

Mr. FORAKER. If the Senator will allow me to interrupt him, there is a provision in this bill which extends to Puerto Rico all the laws of the United States of a statutory character, all the enactments of Congress not locally inapplicable, and I presume under that provision a national bank could be established in Puerto Rico.

Mr. MORGAN. Well, if that is a correct assumption on the part of the Senator from Ohio, it shows that we can establish national banks in those islands. That is the proposition?

Mr. FORAKER. That is what we supposed.

Mr. BATE. Then it is not a foreign country.

Mr. MORGAN. Then it is not a foreign country in any sense of the word. It is a country against which you can make no discrimination, because if the national banks are carried into that new country under this bill, every law of the United States is carried in there that can be made useful or be made applicable to any condition that is found in the island of Puerto Rico. There can not be any question whatever about the logic of that proposition.

Therefore I approve, Mr. President, of the exchange of these coins for coins of the United States, with a mandatory provision that they shall be coined. I approve of the proposition that they shall be coined in the mints of the United States on the demand of the owner, and the further proposition that the individual who brings the bullion shall have the benefit of his demand and shall get his pay in the coin of the United States for his bullion at the price agreed upon. That is a good movement. That is in the right direction. That is what has contented me with this bill more than anything else. It was the fact that this movement was made absolutely necessary by conditions that were unavoidable which more than anything else has reconciled me to the expansion of our power and our influence over the newly acquired possessions, and also the further inevitable necessity which the Senate now is looking at with apprehension on the other side of the Chamber, that the tariff laws of the United States shall also be modified to suit these new possessions.

It is the fact that the Republican party, in order to expand the power and influence of this country and carry its flag into the Spanish possessions, find it necessary to come back to Democratic principles for the sake of conducting good government there which causes me to welcome an opportunity that otherwise never would have occurred, perhaps, for a hundred years, to force them to the adoption of Democratic principles and Democratic law as the true law and the true principles of the Government of the United States.

"All things come to him who waits," and, sooner than was hoped for, a protectionist Republican President demands free trade with Puerto Rico and Hawaii, and a gold Republican from Ohio reports this bill with a free-coinage provision in the seventh section.

Now, sir, I propose to use this principle thus admitted, this wise doctrine of political economy thus confessed, for an additional purpose for the benefit of those people and also for the benefit of ourselves. I want to give to the individual American citizen who owns silver bullion the right to go to the mints of the United States and have it coined exactly as if the bullion he owned were gold bullion. Under the laws of the United States as they exist now, whether gold bullion is in one form or in another, whether it is in the virgin form in which it left the mine, or whether it has even been wrought into articles of commerce, or whether it has been coined into foreign coin, if it is gold bullion, every American citizen and everybody else has the right to carry that bullion to the mint, demand a certificate of deposit for it, have it coined on his own personal account, and take that coin and circulate it through the country and through the world without the consent of any bank or banker or anybody else.

No Democrat has ever complained of that privilege being given to the American people. It has been a boast of the Democratic party always that gold bullion should be coined at the mints of the United States on the personal demand of its holder and that it should be handed out to him as coin after it is converted and stamped in the mint.

That is a principle, Mr. President, which belongs and has always belonged to American citizenship. It belongs to us under the Constitution; for at the time our Constitution was adopted and when we were British colonies and when we threw off the yoke of bondage to Great Britain, it was the law in all of the colonies of Great Britain, by act of Parliament, that every British subject, wherever he might be in all the realm, had the right to go to the British mint and have his gold bullion and his silver bullion coined into money.

That was the law at the time the Constitution was adopted, and it was with reference to that very law that that feature of the Constitution was adopted which forbids the States to permit any other kind of money to be made a legal tender except coins of gold and coins of silver. That had reference to the British statute, which secured a personal privilege—a most valuable personal right—to every British subject. It was retained, secured, and guaranteed in the Constitution and made obligatory on Congress.

Now, what is the personal right of the American citizen, at least as to gold? We have continued that right in our statutes, and under them to-day the right is perfect in any American citizen to have his gold bullion coined at the mints of the United States on his own private account.

The Democratic party, Mr. President, have always insisted that the same right should be extended to silver, and this is "free coinage." That right existed for seventy-odd years—for seventy-three years, I believe—unquestioned in the United States, and those who have denied that right to American citizenship have denied something that was guaranteed to them by the Constitution and by the laws of England at the time we became an independent power, and has always been approved and sustained by the Democratic party. It is the denial of a personal right to an individual that is just as personal to the man himself as the right to the writ of habeas corpus or trial by jury to deny him the right to have the Government convert his bullion into money, whether it is silver or gold. The Government has the sole power to convert bullion into money, and the citizen has the right to demand its exercise. The power can be regulated, but its exercise can not be refused, so as to destroy the value of gold or silver bullion.

Now, we have come to a point where, after having passed this great gold bill and put the country upon what is called a gold basis, we begin to relax in the very first bill that is presented here for consideration after that time; and in that we find the principle reaffirmed, that a man who owns silver bullion in Puerto Rico has the right to bring it to the mints of the United States and have it coined at a certain fixed rate. We are indebted to a Republican Senator from Ohio, Mr. President, for this new departure in search of the old road, I will call it, on the part of that great political organization, and I profoundly thank him for the courage, the manhood, and the recognition of duty that are involved in the report of the seventh section of this bill.

On another occasion, perhaps twenty years ago, we were indebted to another great Ohio Republican, Stanley Matthews, for resolutions which the present Senator from Ohio to-day follows out, giving to the people of the United States the right of the free coinage of gold and silver upon terms of equality, so far as the mint privilege is concerned, and at a ratio fixed by law. From that time until the passage of the gold bill in the Senate a few days ago, the Democratic party, along with some very valuable and very honorable allies who have been associated with us in our efforts, have fought year in and year out, have struggled with all possible power, energy, and determination, to get as much as we could get of silver money coined in the United States, and to enlarge, as far as it was possible to enlarge, the right of the

citizens of the United States to coin silver bullion into money. We have made great progress through great difficulties, many obstructions, some of them coming from Republicans and others coming from Democrats in the Presidential office. We have made great progress.

Finally it has come to this condition, Mr. President, that this country is not only on a gold standard, but that the bond debt is made perpetual, an irredeemable bond debt, redeemable only in name and not in fact. The national banks are the sole dispensers of the power of the Government of the United States in the distribution of money and are given the absolute control of it. But in this bill the first movement is made which I am proud to say I believe will ultimately result in the entire freedom of silver as to its coinage, and it comes again from a Republican Senator from the great State of Ohio, and I welcome the movement.

It may be long delayed through the obstructions of the capitalized classes, but its necessity is confessed in this measure in a bold and, I trust, in a sincere way that can not be hereafter denied. The cerements are suddenly broken by this bill, and silver is released from its new-made grave.

The addition which I propose to make to this section I will now read. It is exactly in line with the seventh section. It does not in the slightest degree conflict with it except that it is a narrower provision than the seventh section. It places upon the American citizen some restrictions in regard to the right to have silver bullion coined that are not found in the seventh section of this proposed act.

I will read my proposition:

Any citizen of the United States who shall deposit for coinage, at any mint of the United States, silver bullion of the value of not less than $100, estimated at the rate of 371¼ grains of pure silver per dollar—

Just as here we estimate the peso at 60 cents of the American dollar—

and at the same time and as a part of the same deposit shall also deposit gold bullion for coinage of equal or greater value, estimated at the rate of 23.22 grains of pure gold per dollar—

That is 16 to 1 fixed by law, just as it is fixed by law to-day, the silver dollar which we are now required to redeem in gold, as is asserted, every silver dollar now bears the relation to a gold dollar of 16 grains of silver to 1 of gold—

shall be entitled to have such gold and silver bullion coined in such lawful denominations of gold and silver coins of the United States as he shall designate, and after such deposit none of said bullion shall be withdrawn as bullion from such mint—

That is to prevent a fraudulent deposit and to force the coinage when you make the deposit, without the liberty of withdrawing it—

but such gold and silver bullion shall be coined and the coin shall be delivered to the depositor, his or her assigns, or legal representatives, in discharge of the certificate of deposit issued for such deposit.

The superintendent of such mint shall issue to such depositors certificates of deposit, in accordance with this act, and shall refine and coin such bullion of gold and silver for and on account of such depositors in the same manner as if the same was owned by and was coined on account of the Government of the United States, and the charges for refining and coining such bullion shall be the same as are lawfully made in such cases.

No gold or silver bullion shall be deposited for coinage under this act that has been coined or manufactured as an article of commerce, or that is not the product of mines in the United States.

There is another limitation, a very much more stringent limitation than the one that is imposed by the seventh section of this bill upon the Puerto Rican coin. They are bullion. What I offer to have coined under this additional section is bullion. They are bullion that has been coined in the Puerto Rican mints. What I offer is the virgin silver and the virgin gold that come from the American mine and belong to American citizens and must be deposited in one deposit and in equal quantities, or at least that there shall be as much gold deposited as there is of silver in value, and when coined the coin shall be delivered into the hands of the depositor.

Now, Mr. President, where is the injustice of that? Who can suggest that there is some inequality in this proposition, that there is some advantage given in favor of silver over gold or of gold over silver? They are to be deposited in equal amounts, deposited together, coined at the same mint and under the same deposit, and the money is to be handed out when coined into the hands of the depositor. Where can be the injustice; where can be the danger to the national banks, or the capitalists of the country, or the holders of gold mines, or to any other person when every time we coin a silver dollar we must also coin a gold dollar and put it in circulation?

The silver money of this country, after it has been dethroned from its constitutional attitude of a money metal, is made to play the part of a transgressor against the law; something that has committed some public sin against the general welfare, something that is unworthy of a place in the American coinage, except in virtue of the provision that it is made redeemable in gold coin. It is the theory of the gold bill, it is the theory of the Republican party at this time, that there stands behind every silver dollar in the United States a pledge of gold redemption. That is the theory, although it is infinitely far from the fact. Now, if under this section that I propose to add to the bill you issue a gold dollar at every time you issue a silver dollar, you produce the redeemer at the same time that you create the sinner.

The alleged silver token is always attended with its redeemer and can not be coined in its absence. The antidote goes along with the alleged poison, and the redemption takes place instantly; they both pass out into the country, the one to stand for redemption and the other to be redeemed, just like it is on the presentation of a silver dollar or of a gold five-dollar piece at the Treasury Department and the taking out of a gold certificate or a silver certificate. That remains in circulation among the people for the purpose of redeeming the silver dollar that was put out at the same time, and the parity is made perfect.

Now, what effect will this have upon the country? The first effect will be to stimulate the production of gold in the mines of the United States. Is there any reason why the production of silver metal should not be encouraged in the United States from mines within our own limits when we know perfectly well that silver is not a useless and worthless thing; when we know that the nations of the earth are bound to have it, at least for subsidiary coinage; when we know that the Almighty gave us these facilities here for the purpose of enabling the people to carry on their work, and without which it can not be carried on? We can not treat or consider the possession of silver mines as being a matter of no value to the people and no source of wealth for them. On the contrary, it is our duty to make for ourselves, our people, and our Government all the advantage that we can out of the ownership of these silver mines.

The most irrational and fatuous neglect and abuse of a vast and peculiar source of wealth to our people—our silver mines—is locked up by the hand of avarice, and the key is handed over by our politicians to the money kings of Europe. I fear it will remain so until some terrible war has forced us to look to our silver resources to supply the place of European credit and capital, from which we shall then be divorced. We can prevent such a war if we will now begin to coin these treasures.

Senators know perfectly well that it is only in the Western Hemisphere that silver is produced in any appreciable quantities. The Western Hemisphere is the silver-bearing part of this world. The Eastern Hemisphere has gold in great quantities, but very little silver is there to be found—a little in Germany, a little in Russia; and where else will you go in the Eastern Hemisphere to find silver? A very small fraction is produced in China, possibly a little in Japan, but the great silver-bearing region of this world is the Western Hemisphere, commencing with the mountains of Alaska, extending to Patagonia, through the whole sweep of this great range of mountains.

As the world is obliged to have silver, and as nations and cities and dense communities could not subsist without the use of silver subsidiary coin, why should we not, being the possessors of the most valuable silver mines in the world, create a policy here which will stimulate the production of silver and also of gold? Europe and Asia must furnish us with a market for silver that can never fail. Have we got to the point where we are afraid of an inundation of specie money? Are we afraid that the time has come or is about to come or that it will ever come when there will be too much specie money in this country?

Well, Mr. President, I can say for a vast mass of the people of the United States who are called Democrats that there is not one of them who ever shivered at that prospect, not one. The Democrats of the United States would gladly welcome an extension of the specie basis of this country, and at the proper time—which, I think, is any time—a motion will be made to compel the national banks of this country to substitute in place of the national bonds as a basis of their banking circulation this specie basis of gold and silver. We shall have to come to that pretty soon.

Ultimately we will be bound to come to it; we can not avoid it. This country can not go along on the plan of issuing bonds and continuing to issue bonds, to be charged as interest upon the labor and industry of the country, in order to furnish a foundation for a national-bank system. We have got to get some other foundation for it. The laboring men of this country are not going to consent to be taxed, they and their children, for ages and ages to come, to sustain the national banks and the classes of society to which they pander and which they assist in building up into exclusive and masterful communities in this land.

The Democratic idea, Mr. President, will prevail upon this question. It is bound to work out. It may be said that the silver question is dead. Suppose it was dead, Mr. President—dead as Hector. We have found the Republican Senator from Ohio [Mr. FORAKER] bringing it up in the seventh section of this bill and opening it again. He is obliged to bring up the silver question and put it into the bill in order to keep those poor Puerto Rican people from starving to death, and that is exactly what we have got to do in the United States to keep a great many other people from starving to death after a little time.

This is what is destroying India to-day. Seventy million people in India to-day are in starvation. The Senate of the United

States, it seems, can look at that with perfect complacency. We, perhaps, need not disturb our slumbers or our dreams in our own splendid condition of present enjoyment by reflecting that there are 70,000,000 people in India to-day who are starving. It is very hard to get our people to believe it, and yet that is the fact. The British Government is straining every possible energy and using all of its vast resources for the purpose of trying to prevent the starvation, which they themselves have caused.

Mr. President, it is not the withholding of the rain, or the refusal of the hand of labor, or the presence of disease or of war—for there is no war in India—that has caused this starvation there. What has caused it? The British gold policy. How has it caused it? By taking off the supply of money from the poor people, who live on small amounts of money daily. It has reduced the supply of money in India, and food can not be obtained, not so much because of the failure of the crops as because you can not get interchange of produce from one part of that country with another, even where they have railroads and canals, but where the money is not in the hands of the people to buy provisions. When the British Government carries the provisions to them, they must do it as a bounty, the people themselves not being able, for want of a sufficient circulating medium in that country, to buy anything.

That is the condition of India. Senators may make light of it, but they can not find any other reason for it. That is a plain and palpable fact, and it will come in this country when our populations get congested to two or three times the number of people we have got here unless we accept the invitation of the Almighty and open our mines of gold and silver and allow the people to use gold and silver as coin in the conduct of their business, as they have the constitutional right to do.

The first impression that will be produced by the passage of this bill is that it will stimulate the silver mines in this country to production. That ought to be done. They ought not to go to waste. The silver ought not to be allowed to remain locked up in the bowels of the earth. Silver ought to be doing its duty among the business men of this country, rich and poor, but particularly and chiefly amongst the poorer classes of the people. There will be an addition to the value of money in this country. There is no doubt of that.

Mr. President, when we think of the enormous additions of population to our country even through immigration, to say nothing of the natural increase from year to year, we find that it is necessary to increase the volume of money to correspond with it. Can any Senator here name a country in this world, except Argentina, that is receiving an acquisition of population by immigration besides the United States? If so, what country is it that in its daily reports of its population shows that it is receiving an increase of popular strength from the other parts of the world?

To what country is it that the American emigrates? What line of migration has ever started in any part of the United States to draw our people away from this country, to carry them to some more favored land? Nothing of that sort has ever occurred.

Mr. President, so long as our institutions are what they are and so long as we carry into effect that grand, splendid pledge of individual liberty found in the Constitution of the United States, this emigration will never take place. It may follow expansion into distant places, under the flag of the country, but there is no man who has ever tasted of American liberty who is willing to exchange it for the liberties of any other country in the world.

No man who has ever shared the honors of its flag is willing to exchange them for the honors of any other flag that floats on sea or land. So that there is no disposition on the part of Americans to emigrate. But this country is filling up annually with from six hundred thousand to a million of new acquisitions of population from other countries. That is keeping on and on. Every man who comes here requires that much more of currency created by law in this country in order to transact his business. If we had as many people in the United States to-day as there are in China, which has not much over two-thirds of the area of territory that we possess, the amount of money that we have here of all kinds and descriptions, gold, silver, paper money, national-bank notes, and Treasury certificates, would not be one-third of what would be requisite for carrying on the business of the country, and paralysis would take place in all classes of industry almost instantaneously.

As the country expands and as it grows without expansion it is the duty of the Government of the United States to increase the volume of sound money, just such sound money as is provided for in the seventh section of this bill. I can not assume in justice to the honorable Senator from Ohio that in the seventh section of this bill he proposes to pay to the Puerto Ricans any unsound money for the Spanish pesos and pesetas. He takes a Spanish peso and he prices it at 60 cents, and pays for it with silver coin. You are not giving that man unsound money; you are not tricking him out of his little earnings and sending to him silver money which is unsound. That would not do; that would be immoral; that would be, Mr. President, scarcely less than petit larceny by an act of Congress.

So it is sound money that we are giving to those people, and it is sound money that I propose to issue dollar for dollar, gold and silver in company, so that no silver dollar shall issue without its accompanying dollar of gold. That is sound money, and if gold is the redeemer, it needs no other atonement. It is that much sounder than the silver would be by itself if the Republican doctrine is true. I accept the situation for the sake of the argument, not because it is true. Out goes the silver dollar, attended by its escort and redeemer, the gold dollar; one can not go without the other. In doing that we are filling up the substratum, the real foundation, the basis of currency in this country, to meet the many exigencies that are arising, exigencies created by immigration to this country, exigencies created by the expansion of our territorial domain; exigencies created, Mr. President, by the command of the Almighty that we shall make good use of all the materials we have in our possession that He has bestowed upon us. We can not ignore that duty without doing ourselves a serious and an unchristian wrong.

I have now, I think, explained this matter so far as it is necessary to go with it at the present time. If anyone else wishes to discuss this subject, I shall be very glad to hear some objections that can be urged against this measure; I shall be very glad to have pointed out to me some disadvantage it can possibly be to the people of the United States or the people of Puerto Rico.

My purpose in bringing the question forward, Mr. President, is not the mere idea of a party man trying to gain a political advantage. I present this subject at the first opportune moment, which has been furnished in the seventh section of this bill, and upon exactly the parallel principles that are found in the seventh section, for the purpose of inviting the attention of the Senate of the United States and the Congress and the people of the United States to the fact that we still have open to us under the gold law an opportunity to enlarge the specie basis of this country, to improve the value of our mines, and, Mr. President, above all, to hold them in the control of the Government of the United States.

If we pass this proposition that I present now to the Senate of the United States, it will not be one year until every dollar that can be taken out of the silver mines of the United States will be coined as it is taken out. Men will easily find the gold bullion to carry in company with their silver in order to get the right of joint deposit and to get the money that will result therefrom. This will cause the mints to increase their output of money with great rapidity, and it will bring into the coinage every dollar of silver that we can produce from our mines. Is that going to flood the country with iniquity and wrong and disaster and crime?

Has it ever been heard of, or will it ever be heard of, that it is an unjust thing or a dangerous thing to open the mines of this country and send out the silver and gold in equal quantities? Mr. President, that would destroy this competition between gold and silver, which means the competition between the capitalist and the ordinary toiler in the fields. Neither of them would have any advantage; but the toiler would have the right to produce, if he were a miner, at the point of his pick, when the sun went down upon his daily labor, the bullion which he can mint into money and circulate in the payment of his debts and the purchase of what he wants, without asking the consent of any banker that lives; and until we get into that condition we will not realize, as we did for seventy-three years in this Government, the true, real, actual, individual liberties of the citizen.

It is a part of my liberty, sir, that I have the right to have gold coin. That is secured to me by law. Why is it secured to me by law that I can take gold bullion and go to the mint in Philadelphia or to the Treasury here in Washington and demand its coinage, instead of keeping it in bullion in my pocket? Because that is secured to me by the Constitution of my country and by the law of my country. Why can I not take silver, if I hold that in bullion, and have that coined? It was a right that existed under the Constitution and under the laws of the United States and under the laws of England for two centuries before the Constitution of the United States was adopted.

I had that right, which a political party, for the purpose of setting up the national banks in supreme control of the financial affairs of this country, have taken away from me. That is all of it. I am a man robbed of his rights as an American citizen by an act that I consider, Mr. President, unconstitutional and excessively cruel and very unjust to the whole country; and I think it is a shameful defiance of the laws of God—that is my view about the silver question—a shameful defiance of the laws of God.

Now, sir, when I offer to do this, when I present the proposition to the Senator from Ohio, following the principles of the proposition he himself has offered in this bill, not departing from them one iota, it can not be said of me that I am attempting to work some political purpose; it can not be said of me that I am bringing up a subject of irritation for the purpose of delaying the Puerto Rican government, which I am very anxious should be established by this bill.

I do it, Mr. President, for the purpose of addressing myself to this question at a moment and under circumstances where I have

the precedent and the rule laid down in section 7 of this bill. I follow it strictly, closely, and do not depart from it; and I insist that I have the right, under the logic of the seventh section, to extend this free-coinage privilege that is given to the Puerto Rican citizen, so as to recover back my right to have silver coined if I can produce gold to accompany it, and to let the two metals accompany each other.

The voting down of this amendment, Mr. President, will be the final declaration on the part of the Senate of the United States that no more silver dollars in this country shall ever be coined so long as the Republican party has the power to prevent it. Now, I am willing to meet them on that issue, politically speaking. If they have the judgment which I suppose they are possessed of, they will hesitate a long time before they raise a question of that kind in the campaign to be determined in November next; for when the people of the United States see that this gold law means that there is to be no more silver coined forever so long as the Republican party is in power, they will make way for putting that party out of power very suddenly.

There is nothing demanded here that is not right, that is not constitutional, that is not just and equitable, that is not safe. If any Senator wants to discuss this question after I take my seat, I hope he will address himself to any possible danger that might arise out of the adoption of this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ALLEN in the chair). The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. MORGAN].

Mr. MORGAN. On that I call for the yeas and nays.

Mr. FORAKER. Mr. President, I only want to say before a vote is taken that the amendment proposed by the Senator from Alabama is in the nature of general legislation, while the legislation under consideration has reference only to Puerto Rico and to affairs and questions concerning Puerto Rico.

The provision the Senator finds in section 7 is not a provision, as I understood him to characterize it, providing for the free coinage of silver bullion, but it is a provision for the exchange and redemption of Puerto Rican coins in the manner provided in that section, in order that the people of Puerto Rico may have for the transaction of their business only one kind of coin, and that American coin. The whole purpose of the provision is to meet a necessity which is existing in that island, and which, according to present conditions, is working very great hardship in the way of a handicap, as it were, upon all kinds of business transactions.

It does not seem to be necessary, Mr. President, to answer the Senator further than to simply make this general statement. I think the statement of the Senator that the provision is in the nature of a provision for free coinage generally is entirely unwarranted and that his amendment is out of harmony with this bill. We are not in favor of the free coinage of silver, even when tendered with such compliments as the Senator saw fit to bestow upon the author of the section in question.

It is always a delight, Mr. President, to hear the Senator from Alabama. He is so able and so fertile; he is so kind; he is so agreeable that I hope the day is far distant when he will not belong in this Chamber. He is a delight to every member of this body, and he enjoys the unqualified respect and esteem of all who are in political opposition to him. That is well known to all here, but that is not enough to induce us to accept this amendment.

I hope, Mr. President, that the Senator will understand that we are not showing any lack of appreciation for the proposition he has made in dismissing the matter without discussing it at length and in the serious way in which he has presented it to the Senate.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. President, this proposition can not be passed over and will not be passed over by the people of the United States in any light way.

The Senator makes a distinction, or attempts to do so, between the redemption of a peseta or peso of the Puerto Rican coinage and the coinage of American bullion. Suppose I should change the phraseology of my amendment, and say that when $100 of gold and $100 of silver, the product of an American mine, is presented at a mint, it shall be redeemed in the coin of the United States, of gold or silver, at the rate of 371¼ grains of pure silver or 23.25 grains of pure gold, would there be any difference between the two propositions? There would be only a difference in words.

When I have the right to deposit gold and silver at the mints and demand for it the coinage of the United States to be handed back to me, whether that coinage shall consist of the same metal or some other metal, it makes no difference—that is the redemption, if you please to call it such, of the bullion in the coin; it is a conversion, to use the proper term; and while the Senator has used the word "redemption" here, it is only a conversion; it is a change of the Spanish peseta into the American dollar or the Spanish peso into the American dollar or other American coin; for the bill provides that when this coin is deposited by the holder in his own right in a mint of the United States it shall be coined into the silver money of the United States. It is redeemed; it is converted; it is changed; it is coined.

The idea and the principle is precisely the same, and there is no refinement of language or argumentation that can get away from the main fact that we give to the Puerto Ricans here the right to come or to anybody who owns those pesetas or pesos the right to come to the mint, to deposit them, and have them coined, and to receive for them the silver coins of the United States. That is all I claim for the people of the United States.

The Senator spoke as if the people of Puerto Rico were not to be citizens of the United States; that it was a favor given to some foreign people, some people in some peculiar situation. Well, that only makes the argument stronger in my favor, for we ought to do for our own citizens what we are not compelled to do for citizens of other countries, if the argument is that they are not citizens. But they are citizens. The treaty of Paris makes them citizens. It puts it in the power of the Government of the United States to use them in its armies, to do anything else with them, to force their obedience to our laws, and they are subject to our power. If in that light they are not citizens of the United States, then we have no citizens. I do not know what their powers may be as provided by act of Congress, and I have not looked at that subject as it is presented in this bill; but I do claim that they are citizens of the United States in respect to this particular function and power which is given to them in the seventh section of this bill.

No, sir; this matter can not pass off lightly; it can not pass off without notice; it is a serious proposition; it is not out of order; it is no departure from the principle or the plan of the bill; it is directly in line with it; it is the subject of legitimate legislation, just as much so as when the seventh section gives the right of coinage or the right of redemption or the right of exchange in favor of the owner of Spanish money—just the same.

It may be, Mr. President, that the country have not caught upon the idea, it may be that they have not yet appreciated the situation in regard to the gold law. That is very true. Our people are as dead as if they were frozen in an Alaskan glacier on the subject of gold and silver at this moment; but as soon as the people have discovered the work that has been done against them you will see, Mr. President, that the reaction will be volcanic. The people will rise in their majesty, and they will throw off the men and the powers that have enchained them in that gold law. I am furnishing the Senators now an opportunity to pacify the people; an opportunity to do them justice; an opportunity to show that the Republican party of the United States are not for ever and ever compelled by their present committals against the restoration of silver money to the people of this country.

Is silver dead absolutely? Is the silver dollar gone out of the coinage, gone out of existence, except something that remains to be redeemed? Has it now become so thoroughly demonetized that it requires the action of the Congress of the United States to bring it back to life? That seems to be the situation. It has been destroyed. There is no doubt about that, Mr. President. Silver money is in nothing like so favorable a condition to-day as it was when the John Sherman Act of 1873 was passed. The act of this Congress in passing the gold bill has placed silver money in a far worse condition than it was placed in 1873; and yet the people seem to be sadly looking on. They are dazed. They have not yet comprehended what has happened to them.

Some of us understand it and have been trying to inform them as to the great outrage which has been perpetrated upon them in that bill; and now when I come forward with a measure which will give the people very great relief, they say that because they like me they do not wish to treat the subject very harshly; they do not wish to debate it because they are pleased with me and my presence in this Chamber. I warn Senators that they must not think the crow will drop the grapes from his mouth because the fox at the foot of the tree is trying to beguile him.

This movement which is going on here before the Senate, where 90 per cent of the seats are vacant, when the Senators are off amusing themselves or attending to other matters of business, will strike to the very bottom of the political situation of this country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Chair understand the Senator from Alabama to suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. MORGAN. I did not. The people of the United States will call this debate in question. They will examine into what is being said. They will examine into the merits of this amendment. They will hold the Republican party of this country responsible for what the Senator from Ohio has said here this evening—that the subject is hardly worthy of consideration.

Mr. FORAKER. Oh, Mr. President, I did not say the subject was not worthy of consideration. The Senator entirely misunderstood my remarks if he thought I said any such thing. I think it is a very important subject; but I said the amendment of the Senator is in the nature of general legislation, and therefore we did not feel disposed to take it into serious consideration in connection with this bill, which is special, simply providing a civil government for Puerto Rico and dealing only with Puerto Rican affairs.

Mr. MORGAN. Suppose it is in the nature of general legislation. Where is legislation more general than that found in this bill? It is the first effort we are making to control these Spanish possessions. There is wrapped up in the provisions of this bill more general legislation than I ever saw in one bill. There are more general provisions, each one extremely important, found in the body of this bill than in any other bill which has been reported to the Senate since I have been in the body. It is a new movement on the part of the United States. It includes every interest of everybody, not only in the Spanish islands but in the entire country. It includes the most profound discussions and considerations of the Constitution of the United States in all of its bearings and in regard to all of its departments, legislative, executive, and judicial.

This is, sir, a general bill, as much a general bill as any that was ever offered at that desk; and general legislation, providing for the people of the United States, is as much at home upon this bill as it would have been upon the gold bill. It is not only at home, but it is here by invitation, for the gentlemen, finding that they could not get along without providing silver money for Puerto Rico, have come back to the general proposition that it is their duty to do it, and they are proposing to supply that money by what they call an act of exchange or redemption of Puerto Rican money into American coin.

What obligations are we under to redeem Puerto Rican money? Put it upon that ground—that this money shall be redeemed at the Treasury. Are we under an obligation to those people that their money shall be as good as gold? If we have come under any obligations at all, that is the effect—that their money, which was as good as gold in Puerto Rico and circulated freely as legal tender, shall be as good as gold in the United States. But instead of complying with that obligation, we price it at 60 cents on the dollar, put our own price on it, and compel them to do it or else banish it from the island. That is the legislation we are indulging in here, legislation of the most general character.

A man anywhere who owns one of these pieces of money can go and demand its redemption at 60 cents on the dollar at any mint in the United States. A citizen of the United States or of Spain (whether he resides in one of these States or Territories or in Puerto Rico makes no difference under this bill) has the general, universal right to go and demand redemption. Is not that general legislation? Is not that legislation that affects everybody in the United States?

How can the Senator content himself with answering the argument that has been made here this afternoon, and others very much stronger that could be made by abler men, by saying that this appears to be a departure; that this is specific legislation for Puerto Rico and not general legislation. Sir, we are always engaged in general legislation when we are dealing with the principles of this Government, and especially those that are based upon the Constitution of the United States. We can not escape it. Senators need not suppose that there is any possibility of escaping the full measure of responsibility to the people of the United States for the rejection of this amendment. It is an important subject. It is a proper subject.

The view I present in this amendment is a just view. If it is unjust toward any person in the world, it is toward those who own silver bullion, the product of American mines. I repeat that we have limited the right to the citizens of the United States and to bullion produced in American mines that has never been mined or wrought into articles of commerce, and we have priced it upon exactly the basis that obtains to-day between gold and silver coins in this country; that is to say, the basis of 16 to 1. That obtains here now. Nobody has ever attempted to change it until we come to this bill, when the basis is changed to a different rate and 30 per cent is knocked off the value of a silver peso, nine-tenths fine, standard silver. Thirty per cent is knocked off in order to give those people down there the money.

How much money are we going to make out of this and at what rate are you going to coin this bullion when you get it into the Treasury of the United States? Four hundred and twelve and a half grains make a dollar, and we buy that much money from these Puerto Ricans, by compulsion, at 60 cents. That is what this bill provides for. We compel them to go without money or take it at 60 cents on the dollar.

What kind of justice is that to them, if you please? Why not say to them, "You shall bring your money into the Treasury of the United States, to the mints of the United States, and have it coined in any of the mints at the rate of 16 grains of pure gold for 371¼ grains of pure silver?" Why not say that to them? Why do we not place their silver money upon exactly the same basis that other silver money occupies in this country to-day? For it can not be denied that a legal-tender silver dollar, if there is any such existing in the United States now, does contain 412½ grains of silver, nine-tenths fine. That can not be disputed.

When we are dealing with this subject we ought not to act arbitrarily. We ought to deal with it on principles of exact justice. The Government of the United States will make money, large money, out of the seventh section of the bill and out of the poor Puerto Ricans. It is bound to do it, for a peso containing as much silver as there is in an American dollar is brought here under the compulsion of this law and "redeemed" at 60 cents.

There is a margin of 30 cents on the dollar that we are making as a Government for giving them the privilege of using our coin; exchanging it, as they call it; redemption, they call it, when we are under no obligation to redeem; when there is no promise outstanding for redemption. There is no redemption about it, because there is no promise to be redeemed. There is no obligation to be lifted. Under this specious and improper word "redemption" we are forcing these people to deliver up their coins at the mints of the United States in exchange for American coin at 60 cents on the dollar. We call it redemption.

No, sir; it is free coinage. It gives them the privilege of doing it or not doing it. They can take this money and go to Spain with it, where it is at par, and use it there. The result of the bill that we are passing now, in its seventh section, unattended with the section I propose, will be to drive the Spanish money out of Puerto Rico and leave those people poorer and worse off than they could possibly be in any other way.

The bill provides that after its passage nothing shall circulate there as legal tender except the money of the United States. What then becomes of all these pesos and pesetas, all the silver money in Puerto Rico, and what will become of it in the other islands, where about 13,000,000 people are in daily use of it? It will all be swept out and carried back to Spain. These islands will be denuded of silver currency until we can supply the place of it, and our laws do not provide any means of supplying the place of it except under a measure like that which passed here yesterday for the purchase of silver bullion to be coined into subsidiary coin of the United States.

There is no power in the United States to-day to coin a legal-tender silver dollar. There is no possibility of it, and a legal-tender silver dollar could not go into Cuba or Puerto Rico or the Philippine Islands or any of the late Spanish possessions unless we take it there through our Governmental agencies and pay it to the people out of the money already coined into silver dollars. The fate of the silver dollars was sealed by the gold bill. No other silver dollars ever will be or can be coined while that bill is the law of the United States. Here comes the island of Puerto Rico, with a million inhabitants, knocking at the doors of the consciences of the Senate, finding a ready response in the heart of the honorable Senator from Ohio, who proposes to them "if you will take 60 cents on the dollar for your peseta that is worth a hundred cents we will let you have American coin for it."

Mr. FORAKER. If the Senator will allow me, does he not know that this peso in Puerto Rico is now worth in our money really only about 45 or 48 cents?

Mr. MORGAN. I think so.

Mr. FORAKER. And that we are proposing to give them 60 cents, as the Senator said a while ago, in gold, I believe, or the equivalent of gold at any rate.

Mr. MORGAN. This is a very munificent thing. We are rich and can afford to do that. Why not give them a dollar?

Mr. FORAKER. What I wanted to call to the attention of the Senator is the fact that we are not seeking to deprive them of any value, but we are paying them far in excess of the real value, which is all they can realize there.

Mr. CLAY. Will the Senator from Ohio allow me to ask him a question right here?

Mr. FORAKER. Certainly.

Mr. CLAY. I desire to ask if it is not true that the peso of which he speaks contains an ounce of silver, and if we take it and redeem it in silver or gold, American money, and coin it, will we not really coin it into a dollar and will we not get a dollar for it? It contains the same amount of silver, I understand, that our silver dollars contain.

Mr. FORAKER. I do not know into what it will be coined, but I know it is worth only what I have indicated. We are proposing to pay them more for it than it is worth. If it be only bullion, as the Senator from Alabama stated, they are selling it at a good price, one advantageous to them. We are not compelling them to turn in their coins and to have them redeemed and to take other coins in exchange.

We are simply giving them that opportunity, in order that there may be only one kind of money in Puerto Rico. If they prefer to take their money to Spain or to send it there, where the Senator says it will have greater value, that is their privilege. They are not denied that. The Puerto Ricans, so far as I am aware, are not making any complaint, but they are very greatly pleased with the proposition. We are under no obligation to make their Puerto Rican coins legal tender there or elsewhere. We take the situation as we find it.

Mr. CLAY. Is it not true that we get from them the same amount of silver that we put into our silver dollars? If that is so,

will we not really get a dollar's worth of silver from them and pay them 60 cents for it, and recoin it, and place it in circulation for a dollar?

Mr. FORAKER. It is true that we are paying them 60 cents for what we might buy elsewhere for less money. We can do with it as we like after we get it, I presume. The United States is not buying it with the idea of coining it into money and increasing the silver coinage of the country or of making any profit. If we were, we could buy all the silver we could coin for years to come for a much less price, as I understand it.

Mr. MORGAN. I called attention in the opening of my remarks on this subject to the fact that the seventh section of the bill requires this money to be coined into coins of the United States; whether it is dollars or half dollars or quarter dollars makes no difference. It is coin of the United States at the rate of 412½ grains of silver nine-tenths fine. The ounce of silver that is contained in a peso, as the Senator from Georgia very properly suggests, is worth a dollar in our coinage.

We go to the people whom we have brought within the influence of our sovereign power, who are entirely helpless, and we find them in possession of a coinage of silver without which they can not live, the only money in Puerto Rico they ever used in their business at all, and we say to them: "You are citizens of the United States; you are liable to serve in our armies; we can tax you; this bill taxes you; this bill imposes a government upon you that is very expensive, and all that; you have money here that rates at only 45 cents on the dollar, and we propose to raise it from 45 up to 60;" and the Senator from Ohio says that is a great benefaction to the people of Puerto Rico, and that the people down there are greatly pleased with it. Suppose we found a Territory in the American Union here within the body of our old organization that was in the same condition.

Would we ever think of taking up the money of the people of that territory at 60 cents on the dollar, as they have always used it, and paying them for it in coins of the United States at that rate? We do make 30 cents on every dollar, for the reason that the bill requires that the money shall be coined, and when we coin it the Spanish peso produces in value in gold 100 cents, and we pay for it 60 cents to the poor, miserable Puerto Ricans. That is what this bill does.

I did not intend to object to the bill on that account if I could get the privilege in favor of American citizens of doing what the Puerto Rican can do, come here and have his bullion coined. We say to the Puerto Rican, "You can bring it here to the mint and you shall have it coined. We will price it at 60 cents on the dollar." I say in the amendment to the American silver miner and the man who owns bullion in this country, "Bring your silver here; bring along with it its redeemer, gold; put them both to work at the same time, so that one shall have no advantage over the other, so that there shall be no inundation of either kind of metal, and we will give you the right to have your silver coined along with the gold. We will restore to you that personal privilege, and put it into your hands, so that you can go to the mint with your silver bullion, just as you can now go with the gold bullion, and demand the coinage of it as a right." That is what I want. That is the free coinage of silver.

People usually do not properly estimate the meaning of that phrase—"free coinage of silver." It does not mean that silver shall be coined without some payment for the manufacture of it from bullion into coin. It does not mean that you must go and melt up the spoons and dishes in the country to make silver money of them, though sometimes that would be very useful, especially in time of war. I have seen times, Mr. President [Mr. ALLEN in the chair], and you have, when that expedient would have been very valuable to both sides whom we were representing at that time. It does not mean that. The free coinage of silver means the right of the individual man who owns the bullion to take it to the mint, as he does when he owns gold, and demand the coinage of it.

It is the right of the free man to do with his property what the Constitution of the United States provided and what God intended when he made it. That is all. That is the free coinage of silver. The law fixes the rate. It fixes the rate between every silver dollar existing in the United States and every gold dollar—16 to 1. In this bill it is fixed at 60 cents on the dollar, which is a wrong and injustice to the Puerto Ricans, and it is one that we can not remedy in any other way so as to give those people silver money, except by giving them this privilege when they are American citizens, to bring the silver or allow somebody else to do it and have it coined without getting the consent of a certain class of people in the United States.

Mr. President, we are not on an equality with each other about these things. There is a certain very valuable class of property in the United States that the Almighty has never condemned, the experience of mankind has never condemned, a class of money that to-day your Government lives upon, for if you could take these silver dollars that exist in the United States to-day and melt them back into bullion your Government would go to ruin in twenty-four hours. It would go into bankrupty. Your banks would fail. Your business would stop. All the operations of commerce would cease. If we were to strike out of existence as coin and return it into existence as bullion the 800,000,000 silver dollars that we have coined since 1877 this Government would go to bankruptcy in twenty-four hours.

This Government is now living upon the silver that we have coined in this country through many trials and labors and tribulations in the last thirty years. That silver has a legal relation to gold at 16 to 1, and it will stay there. But there will not be a dollar added to it. It makes no difference what the growth of the country may be, what its necessities may be in time of famine or war or pestilence, the inexorable law of the gold bill that we passed here the other day forbids the coinage of another dollar of silver.

My heart, sir, leaped with joy when I found the honorable Senator from Ohio, a Republican, coming into this Chamber with a free-coinage proposition for silver. I propose to avail myself of it. I propose to improve upon it as I did once before, twenty-three years ago, when the honorable Stanley Matthews brought forward his celebrated resolutions. Upon that foundation all the work we have done since has been built.

I am glad that the Senator from Ohio has been forced by circumstances which were irresistible and which he tries now to smile away as if he were under no compulsion and under no pressure—I rejoice, sir, that the conditions of this country have forced him to bring this question to the front and have compelled him to put a free-coinage section in his bill. This is not to be laughed down. It is not to be passed by at an idle moment as an amusing episode in legislation. What is being said here now, not by me, but in the language of this amendment and this bill, will reach down to the hearts and consciences of the American people, and they will enact it at the expense of the Republican party.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. MORGAN].

Mr. MORGAN. On that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered; and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DAVIS (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Texas [Mr. CHILTON].

Mr. McBRIDE (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. MONEY]. As he is absent, I withhold my vote. If he were present, I should vote "nay."

Mr. McMILLAN (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. LINDSAY]. He not being present, I withhold my vote. I should vote "nay" if he were present.

Mr. MORGAN (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GEAR]. If he were present, I should vote "yea."

Mr. NELSON (when his name was called). I am paired with the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST]. I transfer my pair to the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SEWELL] and will vote. I vote "nay.'

Mr. PETTUS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR], who is absent on account of family affliction. I therefore withhold my vote. If he were present, I should vote "yea."

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming (after having voted in the negative). Inadvertently I voted in the absence of the Senator with whom I am paired, and I suggest to the Senator from Alabama that we exchange pairs, which will permit my vote to stand.

Mr. PETTUS. Very well, sir.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I allow my vote to stand.

Mr. PETTUS. I vote "yea."

Mr. PROCTOR (when his name was called). I am paired with the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. MALLORY]. I transfer my pair to the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH] and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. QUARLES (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON]. If he were here, I should vote "nay."

Mr. SULLIVAN (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. MASON]. He not being present, I withhold my vote.

Mr. TURLEY (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. SPOONER]. If he were present, I should vote "yea" and he would vote "nay."

Mr. QUARLES. Suppose we transfer our pairs.

Mr. TURLEY. Very well. I will transfer my pair with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. SPOONER] to the Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON], which will enable the junior Senator from Wisconsin and me to vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. WARREN (when his name was called). I am paired with the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. TURNER], and therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. WELLINGTON (when his name was called). I have a

general pair with the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BUTLER]. In his absence I withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. WETMORE. My colleague, the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH] is unavoidably absent. On this question a pair has been arranged between him and the Senator from Florida [Mr. MALLORY]. If present, he would vote "nay."

Mr. QUARLES. By the arrangement which has been made I can now vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. JONES of Arkansas (after having voted in the affirmative). I voted inadvertently on the roll call. I am paired with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PLATT]. If he were present, I would vote "yea."

Mr. HANSBROUGH. I have a pair with the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. DANIEL]. If agreeable, I will transfer that pair to the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. THURSTON] and vote "nay."

Mr. HANNA. I have a general pair with the Senator from Utah [Mr. RAWLINS]. If he were here, I would vote "nay."

The PRESIDING OFFICER (after Mr. ALLEN had voted in the affirmative). The junior Senator from Nebraska being paired with the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. MCCUMBER], who is absent, he withdraws his vote.

Mr. BURROWS (after having voted in the negative). I am paired with the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. CAFFERY], but I voted, believing that that Senator is in accord with me upon this proposition. Yet I do not know but that I ought to withdraw my vote, because I am not positive. Therefore I will withdraw my vote.

Mr. WELLINGTON. I am paired with the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BUTLER], who is absent. The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. JONES] is paired with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PLATT], I understand, and with his permission we will transfer our pairs so that we can both vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I vote "yea."

Mr. MCBRIDE. The senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. MORGAN] is paired with the junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. GEAR], and I suggest to the Senator from Alabama that we exchange pairs so that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. MONEY] will stand paired with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GEAR].

Mr. MORGAN. That is agreeable to me.

Mr. MCBRIDE. I vote "nay."

Mr. MORGAN. I vote "yea."

Mr. WETMORE (after having voted in the negative). I should like to inquire whether the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. BACON] has voted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The senior Senator from Georgia has not voted.

Mr. WETMORE. Then I will withdraw my vote.

Mr. HANNA. I will transfer my pair to the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BEVERIDGE] and vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. CLARK of Montana (after having voted in the affirmative). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. BEVERIDGE], who is not here, and I withdraw my vote.

The result was announced—yeas 9, nays 25; as follows:

YEAS—9.

Bate,	Jones, Ark.	Morgan,	Stewart,
Berry,	Martin,	Pettus,	Turley.
Clay,			

NAYS—25.

Bard,	Foster,	Kyle,	Quarles,
Chandler,	Frye,	Lodge,	Ross,
Clark, Wyo.	Hale,	McBride,	Shoup,
Cullom,	Hanna,	McComas,	Wellington.
Deboe,	Hansbrough,	Nelson,	
Fairbanks,	Hawley,	Perkins,	
Foraker,	Kean,	Proctor,	

NOT VOTING—53.

Aldrich,	Daniel,	McLaurin,	Spooner,
Allen,	Davis,	McMillan,	Sullivan,
Allison,	Depew,	Mallory,	Taliaferro,
Bacon,	Elkins,	Mason,	Teller,
Baker,	Gallinger,	Money,	Thurston,
Beveridge,	Gear,	Penrose,	Tillman,
Burrows,	Harris,	Pettigrew,	Turner,
Butler,	Heitfeld,	Platt, Conn.	Vest,
Caffery,	Hoar,	Platt, N. Y.	Warren,
Carter,	Jones, Nev.	Pritchard,	Wetmore,
Chilton,	Kenney,	Rawlins,	Wolcott.
Clark, Mont.	Lindsay,	Scott,	
Cockrell,	McCumber,	Sewell,	
Culberson,	McEnery,	Simon,	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No quorum being present and voting, the Secretary will call the roll.

Mr. FORAKER. Mr. President, I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, March 28, 1900, at 12 o'clock m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, *March 27, 1900.*

The House met at 12 o'clock m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY N. COUDEN, D. D.

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. JOY indefinitely, on account of important business.

ARMY APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill making appropriations for the Army.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa moves that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the Army appropriation bill.

Mr. HULL. Pending that, Mr. Speaker, I want to ask unanimous consent that general debate may run until 4 o'clock this afternoon, the time to be equally divided between this side and the other side of the Chamber, one half to be controlled by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SULZER] and the other half by myself.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Speaker, that is satisfactory to our side.

The SPEAKER. Pending the motion, the gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that general debate on the military appropriation bill be concluded at 4 o'clock to-day, after which it will be considered under the five-minute rule, the time for general debate to be divided between the two sides, one half to be controlled by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HULL] and the other half by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SULZER].

Mr. HAY. Mr. Speaker, I understood there should be coupled with that a further request that the gentlemen who speak on the bill should have the privilege of extending their remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. HULL. It was understood that if general debate was agreed to be closed at 4 o'clock, then there would be a request that all parties who spoke on the bill should be permitted to extend their remarks in the RECORD. I will ask unanimous consent before going into committee that all members speaking on the bill may have ten days to extend their remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Pending the motion, the gentleman from Iowa asks that unanimous consent be given to all gentlemen who speak on the bill to extend their remarks in the RECORD for ten days. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. LENTZ. That privilege is for ten days?

The SPEAKER. For ten days. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Iowa that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole for the further consideration of the Army appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. SHERMAN in the chair, for consideration of the Army appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is now in Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union for the consideration of an appropriation bill the title to which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 8582) making appropriation for the support of the Regular and Volunteer Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1901.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, I believe there is no one on this side that wants to speak now.

Mr. SULZER. Then, Mr. Speaker, I yield fifteen minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. TALBERT].

Mr. TALBERT. Mr. Charirman, we are face to face with an age of reckless and enormous appropriations, and especially large is the appropriation for the military arm of the country, and, Mr. Chairman, within the limited time allowed me I can not hope to go into any general discussion of this bill. It is a bill carrying a tremendous appropriation, somewhere in the neighborhood of $125,000,000, but it does seem to me that while there appears to be no particular objection to this bill upon general principles, it is a useless waste of time for members on both sides to be standing up here indulging in crimination and recrimination against each other instead of pointing out different items in the bill which it might appear ought to be eliminated as unnecessary. If they desire to economize and have an idea of economy, they might go to work and lop off some of the extravagance here and some of the extravagance there as it appears all along through the bill as reported to the House.

Now, while I do not propose to make any objections to any of these appropriations in a specific manner, for I have not the time,

I say that we are running into a channel of tremendous extravagance in making appropriations to defray the expenses of this great Government of ours, not only for the Army and Navy but in other departments. I took occasion some time ago to call the attention of the House to the fact that in view of these things we might begin to curtail expenses by looking over the pension rolls of this country and at least revising the plan of giving so much time to special legislation for the granting of pensions, and to call a halt at least long enough to reflect a moment or so in reference to such reckless expenditures in this Department.

And it seems to me that it would be a good idea, if it could be done, and it can be, to have published a list of those persons drawing a pension from the Government at the present time, stating the amount being drawn, how first obtained, and the general condition of the pensioner. These facts given to the public, I think, would make some very interesting reading indeed, especially at this time.

And, Mr. Chairman, right here, in view of the fact that I have been severely criticised by some parties and some papers for making that move, which I made with a view of economizing some of the expenses of this Government, by criticising special pension legislation, I want to send to the desk and have read in my time a letter that appeared in the Sunday Post of this city on the 11th of this month—a letter which will explain itself and will go for what it is worth. It will show that at least one gallant, brave, and courageous old Union soldier is not afraid to speak his mind, and before the letter is read and in order to emphasize my views upon certain questions and measures I want to say that I am opposed to imperialism, I am opposed to this Republican expansion, I am opposed to the enormous extravagance that is being indulged in at the present time by this Government, and I ask the Clerk please to read this letter, which gives me somewhat of a vindication, at least, for attempting to lop off some of the expenses of the Government in the way of private special pension legislation as well as in other directions.

That letter was written by a brave Federal soldier from New York, to whom a medal was voted for bravery upon the battlefield. It shows that he coincided with me, although ridiculing me a little in a humorous way.

The gentlemen from Pennsylvania [Mr. MAHON and Mr. DALZELL] in their speeches the other evening exonerated every Democrat but myself from a desire to curtail expenses in pensions and placed the blame entirely upon me, saying in the discussion of the special rule brought in on this question that I alone was responsible for its enactment.

If that be true, and no Democrat dissented at the time or opened his mouth, I want to say that I glory in that distinction, if I am the only Democrat with manhood enough to raise my voice against that kind of extravagance. It seems that my brother Democrats believe in denouncing extravagance upon the floor; but when it comes to opposing and voting against extravagant pension claims, they fail to come up to the scratch. I denounce it and then vote against it.

Now, then, I want to say that that letter was written by a brave Federal soldier, as I said before, and a soldier, too, who is not drawing a pension, while one, the gentleman who so severely criticised me a few evenings ago and threatened even to try to throw me out of the House, if I am not mistaken from his looks, and if I am not misinformed, he must himself be drawing a pension from this great and liberal Government. He can answer for himself. I do not want to do him injustice or misrepresent him. I ask the Clerk please to read now the letter as it appeared in the Post on the 11th March last.

The CHAIRMAN. If there be no objection, the Clerk will read. The Chair hears none.

Mr. TALBERT. I am not asking unanimous consent, but am demanding my rights.

The Clerk read as follows:

House night school—Refractory pupils brought to book by Professor Talbert—Compulsory-attendance issue—Number of members who "play hookey" has been growing, session after session, and the South Carolinian now insists that there must be a reform—There will be no school at night hereafter unless a quorum is present. [Copyright, 1900, by Amos J. Cummings.]

Mr. LACEY. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. LACEY. For the purpose of making an inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield to the gentleman from Iowa?

Mr. TALBERT. Why, certainly; I always yield to my friend, and I do not object to being questioned. I suppose he wants to object, as did the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] the other day.

Mr. LACEY. I observe that this article has been copyrighted. I understand the Public Printer has been annoyed somewhat by litigation growing out of the publication of copyrighted articles in the RECORD.

Mr. TALBERT. I have the consent of the gentleman who copyrighted this article that it may be printed in the RECORD. I have consulted him on several occasions.

Mr. LACEY. I do not see the gentleman present [Mr. CUMMINGS] who has that valuable copyright. I should like to be sure and to have it a matter of record that the gentleman consents to this publication.

Mr. TALBERT. I want to say to the gentleman that I have his consent to publish the letter, and I have stated this fact to the gentleman from Iowa and I hope he does not question my veracity.

Mr. LACEY. No; I do not doubt the gentleman's veracity, but under the statute of frauds I think the gentleman's verbal statement is not a sufficient waiver. I think we ought to have the statement of the holder of the copyright made in the open House. I make the point of order that we can not print a copyrighted article without the consent of the party holding the copyright.

Mr. TALBERT. Is the gentleman drawing a pension himself? Will the article hurt him, or is he afraid it will come out that some other member will be hurt?

Mr. LACEY. Not at all. I am not drawing a pension. I have never either received or applied for a pension.

Mr. TALBERT. I understand that there are a number of gentlemen on this floor drawing pensions, whether it be the gentleman from Iowa or not, and I want to say that some time in the future it will be brought to light, and if they have sufficient manhood they ought to get up and say that they do not need them any longer, for a man who is getting $5,000 a year from the Government has no right to come and draw a pension in addition from the Government unless he has lost a leg or an arm or something of that sort. And unless he has been disabled otherwise to the extent of a loss of a limb, a man who is physically sound has no right to a pension.

Mr. LACEY. I will relieve the mind of the gentleman by saying, so far as I am concerned, that I not only am not drawing any pension, but I have no reason for drawing one. I am in good health.

Mr. TALBERT. I am glad to hear the gentleman say that, and I hope soon to hear other gentlemen rise and explain——

The CHAIRMAN. Does the Chair understand the gentleman to make a point of order?

Mr. LACEY. I make the point of order that the article is copyrighted and therefore can not be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD without the consent of the gentleman holding the copyright.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair can not pass upon the question of the copyright. The Chair can put to the committee the question whether or not they desire to hear the paper read under the rule.

Mr. LACEY. The article itself shows that it is copyrighted.

Mr. TALBERT. I am not asking any privilege. I am demanding this as my right, in my own time, to have that letter read, and I will contend for my rights upon this floor, and I appeal to the Chairman to protect me in my rights.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair can not pass upon the question of copyrights.

Mr. TALBERT. And I hope, Mr. Chairman, this will not be taken out of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair can not pass upon the question whether or not a copyrighted article can be read here. He simply can act under the rules of the House, and if anybody makes objection to having the article read, he will ask the committee to decide whether or not they desire to have it read.

Mr. MAHON. It is a good article, and there is a lot of fun in it.

Mr. TALBERT. The gentleman from Pennsylvania seems to be more friendly to me now than a few evenings ago.

Mr. LACEY. The point is this——

Mr. TALBERT. I refuse to yield any further.

The CHAIRMAN. Ah, but the gentleman is discussing a point of order on which the Chair desires to hear him. This will not be taken out of the gentleman's time.

Mr. TALBERT. All right, then, "let her roll."

Mr. LACEY. The Public Printer has been——

Mr. TALBERT. I hope this will not come out of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. This will not come out of the gentleman's time.

Mr. TALBERT. Then I have no objection.

Mr. LACEY. The Public Printer has been harassed by litigation growing out of the publication of copyrighted articles. Now, seriously, sir, it seems to me that an article which, upon its face, appears to be properly copyrighted ought not to be published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and thrown broadcast all over the country without the consent of the party holding the copyright. I am told by the gentleman from South Carolina that he has some consent from the holder of the copyright, who is a member of this House, and who no doubt could speak for himself.

Mr. TALBERT. Let me interrupt the gentleman.

Mr. LACEY. The gentleman has no right to waive the copyright of the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TALBERT. I stated to the gentleman that the gentleman from New York [Mr. CUMMINGS] had consented that I might print this. I hope my friend does not doubt my veracity.

Mr. LACEY. I am not questioning the gentleman's veracity.

Mr. TALBERT. I am glad the gentleman disclaims any reflection upon my veracity. I misunderstood what he said. I know the gentleman's sense of justice would not allow him to do me any such injustice.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Upon the question of order, I only wish to be heard a moment. I did not agree that the point of order is well taken. It may be unlawful to publish a copyrighted article in the RECORD, and that is all which can be claimed; but everything that is unlawful is not unparliamentary, and the Chair can only look to the question of parliamentary law in the matter. Even if it were conceded that the article was copyrighted and that the gentleman had no right to use it in his speech, the question of order would not be good, because it is not unparliamentary.

Mr. LACEY. Oh, it is always unparliamentary to violate the law.

Mr. RICHARDSON. If the law is violated, that is one question.

Mr. LACEY. It is always unparliamentary to violate the law. The Ten Commandments say, "Thou shalt not steal." A copyrighted article published by any publishing house becomes the subject of litigation. The holder of the copyright is entitled to protection in this House as much as anywhere else. Suppose the gentleman, instead of publishing this article, had introduced a novel that could be read within his time, a novel which was copyrighted. Would it be contended that that might go into the RECORD?

Mr. TALBERT. The gentleman is dealing in supposition. Suppose the gentleman had no nose.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I am not addressing myself to the illegality of the thing. The only question is whether it is parliamentary. Whether it is obnoxious to our rule is the only question here, and there is no rule which would prevent the publication of an article because it is copyrighted. I undertake to say, Mr. Chairman, that we very often read from copyrighted books. Indeed, all books, or nearly all, are copyrighted, and if the point of order is well taken we could not insert extracts from copyrighted books without the consent of the author if the point was made.

Now, I say that the most that can be said in this case would be that the gentleman who undertakes to publish this would do so at his own risk; but as to violating or infracting any rule of the House, I do not think there is any ground in the contention.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is perfectly clear on the subject. This is a question which the House must settle, and not the Chair. The Chair must therefore overrule the point of order. If the House prefers not to hear the article, not to have it published in the RECORD, that is for the House to determine, not for the Chair. The Clerk will proceed.

Mr. TALBERT. Then, Mr. Chairman, I demand the reading of the letter.

The Clerk read as follows:

The House has at last opened its night school for Congressmen. Aristophanes would not have termed it a thinkers' school and Socrates would have agreed with him. Alcibiades might have called it a gabbling school. The Hon. W. JASPER TALBERT, of South Carolina, has taken charge of it for the session. He favors a compulsory system of education. The qualifications for admission are not astringent, although United States Senators are debarred. Mr. TALBERT's equanimity, however, has been temporarily upset by an unruly scholar. He comes from Iowa, and his name is WILLIAM P. HEPBURN.

Night schools have been held under the Reed and other rules for many years. They occur once a week, Friday nights being set apart for them. These are what are called pension nights. The school hours are from 8 p. m. to 10.30 p. m., with no general recesses. The two and a half hours are allotted by the House for the consideration of bills reported from the Committee on Invalid Pensions. They also occasionally take in measures for the removal of charges of desertion. Professor TALBERT has been a close student of these schools ever since he first entered Congress. He has no affection for deserters, bounty jumpers, and coffee coolers.

In previous Congresses he has distinguished himself by bitter opposition to all their demands. In many cases he was successful, but occasionally a deserter slipped through the lines despite his efforts. He made no opposition to bills he considered meritorious, and preferred the claims of private soldiers to those of the field and staff. In the last Congress he frequently crossed blades with GEORGE W. RAY, who, as chairman of the Committee on Invalid Pensions, had charge of such bills. In the present Congress his saber will be uplifted against the claymore of the Hon. CYRUS A. SULLOWAY, of New Hampshire, who succeeds Mr. RAY.

A FIGHTING PROFESSOR.

TALBERT is a wonderful fighter. He uses his sword manfully, and there is no trickery about him. A veritable Hotspur in discussion, he talks fluently, and at times with great energy. No man questions the sincerity of his convictions. Every fiber of his body attests it. He roars like a lion when thoroughly aroused, and pounds his desk like a trip hammer. He has no trouble in securing the attention of the House. It is always willing to listen to what he says. A word in return has a similar effect to a spark thrown into gunpowder. It forces a volcanic eruption.

Expletive sentences flow from him like molten lava, and usually some neophyte is caught in the fiery stream. At times, however, there are indignant protests. In the Fifty-fourth Congress the lava inundated the feet of William E. Barrett, of Massachusetts. As the smell of burning leather began to pervade the Chamber, Barrett showed his apprehension. He moved a resolution of censure. It led to a short but acrid debate. The Carolinian at last made an extremely graceful apology, and the man with the burnt feet oiled his blisters and retired.

The first night school of the present session was held on February 2, with 246 scholars of the 354 absent. Professor TALBERT was present. Wrangler J. F. LACEY, Speaker pro tempore, called the school to order. The rule under which it was opened was read, when the monitor from South Carolina seized a hickory gad and made himself manifest. He asked for ten minutes in which to address the pupils. Mr. LACEY politely replied that he should recognize the chairman of the Committee on Invalid Pensions, Mr. SULLOWAY. CYRUS arose on the Republican side of the House, like a cedar in a stubble-field, and gave way to Professor TALBERT.

The South Carolinian read a newspaper extract saying that the Grand Army of the Republic wanted Order 164 reestablished in the Pension Bureau. No. 164 was in operation only three years, but the newspapers stated that in that time it fastened $50,000,000 every year upon the Government. If reestablished, the pension appropriation would be increased from $60,000,000 to $75,000,000 a year. Tutor TALBERT then read an extract from the Philadelphia Press, edited, he said, by Postmaster-General Charles Emory Smith. It referred to the Cullom bill making deserters pensionable, as well as all militia organizations who served sixty days in the Army and Navy of the United States.

HE SAID IT AND HE MEANT IT.

"I now give timely notice," said Professor TALBERT, cutting the air with his switch, "and I mean it, that so long as I may be able to drag myself to the Capitol, no pension bill—and there is no qualification to this ultimatum—shall pass this House unless a quorum of the members are present. The responsibility must rest upon those who will not come out to see that justice is done to the old soldier."

At this Mr. SULLOWAY moved to go into Committee of the Whole to consider bills on the Private Calendar. Eighty-six smart schoolboys voted in the affirmative and none in the negative. This was 92 votes less than a quorum. A call of the House showed little change. In vain did Mr. DE GRAFFENREID, a post-graduate from Texas, and Mr. MIERS, not yet matriculated, from Indiana, appeal to the gentleman with the hickory gad. The pedagogue shook the switch all the more fiercely. Bedlam ensued, and at 10.30 o'clock Mr. SULLOWAY withdrew from the stubble and school was dismissed.

The second session of the night school was held on February 9. The schoolmaster from Parksville, Edgefield County, was again on hand with a big rawhide. Speaker HENDERSON was in the chair when the resolution for going into committee was presented. There was a division of the vote. Only 86 of the 354 scholars were present. TALBERT again snapped his whip by shouting, "No quorum!"

The yeas and nays were demanded. One hundred and sixty-nine scholars responded. Mr. HENDERSON counted 15 present who had not voted, and announced a quorum. The House, therefore, went into committee, with Scholar WILLIAM P. HEPBURN in the chair. In Committee of the Whole only 100 votes are required for a quorum. The first bill taken up provided for a pension of $17 per month to James H. Kercheval. Committee amendments were read, and agreed to, and the bill was laid aside to be reported to the House favorably.

All this time Monitor TALBERT vainly clamored for recognition. He undoubtedly wanted to demand a division, with a view of ascertaining whether there was a quorum still present. The Chair utterly ignored him. The tutor rushed up and down the main aisle, snapping his whip and demanding his rights, while a score or more of abecedarians were hissing and shouting.

DEMANDED HIS RIGHTS.

"I submit, Mr. Chairman," he shouted, "that I have rights and I am here to demand them. It is an unheard of thing when a member gets up to address the Chair, and when the Chair sees him, for the Chair to deliberately refuse to listen to him."

"The gentleman from South Carolina is out of order and will take his seat," the refractory scholar in the chair responded.

"The Chair is out of order," returned the indignant preceptor. "It has acted in an arbitrary and tyrannical manner. I resent it, and I will stand by what I say. I will take my seat when I get ready."

Under a strict construction of the rules, the monitor was undoubtedly out of order, as he had no right to the floor while the committee was dividing. The unruly learner from the Hawkeye Commonwealth recognized him after the amendments to the bill were agreed to.

TALBERT declared that his action was not governed by the slightest feeling against the men who fought on the Northern side in the war between the North and the South, and he insisted that a quorum should be present. His opposition was to the loose, reckless, unconstitutional method of passing bills at Friday night sessions. He again insisted upon the presence of a quorum when school was open.

Thirty-six pension bills were then passed in committee before the school was dismissed. Mr. TALBERT himself advocated the passage of one because the soldier was old and blind and he believed that he should have a pension.

At the close of the afternoon session on February 16 Mr. SULLOWAY, the good boy from the good old Granite State, asked that the night school be postponed until the evening of Monday, February 19. A fierce snowstorm was raging at the time, and it was evident that there would not be a quorum of the House present if the school was opened at the usual hour on Friday night. The House agreed to Mr. SULLOWAY's proposition.

The third night school was therefore opened at 8 o'clock on Monday night. The preceptor from the Palmetto State was again on hand, ready to administer hickory consolation. Mr. SULLOWAY being sick, Philologist HENRY R. GIBSON, of Tennessee, took his place. The roll call showed that only 64 scholars out of 354 were present. Thus 290 were off on a lark, playing "hookey." Professor TALBERT again shouted "no quorum." Unruly scholar WILLIAM P. HEPBURN, who was acting as Speaker, allowed that it was evident that no quorum was present.

Thereupon the philologist from East Tennessee arose smiling, with the face of a man about to tickle a frog, and turning to Mr. TALBERT, asked if there was not some way whereby they could arrive at some agreement. "Anything you may propose," said Mr. GIBSON, "we will agree to."

Unlike Mark Twain's frog, the South Carolina batrachian was not loaded with shot. He jumped as though he had been touched by a wire attached to a galvanic battery.

"I have nothing to propose, Mr. Speaker," he shouted, "except to bring a quorum here to transact business, legally, lawfully, and constitutionally."

CONFUSION IN THE SCHOOL.

Sophomore JAMES A. NORTON, of Ohio, who is always at fever heat where the interests of old soldiers are at stake, promptly demanded a call of the House. For an hour or more the school was in utter confusion. The doors were closed, and the boys present were denied leave of absence. This was peculiarly unfortunate for a modest but earnest and faithful devotee of night schools, GEORGE EDMUND FOSS, of Chicago. Two weeks before this he had made an engagement to address the Young Men's Christian Association of Washington on this evening.

Over 300 of these good young men were at this time seated in their hall

awaiting the appearance of Mr. Foss, who is a member of the association. A sympathizing Christian from New York, aware of Mr. Foss's dilemma, stated these facts to the House and asked that Mr. Foss be excused. The unruly scholars laughed in derision. They evidently had no sympathy for the diffusion of Christianity, for they refused the request. This disgraceful action, however, does not appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Some unknown Government censor struck it out.

Professor TALBERT, however, with a due regard for missionary work, promptly moved that the House adjourn. This would have given Mr. Foss an opportunity to fill his engagement. The irreverent juveniles refused to adjourn, and Foss remained in purgatory. At 10 o'clock Philologist GIBSON renewed the motion to adjourn. A viva voce vote was taken and Refractory Scholar HEPBURN declared it carried. Sophomore NORTON indignantly demanded a division, but the unruly boy from Iowa declared the school dismissed, threw down the gavel, and disappeared.

Professor TALBERT's fight on behalf of a system of compulsory education will undoubtedly commend itself to the country. It is a sincere effort to confine legislation within its legitimate channels—to conduct public business, not upon the formal, but the real expression of the House. The purse strings of the nation, it would seem, should be unloosed by the House itself, and not by a fragment of the House. Either TALBERT is right or the Constitution is wrong, and no one will apparently recognize this fact quicker than the old soldier himself. The people will issue diplomas to the graduates of this night school next fall.

AMOS J. CUMMINGS.

Mr. TALBERT. Then this letter speaks for itself; and I want to say that this pension matter can not be ridiculed out of court, and Congress must take notice of the enormity of this abuse. And now, Mr. Chairman, as I said at the outset, this Congress seems to be going ahead making extravagant appropriations for various ways in every Department of this Government without stopping to think that every dollar of it must come out of the pockets of the people, amounting to millions and billions of dollars. They do not stop to think that the Government has not a single dollar with which to pay these enormous sums except as they first get it from the people.

I am absolutely opposed to the imperialistic tendencies of this Republican Administration. I am absolutely opposed to the Republican idea of expansion. I am absolutely opposed to standing armies in times of peace. I am opposed to all these things because all of them will only increase the burden of taxation upon an already downtrodden and tax-ridden people. This policy leads toward militarism and large standing armies, entailing countless thousands of dollars more upon the people to pay.

And I want to say to the Republican members of this House that you are responsible for the present unholy and unjust war in the Philippines; and if you would only declare a liberal, humane policy toward these people, the war would end in two weeks and peace abound all over the land.

Then, I say, if you will continue to carry on the war and call for these enormous appropriations, why is it that you do not levy an income tax upon the tremendous incomes of the rich in order to make them bear an equal portion of their burdens? Why not tax the enormous wealth of the millionaires and billionaires of this country to help pay the expenses? You take the young men of our country from their homes to defend the flag, and yet you refuse to go into the coffers of the rich and take a single dollar to help pay the expense. Tax their ill-gotten gains and make them do their duty to the country. As said by the gentleman from Kansas, "the demand for these things only comes from organized capital and officers who are to be benefited."

The gentleman from Illinois in his eloquent address on yesterday brought to light the fact that Army and Navy officers are being appointed to a position one day and retired the next, thus establishing a tremendous civil pension list, and in the end building up and establishing an official aristocracy in this free country of ours. In addition to this there are measures proposed here to pension all the civil employees of this Government in every governmental Department, and members here stand ready to support them.

In conclusion, let me say that I stand here to commence by unearthing and wiping out the immense frauds that exist in the Pension Bureau in its various ramifications and workings, and this pernicious habit of granting private pensions by private bills to undeserving persons, and so long as I may be able to stand up here I shall raise my voice and cast my vote against all such abuses. Let us stop this carping about abuses and set to work to correct them by voting against every fraud, every extravagant appropriation, and by giving to our people an economical and just administration of the Government. [Applause.] Let us stand by the teachings of our forefathers—the Monroe doctrine—and a government of, in, by, and for the people. [Applause,]

Before the reading of the foregoing article was concluded,

The CHAIRMAN said: The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. TALBERT. I ask leave to print the remainder of the article, with my remarks, in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. General leave has already been extended.

Mr. SULZER. I yield fifteen minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PIERCE].

Mr. PIERCE of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, on last Saturday in the House I read and commented on a matter published in the Evening Star of this city, which has stirred up considerable excitement, and I think it but just and right, both to that paper and to the gentleman who wrote the article or gave an account of the interview detailed in the Star, that I should, so far as I can, put in the RECORD the answer of the Star to the charges which have been made and the alleged falsity of that interview.

Now, the Star, which we all know to be an orthodox Republican paper, one which has always been high-toned and honorable in all its dealings in the past, so far as my knowledge goes—fair as to both measures and men—has never intentionally misrepresented nor wronged any one, neither in its editorial department nor through the agency of those gentlemen who represent it as reporters. It has been honorable, honest, and fair in all its dealings. I now read from the Star:

THE SUGAR TRUST—OXNARD IS AND ALWAYS HAS BEEN SERVING IT—WHY THE SUGAR TRUST IS OPPOSED TO THE PUERTO RICO TARIFF.

The assertion by Mr. PAYNE, of New York, in his speech in the House Saturday, that the sugar trust interests were not served by the Puerto Rican tariff, and that if the trust were putting up boodle it would be on the other side, does not accord with the understanding of the matter in Congress for many years, nor with the history of tariff legislation. Mr. Oxnard, being a beet-sugar producer, has for years, whenever the tariff was under consideration in any way, appeared in the sugar interests persistently as a beet-sugar producer, and has endeavored to maintain that he was not a representative of the sugar trust.

But the interests of the sugar trust have been served through his persistence for tariff protection to the sugar interests, and there has not been in the history of tariff legislation of recent years a conflict between his representations and the interests of the sugar trust.

ASSOCIATED WITH THE SCANDAL.

The sugar-trust scandals during the consideration of the recent tariff bill were associated with him, and his recommendations as to sugar duties have been influential to secure legislation which was the basis in the recent bill under consideration of sugar speculations which were investigated in Congress.

Both Mr. Oxnard and Mr. Myrick, representing agricultural journals, were active in securing the adoption by the committee and the passage of the Puerto Rican tariff bill, and in hearings before the Congressional committees were insistent upon the tariff provision. Mr. Oxnard disavows any connection with the sugar trust, but this disavowal is regarded as technical, and it is reported that he has agreements and contracts with the sugar trust which make his interests as a beet-sugar producer and those of the sugar trust coincide.

The assertion of Mr. PAYNE that the sugar-trust interests were in conflict with the tariff in Puerto Rico is negatived by another statement in his speech. His reference to the Puerto Ricans, where he said "who receive," referring to Puerto Ricans, "this small price for their sugar, less the tariff, when they sold it to the American Sugar Refining Company."

SYSTEM OF BUYING RAW SUGAR.

This reference to the sugar price less the tariff is in accordance with what is understood to be the system of the sugar trust in buying raw sugar, which is to make the producers from whom it purchases bear the tariff by deducting it from the price paid. Mr. PAYNE was asked this morning what he meant by that reference, and he said that the sugar refiners paid the tariff and deducted the amount from the market price in New York. That was what he meant.

Under this system it is quite obvious that the sugar trust could have no special interest in free trade, and as a matter of fact the sugar trust has insisted during all the tariff legislation upon a protection according to a schedule of its own making.

BENEFITED BY THE TARIFF.

The facts in the case appear to be that the sugar trust, instead of having, as Mr. PAYNE declares, an interest in free trade, is benefited by the tariff to an enormous extent and has fought for it at all times, not being opposed to even the tariff on the raw material, the burden of which does not fall on it.

In this instance its particular interest extends not only to Puerto Rico, but to all the islands, including Cuba, lest rival refineries should be established on these islands to compete with it.

I put this matter before the House and publish it in the RECORD in justice to the Star and in reply to criticisms which have been made not only on this floor by Mr. PAYNE, of New York, but by the distinguished Senator from Ohio, Mr. HANNA, the chairman of the Republican national committee, whose language, uttered in the Senate yesterday, I desire to read as reported in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

Mr. HANNA said the interview was one supposed to have been given to a reporter for the newspaper in question.

"I do not believe," said Mr. HANNA, "that any Republican member of the House of Representatives ever made the statement attributed to him."

He said the statement carried on its face evidence that it was false.

"I hope measures will be taken to investigate this statement. I brand it as a malicious lie."

In answer to that I will publish what the Star has to say in reply, and if gentlemen want this matter investigated, it will be observed that the Star challenges you to do it. Introduce your resolution of investigation, if you please, and let this whole matter be inquired into. Now let us see if any gentleman on that side will accept the challenge of the Star.

Mr. STEELE. Does not the gentleman think that the Republican member who is charged with having made that statement is somewhat challenged?

Mr. PIERCE of Tennessee. I did not catch the gentleman's remark.

Mr. STEELE. Does not the gentleman think the challenge is thrown down to the member alleged to have made that statement, when Mr. HANNA says that he was a miserable liar, rather than what the paper had said about the matter? If any Republican

member has said what is alleged, the inference is that he lied, and I think he has.

Mr. PIERCE of Tennessee. It is a challenge to the Republican member of the House and to that side that the member who says that your party and your leaders were influenced by what that member has stated as reported in the Star for the purpose of securing a campaign fund from those interests [applause on the Democratic side], and it is a reflection upon those in control of this House. If he or your side wants an investigation, he can get it. Now let me give you what the Star says in reference to it:

The interview was had, as reported in the Star Friday, with a Republican member of the House who supported the Puerto Rican tariff bill with his vote. It was written a very short time after the conversation between the Representative and the Star reporter closed. This fact can be supported by the oath of the man who wrote the interview, who is perfectly willing to take oath to it.

Now, then——

Mr. STEELE. I would like to ask the gentleman another question.

Mr. PIERCE of Tennessee. Certainly.

Mr. STEELE. Would you believe the man who made that statement on oath?

Mr. PIERCE of Tennessee. Would I believe him? I do not believe that any man who occupies a position upon the Star would deliberately and maliciously misrepresent any gentleman on this floor.

Mr. STEELE. I do. If such a statement was made, as charged, by a Republican member, would you believe that member under oath? I mean——

Mr. PIERCE of Tennessee. I can only answer the gentleman as to that from the facts as they are.

Mr. STEELE. If it embarrasses you, you need not answer it.

Mr. PIERCE of Tennessee. It does not embarrass me. It looks to me as if the statements are true. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. STEELE. You only believe that the man said it.

Mr. PIERCE of Tennessee. Take the evidence before the committee in the Senate upon this question, and that before the House committee, and this interview is in accord with the evidence given before these committees, explaining the miraculous change of gentlemen on that side from "plain-duty" free trade with the Puerto Ricans to 15 per cent protection. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. STEELE. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him another question?

Mr. PIERCE of Tennessee. Certainly.

Mr. STEELE. If he believes the statement, I want him to point out how it could be true, directly or indirectly, that a campaign fund could be raised out of the legislation proposed on our side.

Mr. PIERCE of Tennessee. I do it by the fact that these corporations who favor this legislation "and their next of kin," the great national banks, etc., contributed millions of dollars to the Republican campaign fund in 1896 to elect President McKinley [applause on the Democratic side], and that the vice-president of the National City Bank of New York, the bank of the Standard Oil Company, had the audacity to write the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Gage, and jog his memory of the fact that he and his associates had contributed largely to the Republican campaign fund in 1896, and ask financial favors from him in his official capacity, and that Mr. Gage dared not rebuke him for the insult. [Great applause on the Democratic side.]

THE HEPBURN LETTER.

THE NATIONAL CITY BANK OF NEW YORK,
New York, June 5, 1897.

MY DEAR MR. GAGE: The National City Bank of this city, of which I recently became vice-president, through the consolidation of the business of the Third National with it, is one of the banks designated as a United States depository, and I write to request that any changes which may be made under the Administration we may not be disturbed in this respect. We should like to remain a United States depository as at present. Of course, the bank is very strong, and if you will take the pains to look at our list of directors you will see that we also have very great political claims, in view of what was done during the canvass last year.

Yours, very truly,

A. B. HEPBURN.

Hon. LYMAN J. GAGE,
Secretary of the Treasury, Washington, D. C.

Mr. STEELE. Out of the Puerto Rican bill, who is competent to pay money but the sugar trust, which is on your side of the question?

Mr. PIERCE of Tennessee. The Star says not. That is good Republican authority. [Laughter on the Democratic side.] The Secretary of the Treasury dare not resent the insult given, and what else may we not expect from that side? [Applause on the Democratic side.] Now, then, it is for you gentlemen to investigate the charge, as Senator HANNA says you should. Are you going to investigate it? You have the right under the rules of the House, and you can do it. Now, then, I have here the testimony before the Senate.

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

Mr. PIERCE of Tennessee. Certainly.

Mr. HEPBURN. Now, the gentleman seems to be anxious that there should be an investigation of this matter, and that it should be inaugurated.

Mr. PIERCE of Tennessee. I am not anxious; but I think the investigation should come from that side. We on this side are not the accused.

Mr. HEPBURN. Does not the gentleman know that, in all human probability, if the editor of that paper is brought here and interrogated as to who wrote that article he would refuse to answer? Now I want to ask the gentleman the question, if that should be so, would the gentleman and his friends on that side unite with this side in punishing him for his contumacious refusal?

Mr. PIERCE of Tennessee. I never cross a bridge until I get to it.

Mr. HEPBURN. Ah!

Mr. PIERCE of Tennessee. Wait until you can find him guilty. I believe he told the truth. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Now, Mr. Chairman, I ask permission to print in my remarks, in part, an editorial in the Chicago Times-Herald, the greatest Republican newspaper in the Northwest, and some of the testimony on the Puerto Rican matter before the Senate committee.

PARTY POLITICS AND PUERTO RICO.

The Times-Herald has been besieged by requests "for fuller and definite information concerning the origin of the present folly which has been foisted upon the party by its 'leaders' in the House of Representatives," to use the words of "a lifelong Republican," who writes from Earlville, this State. "If the President has solid base for his change," writes the pastor of a Methodist Church in Lake Linden, Mich., "he is in duty bound to make it known to the country." From various sources come queries of the same tenor, all expressing wonder, amazement, regret, and indignation that the Republican party should have been placed in an utterly untenable position by its leaders in Washington, and all with one voice repudiating the action of those leaders.

The Times-Herald frankly confesses that the reversal of the policy of the leaders of the Republican party in Congress is as inexplicable to-day as it was when the Committee on Ways and Means reported the 25 per cent tariff measure. In both the House and Senate the Puerto Rico bills went in free-trade lambs and came out tariff wolves.

There is nothing in the testimony before the Senate Committee on Puerto Rico reported February 5 that can in any way explain or justify the departure of that committee from its original bill, which gave free trade to Puerto Rico. True, Henry T. Oxnard, of Oxnard, Cal., the representative of the beet-sugar industry, and Herbert Myrick, of Springfield, Mass., chairman of the League of Domestic Producers, and claiming to represent the beet-sugar, cane-sugar, tobacco, wool, cotton, fruit, vegetable, rice, and nut producers, appeared before the committee. The latter demanded the defeat "of pending treaties of reciprocity with the British West Indies, whereby sugar and other products are to be admitted into the United States at a reduction in tariff rates, and of the admission to this market of Puerto Rican products duty free."

This Mr. Myrick fairly threatened the committee with the loss of 500,000 votes to the Republican party if it fulfilled the pledge of the President to give free trade to Puerto Rico. Some idea of what transpired in the committee may be learned from the following question asked by Senator PERKINS (Republican), of California:

"You speak of 500,000 of your subscribers through your publications every week. The question is troubling me. This committee has before it a bill for the government of Puerto Rico. It belongs to the United States to-day—is as much a part of the United States as territory as the Hawaiian Islands or Alaska. How can we in justice to this people and to the honor of our country have a different law for the people of Puerto Rico than for those of Hawaii? I see the force of your argument, and I shall be very glad if you can show us a way out."

Mr. Myrick ducked, confessing that he was not posted "in the matters of social economy," his forte being "doctrines of agriculture." Senator DEPEW tried his hand on Mr. Myrick with this question:

"Could any government sustain itself in having one kind of policy in the relations of Alaska to the United States and Hawaii to the United States and another kind in the relations of Puerto Rico to the United States, those all being purchase places?"

Again, Mr. Myrick appreciated "the magnitude and the delicacy of the questions," but excused himself from illuminating the problem. The examination was turned to the "expediency and justice and fair play" of treating Puerto Rico differently from Hawaii and Alaska, and the following colloquy occurred between Senator NELSON and the witness:

"Senator NELSON. Are you opposed to free trade in any form with Puerto Rico?

"Mr. MYRICK. Yes, sir.

"Senator NELSON. Then you are in favor of Puerto Rico placing a tariff on our wheat and flour and meats exported from this country?

"Mr. MYRICK. Yes, sir; as they always have.

"Senator NELSON. You want them to put a tariff on it?

"Mr. MYRICK. Yes, sir.

"Senator NELSON. And that is the way you represent the Northwestern farmers?"

The chairman of the committee, Senator FORAKER, asked Mr. Myrick this pointed question, which went to the very root of the matter: "Leaving out constitutional questions, would you treat it (Puerto Rico) as a foreign country or as belonging to the United States?" What Mr. Myrick would do is enveloped in that dumbness which comes to every man who is cornered between "I dare not and I would."

In these questions and replies the reader has got as near as he is likely to get to the mysterious influence that has pushed the Republican party to the verge of a precipice, over which lie dishonor, injustice, and disaster. The hollow threat made by Mr. Myrick of what he could and would do with his 500,000 subscribers and his associated producers, coupled with the wild talk of cigar makers, stampeded the committees of both Houses of Congress.

We ask the careful perusal of the questions put by Senators PERKINS, DEPEW, NELSON, and FORAKER, as demonstrating that up to January 20 no Republican leader in the Senate dreamed that it was either constitutionally or morally possible or expedient to treat Puerto Rico differently from any other territory belonging to the United States.

Now, then, what else do we find? I noticed, as reported in the morning Post, that your position has changed again. In the Senate the steering committee has changed again and altered their

measure. As the Post remarks, you started down the hill three weeks ago and reached the bottom, and now you are starting back again. That is the position you are in. Who knows where your President stands? He is first one way and then another.

I will quote from this morning's Post an interview with a distinguished Republican from Vermont [Mr. POWERS]. He changed front after making a powerful constitutional and "plain duty" speech in favor of free trade with Puerto Rico, and then, to the surprise of this side of the House, in whose time he had spoken, he turned a somersault and voted for the tariff bill. The gentleman has just returned from a visit home, and he takes us into his confidence and tells us why he "somersaulted."

[Interview in Washington Post, March 27, 1900.]

VERMONT AFLAME FOR FREE TRADE.

Representative H. H. POWERS, who has returned from a week's trip to his home in Vermont, said yesterday that he was surprised at the sentiment for free trade prevailing in the Green Mountain State. "I heard talk in favor of free trade and in condemnation of the tariff everywhere I went," said he. "The Vermonters are ridiculing the idea of Puerto Rico not being a part of this country and under our Constitution. Many of the voters illustrate the absurdity of such a doctrine with quaint illustrations quite to the point."

"On what do they base their objections to a tariff?" he was asked.

"Oh, they call up the proclamation made by General Miles," replied Judge POWERS. "They tell one that the islands came under our rule without resistance, and that it is a breach of faith for us now to set up a barrier and tell them that they are not a part of the United States. I do not suppose they care so much for the legal arguments of the case; they look at the matter from the standpoint of squareness and fair dealing."

"But it is generally believed that the people of New England are paying little attention to the Puerto Rican question, and care little whether there be tariff or free trade."

RESPECT FOR M'KINLEY'S POLICY.

"Well, as far as political support of their members of Congress is concerned," answered Judge POWERS, "the voters may not waver in their loyalty. I told my people that I was for free trade; they knew I had made a speech in favor of free trade. I explained that I voted for the tariff bill after it had been modified, and that I did so at the request of the President."

Now, my friend from Vermont is here, and if this reported interview is wrong, now is the time for him to deny it and say that President McKinley has not been continually changing front so that even that side does not know where he "is at." [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.] The papers say that your leaders have told Mr. HANNA that it will not do to amend your bill and let it come back here, for if it does there is danger of its defeat. You remind me of a fellow I knew in Benton County, now in my friend SIMS'S district.

We had a law in Tennessee after the war, passed by a carpetbag legislature, making horse stealing a capital offense, with the right of the jury to commute to not less than ten nor more than twenty-one years. This fellow had been tried and convicted of horse stealing, and the jury commuted his sentence to twenty-one years in the penitentiary. The judge ordered the defendant to stand up to receive sentence, and wanted to know if he had any reason to give why sentence should not be passed upon him. He said he had; that as to the judge and the prosecuting attorney, he did not have anything to say, but that he was tried by the damnedest infernal set of horse-stealing jurors that any man was ever tried before. [Laughter.]

One of the jurors who had just gone out and sold his jury ticket and bought a quarter section of ginger cake and a quart of hard cider and got on the outside of them, and was in the court and heard what the defendant said, arose and addressed the court: "Jedge, let us set on him agin, and we'll send him up for ninety-nine years." [Laughter and applause.]

Gentlemen, from the mutterings of discontent we have heard coming from that side, I believe there are many of you who, if the Senate will give you another chance "to set on the bill," will send it up for ninety-nine years. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Gentlemen, you are in the middle of a bad fix—Hanna, the trusts, and visions of a campaign fund on one side; the people, "plain duty," and humanity on the other; you know not which way to go; "you will be damned if you do, and you will be damned if you don't." [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Chairman, I will ask the gentleman from Iowa if he can not use some of his time?

Mr. HULL. I know of no one on this side that desires to speak now.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa does not care to consume any time at present.

Mr. HULL. I do not know that we want much time anyway. I have no idea that we shall take much time—certainly not if the debate runs as it does now. I am perfectly willing to suspend the general debate now and proceed under the five-minute rule if the gentleman from New York will agree.

Mr. SULZER. If the gentleman from Iowa does not want to use his time, will he yield it to me?

Mr. HULL. No; not now.

Mr. SULZER. If the gentleman has no use for his two hours, he might yield it to me——

Mr. HULL. I am not yielding at this time.

Mr. SULZER (continuing). I am having trouble over here to get time enough.

The CHAIRMAN. To whom does the gentleman from New York yield?

Mr. SULZER. I yield fifteen minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I want to take advantage of the time given me to insert a few things in the RECORD from distinguished men and equally distinguished newspapers of this country, some of them Democratic and some of them Republican, upon the Puerto Rican question generally, the inconsistencies and self-stultifications of the Republican party upon that question, and the cavity in which it has deposited itself on account of these inconsistencies. [Laughter on the Democratic side.] I will quote first from the Cincinnati Enquirer. It says:

Had the Republican management confessed that it was intended to rifle a land distant 10,000 miles from our shores, lay waste cities and populous districts, and kill and have killed under the science of war tens of thousands of people whose crime consisted of love of home and country and the enjoyment of liberty as they sought best to enjoy it, William McKinley would not have polled a single vote in the electoral college. Had the Republican leaders in the canvass of 1896 scouted our Declaration of Independence, in which our forefathers in 1776 appealed to mankind for approval; had they scoffed the Constitution of the United States and mocked the teachings of the fathers of the Republic, such a political organization as the Republican party would not be to-day in existence. Public opinion would have scorned the party to death. Yet the Administration of William McKinley has done all these things.

It has done something more than "these things," Mr. Chairman. It has contended that certain parts of the earth are neither in the United States nor outside of the United States, and then has contended in the next breath that these certain parts of the world are both within the United States and outside of the United States. You have taken the curious position that Congress, the creature of the Constitution, has powers beyond the Constitution. Then, again, some of you have said: "No; that is false, but something else is true—unless and until Congress legislates the *President*," another creature of the Constitution, "has powers beyond the Constitution; but we do not think that *Congress* has powers beyond the Constitution."

Here are some truths tersely put by a couple of great men who are members of the Republican party. I refer to the speeches of Judge Harman and Judge Taft at the farewell banquet to the latter as he was taking his departure to go as one of the appointees of the President as commissioner to the Philippine Islands.

Mr. SHATTUC. May I ask the gentleman how long it has been since Judge Harman joined the Republican party?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I have understood that both these gentlemen are Republicans. If one of them is a Democrat, all the more respectable is his testimony. He is then much more apt to be a good judge of the Constitution and sound public policy.

Mr. SHATTUC. Judge Harman is a Democrat out and out, and Judge Taft is an extra refined Republican.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. That is a rather rare sort of a Republican bird—rara avis in terris with our Republican friends.

Here are some of these epigrams of Judge Harman:

Our history and principles are a perpetual promise to peoples struggling for freedom and independence.

We now hear the usual plea of doers of doubtful things. "The deed is done; it is too late to discuss it." It is never too late to retrace a misstep, to right a wrong.

Again, I read from Judge Harman:

If the people shall decide—

And this is what they have decided hitherto in our history, and it is to be hoped that they will decide it again—

If the people shall decide that no nation is good enough to rule another nation without that nation's consent; if they shall conclude that this country can not long exist part vassal and part free, then there will be no difficulty in doing what we ought to have done in the beginning—leave the Filipinos to manage their own affairs and serve notice to the world that they are under our protection.

The Philippine question, as it involves right and wrong, will never be settled until it is settled right.

Judge Taft says, and remember Judge Taft is a Republican, and, moreover, is the Republican appointee of a Republican President as a Philippine Island commissioner:

I have always hoped that the jurisdiction of our nation would not extend beyond territory between the two oceans.

Again Judge Taft says:

We have not solved all the problems of popular government so perfectly as to justify our voluntarily seeking more difficult ones abroad.

And how much more difficult, Mr. Chairman, is the problem when the question is not the government of a homogeneous people with common aspirations and common traditions whence those aspirations flow, but the government of a people alien to us in race, in religion, in institutions, in law, in aspirations, in traditions, in environment, in everything, and inferior to us in every respect.

Here is something which I find quoted from Gen. Lew Wallace. I do not know whether he is a Republican or a Democrat. I have

always understood that he was a Republican and an original McKinley man. Perhaps he is super "extra refined;" I do not know:

When the President recommended free trade with Puerto Rico, that was William McKinley speaking from his heart. When he urged Congressmen to eat their utterances and vote for a duty on the industries of the island going and coming, that was MARK HANNA, the great Ohio suspect. Either the Puerto Ricans are fellow-countrymen or people in relation to us not yet defined. If fellow-countrymen, free trade should govern in all our dealings with them, and their institutions should be Americanized, something impossible under military control. If they are in relation unknown and undefined and poor and helpless, then charity, the essence of Christianity, should have had the molding of our policies.

It is idle to talk about the island being outside of the Constitution. Is Congress the creature of the Constitution or the Constitution a device of Congress? It is unfortunate that none of the men invited to see him and come away converted has told us of a word dropped by the President in explanation of his own conversion. It is not pleasant to think of the President exerting himself to control the action of an independent branch of the Government. What shall stop him next from interfering with the judges of the Supreme Court?

That I find attributed to Gen. Lew Wallace, ex-minister by Republican appointment to Constantinople and the author of Ben Hur.

The following I take from a Mississippi paper. It strikes me as very good doctrine:

An Associated Press dispatch says Senator SULLIVAN, of Mississippi, offered a resolution that the Philippine Islands are the rightful property, honorably acquired by the United States, and that "while misguided Filipinos continue the present war, brought on by them against the rightful authority of the United States, as long as a single gun in their hands is trained upon our flag, no expression or intention as to the future course of the United States with respect to them should be made by the Senate."

The Vicksburg Dispatch, commenting on that proposed resolution, says:

That leans too much toward imperialism for the Southern people. It is not unworthy a free people like the United States to inform the Filipinos exactly what we propose to do with the islands on which they have lived all their lives, and what treatment we intend to accord them. If we refuse to inform them of our purpose, and leave them to determine their fate by what the Hanna-McKinley Administration is saying and doing, it would be the same as telling them they have no rights at all.

The Senator's resolution is very unpalatable to the citizens of this State and to the people of the South. *A brave and just people are always willing to inform those they are fighting what their purpose is.* Of course, if we wish to conquer the brave Filipinos, lately our allies, and hold them as vassals, the Senator's resolution would be all right. But the American people are not ready for that yet awhile.

A few more things here, Mr. Chairman, and I will read rapidly, I find this from the St. Paul Pioneer Press, a Republican paper:

SKINNING PUERTO RICO.

This country will not tolerate the idea of skinning Puerto Rico for the supposed benefit of highly protected industries.

And in that connection, why is it that the Republican party upon this floor failed to follow the recommendation of the President when he said that it was "our plain duty" and that it was "evident justice" to allow these people free commercial intercourse with the balance of the United States? Has one of you undertaken to answer it? Will one of you dare do it now? Will one of you give the reasons for your new departure that exist to-day that did not exist when he wrote that message? Will one of you state a single reason cited by him for his own conversion? Will one of you prove that he is converted?

Mr. STEELE rose.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. One moment and I will let the gentleman interrupt. I will tell you what was the matter, and you know what was the matter, too. You know and I know that after that message was written the cigar and tobacco interests of Connecticut became alarmed, the sugar-beet industry became alarmed, the tropical-fruit industry of southern California and Florida became alarmed, the cane-sugar industry became alarmed. Great bodies of American workingmen, threatened with the bodily incorporation of Tagalo and cooly wage competitors, became alarmed.

Industries, organizations, and class interests sent men here to your various committees, and they besought you for what? Not to let those islands alone, which was a very good way and the only constitutional way of getting out of it, but to violate the Constitution of the United States in order that you might at one and the same time do two things—things in law and justice irreconcilable—namely, own, control, govern, and exploit the islands, and still at the same time not admit them to the freedom of traffic and the freedom of travel, which is the innate as well as the constitutional right of every American citizen. You had not the moral courage to recede from a mistaken policy nor the political courage to defy those interests by carrying out your policy to its bitter and bad but only logical conclusion under the Constitution.

Now I will yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. STEELE. The gentleman challenged anyone to give any reason.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Any reason that exists now that did not exist then.

Mr. STEELE. That did not exist when the President called our attention to the fact that absolute free trade was necessary.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Yes.

Mr. STEELE. In the course of the investigation it was ascertained, among other things, that Mr. Finley, who is at present the British consul, located in Puerto Rico, was very anxious for free trade between this country and Puerto Rico. It was also ascertained that he was the largest producer of sugar on the island and that he has as much sugar there now as any other man; that he has 1,500 acres of land that he says is worth $500 an acre.

It occurred to some of us that there must be something behind his interest in American affairs that made him so anxious to have free trade. An investigation has proven that instead of paying $1.60 a hundred, as he has been paying under the Dingley Act, he was not willing to pay the 40 cents a hundred that he would have to pay if he had come in under the original House bill or the 24 cents a hundred coming in under the present bill. Why did he object? Simply because he could put every farthing in his own pockets and not a single dollar of it go to the poor people of the island.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I have now heard the explanation. How long have we not waited for it; and now that it has come, what an explanation! "Montes laborant, nascitur ridiculus mus." "O lame and impotent conclusion!" I am now informed that the Chief Executive of a great nation of 75,000,000 people, that the legislative body of that people, representing the traditions, the history, the aspirations of the greatest Republic upon the surface of this earth, has changed a policy of "plain duty," of "evident justice," for fear that some money might go into the pockets of a man named Finley! A new and revolutionary departure from our Territorial policy, lest Finley should grow rich! [Derisive laughter on the Democratic side.] Is there any other explanation from that side of the House of any reason existing now that did not exist at the time the President wrote his message.

Mr. STEELE. Let me say further that this man is not paying a cent of taxes on this land.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I understand that. I am taking for granted that this thing would enrich Finley. I am taking it for granted that Finley is a British subject. I am taking it for granted that Finley is the archdevil himself, and yet I can not see that all the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States as to uniform taxation between the different parts of the United States and the hitherto traditional policy of the United States, which has been that whenever we added populations to our people we treated them just as we did our other people, should be set aside on his account. Finley may be a great man, a bad man, but I would rather see him a millionaire than to see all that. "Finley, oh, Finley, what crimes are committed in thy name!"

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SULZER. How much time does the gentleman want?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I should think it would take seven or eight minutes to finish it.

Mr. SULZER. I yield five minutes to the gentleman.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I will try to finish it in that time. Here is an article from the Carthage (Ill.) Gazette, Republican in politics:

PART OF THE UNITED STATES.

As Puerto Rico is a part of the United States, we believe it and its inhabitants are entitled to all the rights and privileges enjoyed by any of its Territories or the people thereof.

And we have in all our history held that in regard to other Territories. But Finley was not made profert of in the other cases. Perhaps if Finley had been there it would have been different. Here is something from the Peoria (Ill.) Journal, which, I believe, is a Republican paper:

APPEAL SHOULD BE HEEDED.

The appeal of the Puerto Ricans for the privilege of free trade with the balance of the United States is not one that should be rejected. The party that neglects to heed this appeal will suffer for it.

Here is something from the Cincinnati Commercial Tribune, Republican:

A REPROACH TO THE FLAG.

Puerto Rico suffers because of Congressional tardiness. And in her sufferings is the flag reproached and the nation discredited. This is a condition that discounts American statesmanship.

Here is something from the Chicago Times-Herald. It is Republican, undoubtedly.

A COWARDLY PARTY.

The truth is that the consistency and honor of the Republican party were sacrificed for cheap and cowardly political reasons, and the moral sense of the party was outraged at the bidding of the smallest fly that ever buzzed around the hub of progress.

Here is something from the Racine (Wis.) Times, Republican again. I especially recommend this to those of you who say you are taxing the Puerto Ricans "outside of the Constitution" for their own good:

INDEPENDENCE DESTROYED.

It is not by making beggars and paupers of our new charges that we will make good citizens of them. The very first lesson we should have attempted to instill into the minds of a people who have been held in subjection to a monarchy is the necessity of independence and self-help.

Not satisfied, the Chicago Times-Herald continues in another issue in this original manner:

BEFOGGED WITH TOBACCO SMOKE.

Is it not about time for the advocates of the Puerto Rico tariff bill to select some apology for that amazing political blunder upon which they can stand over night? In the six weeks that have elapsed since the Ways and Means Committee cut its safe moorings to the dock of duty and ventured forth on the stormy sea of broken faith and temporary shifts each week has seen the invention of a new explanation to replace an exploded excuse. Take them in the order in which they were invented and abandoned, the Government will not fulfill the pledges of Miles, the "necessity" of Davis, the "justice" of Root, the "plain duty" of the President.

"It is not by making beggars and paupers of our new charges that we will make good citizens of them."

I commend that to you for sound common sense. Grant them their rights. That is what they demand and are entitled to. Do not first treat them as aliens and men without rights by your exercise of the taxing power, and then treat them as paupers and beggars by your exercise of your appropriation power.

Here is something from the Portland Oregonian, a Republican paper:

AVARICE AND GREED TRIUMPH.

What especially concerns the country is this striking proof that protected avarice and greed have been able to control the House of Representatives and overbear the President against plain duty, manifest justice, and the interests of industry and trade between peoples under the common flag of the United States.

That would have sounded bitter coming from me. What must be the magnitude of your crime to provoke its utterance by a partisan Republican newspaper!

Here is something from the Angola (Ind.) Magnet, Republican. It is headed "People are not fools."

Of course it means "most people:"

Some of the members of Congress tell us that the people do not understand the Puerto Rican tariff bill. Perhaps they do not, but they have a pretty well established belief that the clause in the Constitution which declares that "all duties, imposts and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States" means precisely what it says.

Here is something from the Baltimore American, Republican:

THE COUNTRY DEMANDS JUSTICE.

At this time, when General Miles's pledge, the provisions of the peace treaty, the President's "plain duty" message, Secretary Root's unqualified recommendation, and the temper of the Puerto Ricans are all taken into consideration, the country refuses to believe that there can be any right or justice in the latter-day effort to treat the island as an alien.

Here is something from the Philadelphia North American, Republican, that is very good reading. It is headed "Un-American treatment."

No wonder the Puerto Ricans are not satisfied—

I recommend it to you; there is nothing like a dilemma.

No wonder the Puerto Ricans are not satisfied. If they are foreigners, let them ship their goods on foreign vessels if they find that to their advantage, and let them trade with foreign countries without the impediment of the Dingley tariff. If they are Americans, let them be treated like other Americans. They have a right to be considered one thing or the other.

You apply your navigation laws to them, because it is for your benefit. There you are exploiting them as if within the Union for your benefit, and then when it comes to giving them uniformity of traffic and travel, as guaranteed by the Constitution to all parts of the United States, you put them outside of the Union, because you can make more money out of them that way. You exploit them again for your benefit.

In applying your navigation laws you exploit them for the benefit of your merchant marine on the theory that the island is a part of the United States.

In refusing to apply uniform impost and excise taxes, but in contempt thereof "protecting" other "parts of the United States" against their products, you exploit them on the theory that the island is not a part of the United States.

Here is something from the Minneapolis Journal, Republican, from the Republican Northwest. This paper dares to say that you are blind:

CONGRESS IS BLIND.

It begins to look as if the people who lack for information were not in the country among the constituents, but were in Washington in the Ways and Means Committee and in the House meekly following the lead of its blind leadership. It will not hurt the Republican party to abandon this mistake, and the Republicans look with hope to the Senate to save the party from persisting in a dangerous error.

Then the peaceful rest and grassy quiet of the City of Brotherly Love is disturbed by the following plaint, occasioned by your bad faith:

SOLEMN PLEDGES BROKEN.

"Every consideration of justice and good faith," as the Secretary of War declared in his last annual report, demands that Congress shall accept the obligation of "plain duty" as it was announced by President McKinley. Should Congress fail to do that, it will do it not only at the risk of defeating the Republican party in November next, but with the certainty of breaking solemn pledges, of violating the bed-rock principles of the Constitution, of inflicting monstrous wrong and injustice upon a people who came to us cheerfully and welcomed us effusively because of their confidence in the good faith of our Government.—*Philadelphia Ledger* (Republican).

Now comes a voice from the Hub of the Universe, and the cultured and protected gentlemen who have hitherto voted the Republican ticket in the Athens of America must have their self-contemplative satisfaction disturbed by the following appeal to common sense made by a Republican newspaper:

A STUFFED BOGY.

The stuffed bogy that the admission of Puerto Rican goods into our markets without the payment of duty would be a step toward free trade as a national policy has lost its force, if it ever had any.

We have heard of mother countries, like France and Spain, which force their colonies to buy everything in the motherland. We never heard of any mother country which forced the colonies to sell all their goods outside the motherland. If we insist upon exacting tribute from the suffering island, we shall be acting the motherland very strangely. It will be more like the stepmotherland of the conventional style.—*Boston Transcript* (Republican).

The Cleveland Leader, Republican in politics, actually accuses the "great party of moral ideas," the "G. O. P.," of being immoral.

Drink of it, dissolute man;
Lave in it if you can.

REPUBLICAN PARTY IMMORAL.

It is long since any policy adopted by the representatives of the Republican party in Congress has been attacked by so great a proportion of the best Republican newspapers in the United States as have resolutely opposed the Puerto Rican tariff bill. The outbreak of dissatisfaction is so wide and intense that it may well alarm the most sanguine leaders of the party.

The reason is that the question is largely a matter of morals. Foremost in the issues raised by this unfortunate bill is the plea of Puerto Rico for kindness and justice. That is what breaks the lines of the Republican party. It is the appeal to the moral sense of the people. Republican policies can not safely or successfully be turned away from the instinct of right and justice involved in the demand for free trade between the United States and the little island which welcomed the American flag with high hopes and every demonstration of joy.

And then the Indianapolis Journal even forgets that it is Republican, and remembers only that it is human and American:

THE PAUPER ARGUMENT.

There is no weaker argument in defense of the Puerto Rican tariff bill than that based on the ignorance and poverty of the people of the island. We are told that when we got the island a large majority of them could not read or write; that thousands of them were never clothed beyond wearing a shirt; that 85 per cent of them went barefoot, and so on.

Much the same might have been said of the Southern plantation negroes at the close of the war, yet we gave the latter unrestricted free trade with the United State and the ballot besides. If ignorance and poverty furnished a justification for discriminating duties or taxes there would be a great deal of class legislation in this country.

The Detroit Tribune comes very near to calling you hypocrites. The idea that a Republican paper should "let that cat," of all cats, "out of the bag!"

CHARITABLE ROBBERY.

The proposition made by some of the Senators to levy a tariff equal to 15 per cent of the Dingley duties upon impor ts from the United States free is probably the most remarkable compromise ever offered. Certainly nothing more extraordinary has been proposed since duty and destiny established themselves in the seats of the mighty.

The principal argument advanced by the supporters of the House measure is that Puerto Rico needs the revenue. Now, the solemn Senators come along and say, "Let us do the right thing by these helpless people. We will keep their products out of the United States, but we will permit them to buy our products without paying anything extra for the blessed privilege." Humanity and benevolent assimilation can go no further. If the Puerto Ricans are not tickled now, it is hardly worth while trying to please such a fickle and frivolous people.

Then comes the Evangelist, and in the stern tones of a "God-fearing covenanter" announces what one might have known would be its opinion, dictated by the great heart and hard head of Presbyterianism:

COMMERCIAL DEGENERACY.

Some commercial degenerates are said to have used the argument with the President that Puerto Rico sugar and tobacco will compete with the American product. We must protect our own growers. Our own growers! Is not Puerto Rico our own? What kind of absorption is this? What kind of Americanization of our new dependence does it portend? It would leave Puerto Rico worse off than it was under Spain, and it would impose on the people of this generous and justice-loving Republic the harder lot of exchanging places with Spain and coming down from our ideals to the level of that once proud and magnanimous people.

Then to make the sad irony of your fate "sadder yet and yet sadder" comes the voice of commercialism itself. Listen to the New York Board of Trade and Transportation, then cry, "et tu Brute" and die.

ROOMS OF THE NEW YORK BOARD OF
TRADE AND TRANSPORTATION,
MAIL AND EXPRESS BUILDING, 203 BROADWAY,
New York, March 22, 1900.

At a special meeting of the New York Board of Trade and Transportation, called for the purpose of considering the Puerto Rican tariff matter and held this day, the board adopted the following resolutions, viz:

Resolved, That in the judgment of the New York Board of Trade and Transportation the policy of the United States toward the island of Puerto Rico should be definitely and immediately determined upon considerations and conditions which relate to that island alone, and that such policy so decided upon should not in any particular or degree be affected, influenced, or warped by other and different questions, conditions, and considerations which may be involved in the relations of the United States to the island of Cuba and to the Philippines.

Resolved, That the people of Puerto Rico, in the opinion of the New York Board of Trade and Transportation, are entitled by every consideration of justice, equity, and honor to the most beneficent treatment by the Government of the United States. We believe that in assuming the existing relation toward Puerto Rico this country accepted obligations which can not honorably be evaded, and that, apart from all other considerations, due regard for pledges given demand the extension to that island of free commercial intercourse with the United States and a civil form of government.

Resolved, That it will be a dishonor to the American flag, which now floats

over the island of Puerto Rico, if by reason of any consideration unworthy of this great nation any act of ours shall impose upon the people of that island burdens less tolerant than those from which they have been released. and they shall come thereby to regard our flag as the emblem of avarice and not of liberty and happiness.

Resolved, That while giving expression to the foregoing sentiments, the New York Board of *Trade and Transportation* renews its expressions of confidence in the wisdom of the Administration and of Congress, and of their desire and purpose to legislate upon the interests of the island of Puerto Rico, in accord with the overwhelming sentiment of the people of the United States, which. in our judgment, favors the keeping of good faith pledged by General Miles and other representatives of this Government.

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be forwarded to the President of the United States and to the members of the Senate and of the House of Representatives.

Resolved, That the president be authorized to appoint a committee of five members of this board, who shall have full power to take such action as they may deem conducive to the carrying out of the views of this board as expressed in the foregoing resolutions.

A true copy.

W. H. PARSONS, *President*.

Attest:

FRANK S. GARDNER, *Secretary*.

Are you going to disappoint their expressed, even if not entertained, confidence in your wisdom, so deftly interwoven as it is with their denunciation of your known purpose? You used to ding into the ears of us poor free-silver fellows the constantly recurring refrain:

Oh, listen to the boards of trade!
Oh, hear what the boards have said!

Make your hymn the guide of your own conduct. Surely it has not ceased to be true that the New York Board of Trade is the source of all wisdom?

If so, then perhaps some wisdom may dwell farther west—even in the far land of Buffalo. If so, hear these parts of an editorial in the Buffalo Evening News—a proselyte to Republicanism, and therefore zealous in the faith:

If the tariff wall is to be raised between the United States and Puerto Rico, the Republican party may well look about for another candidate for President, for William McKinley has himself written the epitaph which will be his if that happens. His message to Congress put upon Congress, as a matter of conscience, the duty of opening our markets to the annexed island. If he yields to pressure, and in the end consents to wrong Puerto Rico, the responsibility will be his, and it will be a grave one.

* * * * * * *

The attempted betrayal of Puerto Rico has divided the Republican party in Congress. It will divide it in the nation if the policy is carried out. The responsibility rests mainly with the President. This is a year when, of all years, the Republican party should be united, hopeful, and aggressive. It should not be put on the defensive. The prestige of a successful war and returning industrial prosperity makes it invincible if it will only be true to American ideals.

* * * * * * *

The President should speak out, and should stand by his message in the manly fashion which is his in matters of principle, however he may compromise in matters of policy and detail. The Republican State legislature of Iowa has protested against the betrayal of Puerto Rico. In New York a great mass meeting is to be held Thursday night to voice a similar protest. Soon it will be too late for the Chief Magistrate to break silence with self-respect. For political reasons, for personal reasons, above all for patriotic reasons and for the welfare of the whole country, the President should speak out, and he should speak out now.

Wants the President to "speak out." Poor fellow! So anxious to please everybody! He has "spoken out" so often and so variously that he has spoken himself out of alluring breath and some of you out of Congress. What a predicament you have gotten one another into!

Let the Washington Post, which expresses it well, speak. It calls itself "independent" in politics. It has been, as all will admit, Administrationist. Here is what it says:

THE REPUBLICAN PREDICAMENT.

May we be pardoned for suggesting that the Republican party seems at this moment to be in a highly interesting condition? May we add that, as is usual in such cases, it is the party's own fault? In the absence of objection—and we follow Big Tom Reed's methods in this respect—we declare both motions carried and a quorum present. The Republican party is in an interesting but very unpleasant situation, and the party has itself to blame.

Let us survey the field!

When Congress assembled last December, the President's message was, of course, the first number on the programme. In that message Mr. McKinley declared himself, unreservedly, for free trade with Puerto Rico. By way of supplement to this, the Secretary of War—one of the most eminent and gifted jurists in the country—urged the measure in even more elaborate terms. While the President appealed to "our plain duty," Secretary Root reminded us that "justice and good faith demand," etc. Only the most callous and indurated of Congresses could have resisted such clarion calls, and the Congress to which these illustrious gentlemen addressed themselves was, notoriously, a Congress of unusual sensibility.

No wonder, therefore, that the Ways and Means Committee of the House promptly reported a free-trade bill with reference to Puerto Rico and still less wonder that all the forces of altruism and humanity and benevolence rallied as one man to praise and to commend the proposition. Right there, however, is where the trouble began and where the Republican party entered upon a course of stultification and moral acrobatics and intellectual hide and seek which has enshrined it permanently in the disrespectful amazement of the country.

Let us be businesslike!

Explanation first. The Republican Congress could not grant free trade to Puerto Rico without committing the party to the principle that "the Constitution follows the flag." (Note: No legislation with reference to Puerto Rico would affect the constitutional question, one way or another, pending a decision by the Supreme Court.)

Explanation second. A tariff on Puerto Rican products was necessary so as to create a fund which could be applied to the necessities of the people. (Note: A bill was passed appropriating $2,000,000 to relieve those necessities, thus giving the Puerto Ricans more relief than would have been afforded in one year by the proposed tariff.)

Explanation third. It was indispensable to uphold the principle of protection. Labor—organized labor—was supposed to demand such a policy. (Note: This principle had already been abandoned in the case of Hawaii, and no evidence could be presented to show that organized labor cared three straws about Puerto Rico.)

Explanation fourth. If we give free trade to Puerto Rico, we must also give it to the Philippines, and perhaps, later, to Cuba. This would establish a dangerous precedent. Moreover, the idea of giving Puerto Rico a representation in Congress was fraught with mischief and alarm. (Note: The precedent had been established in the matter of Hawaii, both as to free trade and representation in Congress. Mr. LODGE says so himself.)

Thus we find that in none of their squirmings and tergiversations have the Republican leaders a shadow of justification in fact. They are in the position of advocating a policy—nay! insisting upon it—which the President and the Secretary of War have with force and eloquence, if by indirection, denounced, and for which they can offer no rational excuse. And to complete the illustration of the party's sad predicament, we need only refer to the remarkable declaration of General GROSVENOR'S Ohio convention Tuesday—the Eleventh Congressional district—which for obscurity, noncommitalism, obfuscation, and general elasticity is without parallel since the days of good Jack Bunsby.

It may be that at some period in the past a great national party has found itself upon the threshold of a campaign in such a humiliating plight. But we do not at this moment recall the incident.

While we are quoting from the press of the Federal city, I will furnish some other choice specimens of what it thinks.

The chief daily papers are the Star, partisan Republican; the Times, partisan Democrat; the Post, Administrationist, but not always or chiefly partisan.

Read these from the Post, and first the following sermon on a text from the lips of the President:

WHAT THE FLAG MEANS.

"Our flag does not mean one thing here and another thing in Cuba or Puerto Rico."—*President McKinley to 20,000 Methodists at Ocean Grove on August 25, 1899.*

Our flag wherever it flies as an emblem of our sovereignty means constitutional government.

* * * * * * *

There are two kinds of government authorized by the Constitution and sanctioned by the Supreme Court. One rests on the authority of the President as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy. In that way New Mexico and California were governed and well governed for years. In that way Puerto Rico has been governed since her people welcomed our invading army as deliverers from oppression. It would have been lawful for the President to continue to govern Puerto Rico for some years without invoking aid from the legislative department.

The President might have been able to discharge "our plain duty" toward the loyal people of that little island by giving them free trade with the United States. That would have been such an indication of the meaning of our flag as would have commended it to warmer affection for its starry folds than can be felt by wards of the nation subjected to an oppressive and impoverishing discrimination.

But although a circuitous route may be taken to bring to the Puerto Ricans a full realization of the meaning of our flag, they are sure to get it. Congress can not govern any island or any part of any continent outside of the Constitution. There is a power higher than Congresses or Presidents in determining what may or may not be done in the name of the Constitution. That power, following its own precedents, will decide that "our plain duty" must be discharged.

If Congress, in face of the thunderous protest of the people, attempts to impose a tariff tax on Puerto Rican products, the tribunal which interprets law to Congresses and Presidents will declare that our flag can not mean one thing here and another in that island. But it would be better for all concerned and immeasurably better for the Republican party to get back without needless delay to the text of the President's message; better to discharge "our plain duty" directly than to do it grudgingly under compulsion of a Supreme Court decision.

And if there are Senators and Representatives who doubt this, let them put their ears to the ground.

Read this pathetic appeal to "stand by the President:"

STAND BY THE PRESIDENT.

A Republican who is neither a statesman nor a philosopher, but merely one of "the plain people" of the great Northwest, asks the Post to oblige him by frankly stating whether or not there is truth in the reports that the President has changed his mind respecting "our plain duty" toward the inhabitants of Puerto Rico.

"Is it not," inquires our correspondent, "our best policy to assume, in the absence of any contrary statement by the President, that he stands just where he stood when he made that declaration and convinced the country that he was right?" Our correspondent asserts that it would be impossible for the Republican leaders in the Northwest, however arduously they might exert themselves in that direction, to carry the people with them in support of the pending tariff measure. "Standing with the President on his message to Congress," he says, "we can carry the Northwest in this year's campaign."

Having no doubt that this inquirer correctly represents the situation, knowing from the press of the Northwest that he utters the general thought of "the plain people," we feel that in addressing him we are speaking to the masses of that section. As to the reports respecting a change of mind, the Post has no hesitancy in saying that the best Republican policy is to ignore them altogether. What this or that Senator or Representative may have said as regards the President's opinion need have no weight against the latest public and official declaration of the President himself.

Let the Republican masses stand with the Republican press and the President on and by and for the promise made by General Miles: "Puerto Rico under the American flag will enjoy the same privileges and the same immunities as the citizens of the United States and Territories of the Union." Repudiation of that pledge should be impossible. "The plain people" of this nation are honest. Therefore they stand with the President and not with the House of Representatives.

The same mistake that was made by the Republicans of Fairfax County, Va., in their convention last Monday—the blunder of charging the President with having receded from his position—has been perpetrated in other quarters. For example, President Hyde, of Bowdoin College, one of the great institutions of learning of which New England is justly proud, a college among whose graduates have been Presidents, Chief Justices, Senators, governors, and men of fame in every honorable calling, has preferred to credit rumor rather than stick to the only official evidence in the case.

The Lewiston Journal, the leading Republican paper in Maine with which

the late Governor Dingley was so long identified, prints in its issue of the 19th instant a special telegram from Brunswick, dated the 18th, under a highly sensational display head, which reads as follows:

"President Hyde's talk in chapel this afternoon widely differed from his usual short Sunday afternoon sermons, and has caused much comment among the students.

"The Scripture lesson read was the story of Balaam, and the talk which followed had 'inconsistency' as its text, but consisted almost entirely of a criticism of Governor Roosevelt for his removal of Dr. Backus, and of President McKinley for his action regarding Puerto Rico.

"'Roosevelt,' said President Hyde, 'has had such a good previous record that this mistake of his may be forgotten, but McKinley has shown his fatal characteristic; is becoming distrusted by the people, and if not strongly intrenched in his party could not be reelected next November.'

"Continuing, he compared McKinley to Gladstone, saying, 'Gladstone changed his mind; McKinley has allowed his mind to be changed for him.'

"In concluding, President Hyde said: 'No man who so acts can command the respect and confidence of the American people. Remember the relapse of Roosevelt; remember the downfall of McKinley.'"

The Post's advice to Dr. Hyde and his friends, should they happen to ask for sober counsel, would be the same that has been given in this article to a Western correspondent. Stand with the President. He is not responsible for the House or the Senate. The world knows where he stood three and a half months ago. And he has not said a word to the people of the United States since that time indicative of a change of mind. If the Republican masses continue to stand for "our plain duty," Congress will not long hesitate to align itself with them.

No measure has ever passed both Houses of Congress against such opposition as the Puerto Rican tariff bill has evoked. No party is or ever will be strong enough to bear unharmed the strain of the passage of a measure thus opposed.

Later, when that seemed unavailing, this despairing appeal was made to the President to stand by himself. I still read from the Washington Post:

MR. M'KINLEY'S OPPORTUNITY.

So far as the country now knows—so far as the Post knows—so far as any authentic utterance warrants the humblest citizen in believing—the President still stands upon the declaration contained in his message, and advocates free trade for Puerto Rico. He made that declaration so deliberately, and based it upon such a solemn and persuasive array of facts, the whole country responded to his overture with fervor and sincerity. If he has changed his mind since then—if any of this agitation in Congress for a tariff against Puerto Rico has his encouragement and sanction—the American people do not know it, and have no reason to believe it.

That something has occurred; that some pressure has been brought to bear to launch Congress upon a course which, three months ago, it would not have dreamed of taking; must be evident to the most careless observer of public events. As a matter of fact, we see the President's closest and most enthusiastic supporters urging this tariff bill. We are aware—we could not ignore it if we would—that they are using every possible influence to obtain support for a measure which Mr. McKinley in his message denounced by implication as an injustice and a breach of faith.

The spectacle presented to the country is baffling and confusing and mysterious beyond measure. The masses wish to stand by Mr. McKinley, who has won their entire respect and confidence, and yet they are confronted by a situation which involves his notorious champions and spokesmen in an organized hostility to what they had supposed—on the strength of his own deliberate announcement—to be his personal desire and conviction.

What are Mr. McKinley's supporters, the loyal Republican masses of the nation, to infer? Are they to take his word as he proclaimed it last December, or are they to assume that Mr. LODGE and Mr. Smith, the Postmaster-General, are authorized to represent him as having changed his mind? It is perfectly evident that members of the House have voted for the tariff bill against their wishes and convictions. It is notorious that the House, if permitted to reconsider its former action, free from all compulsion and duress, would defeat the tariff by an overwhelming majority.

Everybody knows that Senate Republicans, having heard from home meanwhile, are strongly disposed and frankly anxious to bestow free trade on Puerto Rico. What, then, is the meaning of this extraordinary complication? How is it that the country can not understand the seeming incongruity, and why does not the President at once relieve his friends and satisfy the people by giving out, upon his own responsibility, a statement that will set all doubts at rest?

He enjoys the affection and the confidence of the country. If he has changed his mind about Puerto Rico and will give the reasons for that recantation, his fellow-citizens will still believe in his sincerity and cherish him in their affections. If he has amended his views; if, after demanding free trade for Puerto Rico, he now insists upon a tariff, he has only to make candid acknowledgment of the fact and thereby retain the respect and confidence of the country. He owes this to himself, to his supporters, and to the American people. He can lose nothing by paying the debt.

Afterwards the President thought to get out of the imbroglio by giving back with one hand what he proposed unlawfully to continue to take with the other. Then the Post thus exposes it all:

[Editorial, Washington Post, March 3, 1900.]

TINKERING WITH PUERTO RICO.

In response to a special recommendation by the President the House of Representatives yesterday passed a bill providing that all moneys collected as a result of the tariff on Puerto Rico products shall be applied to the development and improvement of the island.

Discussion was suppressed, and the measure put through practically without investigation. It sounds well. It bears the earmarks of a cheap but worthy altruism. We fancy that this noble outburst would figure powerfully in a sophomore address at a female seminary commencement, or make so crushing a peroration in a Washington High School debate as to wreathe Superintendent Powell's speaking features in honest ecstasy. The question, however, is whether it clarifies or still further muddles and obscures the situation.

Frankly, we think it does the latter thing. If the moneys collected from the tariff on Puerto Rican products are to be returned to the island; if the United States Government relinquishes all idea of profit; if our purpose be truly benevolent and humane, as we profess, why set up this complicated machinery, involving large clerical expense and a painful multiplication of official equipment? Why not consider the preferences of the Puerto Rican producers, and save money at both ends?

It is sufficiently evident that the representatives of industry in the island want free trade, and the opportunity of applying their resources in such fashion as their judgment may dictate. They are the people to consider. They can be trusted to know what is best for them. If we are legislating for the material interests of Puerto Rico, surely we should think first of the classes who represent those interests. Not to beat about the bush, we make bold to say, without further palaver, that the President's new attitude is more mysterious and distasteful than the situation it affects to modify.

It looks to us—and we believe it will so impress the American people—like an attempt to placate the overwhelming hostile criticism which, without reference to party or section, has buried the Puerto Rican tariff bill in popular contempt and reprobation. It will fail, however. It is a confession of blunder and injustice, and there is nothing in it to appease the wrath and sorrow of the country. There is a principle involved—a principle which the new arrangement violates as brutally as the other did—and the nation's conscience is as wounded and as scandalized as it was before.

What, we wonder, is behind all this? It is impossible to believe that the superficial aspect is other than a mask.

This was on March 3. But, alas! on March 13 this lover and well-wisher of the President could not restrain the following utterance:

WORSE AND WORSE FOR PUERTO RICO.

The last state of Puerto Rico is, in our opinion, worse than the first. It is now proposed, we understand, to give the island free trade with a string to it. All our products are to be taken in without a cent of duty. The natives may have our churns, sausages, mowing machines, baby carriages, washboards, missionaries, etc., and not pay so much as the fraction of a penny on any of them. So far it is the perfection of altruism—may we say benevolent suffocation? The only thing is that Puerto Rican products—the results of native enterprise and effort and the basis upon which the people's prosperity must be founded—the only thing is that these products are to be taxed when they reach our ports.

In other words, the United States is free to flood Puerto Rico with its merchandise, but Puerto Rico must pay on everything it sends to our markets. The situation reminds us of a deal once made between China and Great Britain, and of the reply made by the English representative when asked how the deal would operate. "Heads I win, taels you lose," said the Englishman—and so it was. We are a promising pupil of England, under present auspices, and England must look to her laurels as a spoliator if we ever get ourselves really educated.

Seriously, however, we feel moved to say that this new proposition is even more inexcusable than any yet advanced. We are to introduce our wares into Puerto Rico free of charge, and Puerto Rico is to be taxed on everything she produces and sends to us. Just how Congress can discuss this with a straight face we do not pretend to say. Even the Roman augurs contented themselves with winking at each other. They never gave the game away to the ribald multitude. In this case, however, the dullest intellect can grasp the meaning of the situation. It is as plain as daylight that the object is to enrich our producers and merchants while we industriously fleece the Puerto Ricans.

We went into the war against Spain sobbing with sorrow for the downtrodden victims of Spain's oppression. We girded up our pious loins and swore a great and righteous oath that we would uplift the groaning generation. How well do we recall the passionate orations which fired the pious heart and waked to fine frenzy the American zeal for noble works! To this day we thrill responsive to the hysterical appeals of the great and good men who made the halls of Congress ring with their denunciations of Spanish tyranny. And now we are told that our scheme of rescue and exaltation consists in free trade for the United States and taxation for Puerto Rico!

Verily, it seems to us that this is the very carnival of humbug and hypocrisy!

Then it leaves unheeding Executive and legislative for the nonce aside, and on March 19 reasons to the "plain people" in a manner almost sound enough to be Democratic:

"THE PLAIN PEOPLE" AND PUERTO RICO.

The Philadelphia Press is one of the quintet of Republican papers that support the Puerto Rican tariff bill. The Press, referring to the passage by the Senate, with amendments, of the Puerto Rico appropriation recommended by the President, says:

"There is no disposition anywhere to deal with the island of Puerto Rico except on the most generous principles. The return of these duties shows this, and the proposition to relieve the island of all but a very small fraction, 15 per cent, of the Dingley duties, and then hand that 15 per cent over to the island for the sole benefit of the Puerto Ricans, is another example of national generosity which some good people persist in misunderstanding, and some not so good misrepresent and distort for their own fell purposes. We do not believe they will succeed in deceiving the plain people or make them believe that it is dealing harshly with a people to collect a trifling duty on their goods and then hand the money collected back to them."

There are few of the "plain people" in this country so dull as to be deceived by the flimsy pretense that the collection of a tax from individual Puerto Ricans and then appropriating the proceeds for public works on that island is a fulfillment of our duty in the premises. It is substituting charity for such just action as would place the people beyond the need of humiliating assistance. It is a violation of our pledged faith, a direct breech of the promise held out to the Puerto Ricans when our Army landed on their shore. President Schurman, of the Philippines Commission, appears to be one of those "good people" who "persist in misunderstanding" this business, and therefore cooperate with "some not so good" in efforts to "deceive the plain people." He stands by and on the President's message calling for free trade with Puerto Rico. He says:

"We are bound to this course by solemn promises. The supreme and irresistible reason for removing all customs barriers between the United States and Puerto Rico is the promise made by General Miles, when first landing American forces on the island, that the Puerto Ricans should enjoy the same rights, privileges, and immunities as the people of the United States. On this understanding the Puerto Ricans accepted American sovereignty, not only without opposition, but with joyful trust and confidence. The present issue is simply this: Shall we repudiate or shall we fulfill the national engagements? Shall this great Republic break faith with the little island of Puerto Rico? Having secured the fruits of General Miles's promise, shall we now renounce the promise?"

Does the Press imagine that the "plain people" will fail to understand that? Is it not as clear as a ray of sunlight? And it goes to the country commended by the fact that the gentleman who wrote it possesses, in the most marked degree, the respect and confidence of the President.

President Schurman not only stands on the President's message, but on the annual report of Secretary Root, in which he said:

"The highest considerations of justice and good faith demand that we should not disappoint the confident expectation of sharing in our prosperity with which the people of Puerto Rico so gladly transferred their allegiance to the United States. We should treat the interests of this people as our

own. I wish most strongly to urge that the customs duties between Puerto Rico and the United States be removed."

Is there any difficulty about "the plain people" comprehending that? And will they misunderstand ex-President Harrison's declaration that he regards the Puerto Rican tariff bill "as a most serious departure from right principles?" Senator Davis, of Minnesota, has some influence with "the plain people." We suspect the Philadelphia Press has a very high opinion of his judgment. Did the Press follow him when he said to the Senate the other day, "What is the reason that this tariff rate, anomalous, unheard of, unprecedented, and temporary, should be applied to Puerto Rico while the other day a bill was passed in the other House appropriating $2,000,000 for Puerto Rico from the Treasury?"

There is an ex-Senator from Vermont now residing in Philadelphia, for whose opinion on a constitutional question his countrymen, "plain" and otherwise, have as much respect as for that of any other living man. We refer to George F. Edmunds, and cite his declaration that "the Puerto Rican tariff bill is clearly unconstitutional and violates all our agreements with and pledges to the Puerto Ricans."

"The plain people" are with the President and his Secretary of War, with General Miles and President Schurman, with ex-President Harrison and George F. Edmunds, with the almost unanimous press of the United States. And it is a case in which conscience plays so large a part that judgment refuses to be warped by selfish representations of political expediency.

Remember Professor Schurman is the President's own appointee as chief of the commissioners to the Philippines.

On March 18 the Post, commenting on an appeal made by the Chicago Times-Herald to Republicans in both Houses not to "defy the will of the people" in this Puerto Rican matter, in part says:

There is a clear and very significant recognition of the peril which now confronts the Republican party. The great Republican States of the Northwest are intensely in earnest in their demand for fair dealing with the Puerto Ricans.

In Indiana, Illinois, and Minnesota this demand is so imperative, expresses a sentiment so deep and all-pervading, that a defiance of it by Congress would, in the opinion of the most competent local judges, render even the most strongly Republican of those three Commonwealths extremely doubtful fighting ground in the Presidential campaign. The Times-Herald's warning might be treated as the result of overanxiety if that paper stood alone, but standing with all the Republican and independent papers of that section, and with nearly all the influential papers in the entire Union, and known to be a warm friend of the President, its admonition should have serious weight with those who have in a special manner the fortunes of the Republican party in their keeping.

The Chicago Inter Ocean is a thick and thin, uncompromising Republican paper. It is in close touch with stalwart Republicanism throughout the Northwest. Referring to the report that Senator HANNA is telling United States Senators that free trade with Puerto Rico will injure the Republican party with the working people of the United States, the Inter Ocean says:

"If Mr. HANNA and his associate Senators wish to know what is really injuring the Republican party, not only with working people of the United States but with all the rest of the people, at the present moment, we can tell them.

"It is the proposal on the part of Republicans in Washington to repudiate this nation's pledges to Puerto Rico. It is their efforts to violate the faith pledged by the President of the United States and his representatives to the island."

It would be easy to fill columns, pages, or volumes with extracts similar to that from newspapers that are friendly to the Administration and desire the success of the Republican party. They stand and they demand that Congress stand with the President as to "our plain duty." Those newspapers have an ear to the ground and a finger on the public's pulse.

Meantime, on March 1, it had passed through the stage of upbraiding the House, "moved," as it says, "by an influence mysterious and inexplicable," for not "following the President." Poor House! How anxious a majority of its Republican majority had been to "follow" him, if only it could ascertain "whither he was drifting." Listen:

[Editorial of Washington Post, Thursday, March 1, 1900.]

THE HOUSE AND PUERTO RICO.

The House has repudiated—rejected by a vote representing almost the full Republican strength of that body—the President's solemn and righteous injunction regarding Puerto Rico.

"Our plain duty," said Mr. McKinley, in his message to Congress, "is to abolish all customs tariffs between the United States and Puerto Rico and give her products free access to our markets." How has the House responded to this earnest recommendation? By passing a bill that, if concurred in by the Senate, will impose a tariff tax of $1,200,000 to $1,600,000 upon the struggling, poverty-stricken people of the little island.

What a spectacle is thus presented to the country! A Republican House overrules the solemn and just decree of a Republican President! The country has no knowledge of any changed conditions since the President's message was written. It knows of no change of policy or sentiment on the part of the Executive. Our duty is as plain, as pressing to-day as it was in December last. There was a ring of genuine, generous Americanism in the President's utterance. It was the recommendation of a Christian, a patriot, and a statesman. Yet the House of Representatives, moved by an influence mysterious and inexplicable, proclaims to the nation that Mr. McKinley was wrong; that we really do not owe such a duty to Puerto Rico as he so clearly and earnestly indicated.

Verily this is a spectacle not only for the country but for the world. What of our boasted mission to redeem and Christianize? What of our lofty pretensions of a year or so ago? Are we giving evidence of good faith by imposing a tariff upon our own wards more burdensome than that provided in the pending reciprocity treaties for the benefit of the British tradesmen of Jamaica and Trinidad?

The proposition is wicked upon its face, and the great mass of honest American people will continue to look at it askance in spite of all the oratory from the stump which Republican speakers can put forth.

As showing how the "plain people" of the United States, not being, like the House, "moved by an influence mysterious and inexplicable," regarded your high-handed, unjust, and unconstitutional, colonialistic, and imperialistic departure from all historic American precedent, read these specials to the Post from Indianapolis, Ind., and Portland, Me.

What receptions the people gave CRUMPACKER and LITTLEFIELD for defying your party lash!

BLUNDER WILL COST VOTES—INDIANA REPUBLICANS BITTERLY DENOUNCE ACTION ON PUERTO RICO—JUDGE CRUMPACKER'S COURAGEOUS STAND IS UNIVERSALLY INDORSED, AND IT MAY MAKE HIM GOVERNOR.

[Special to the Post.]

INDIANAPOLIS, IND., *March 1.*

The action of the House of Representatives in passing the bill imposing a tariff tax upon the products of Puerto Rico—contrary to the recommendation in the President's message—is denounced by the Republican press of the State without exception. The Journal, News, and Press of this city have assailed the measure vigorously.

Representative LANDIS is being sharply criticised for his assertion in an interview that the people of the State were not interested in the bill. The papers say that he is out of touch with his constituents on this subject, and does not understand the feeling in the State.

Judge CRUMPACKER, the only Indiana Representative who voted against the bill, is receiving universal praise and commendation for his courageous stand. The change of front by Representative WATSON at the last moment was a sore disappointment to his friends, who had enthusiastically applauded his announced determination to vote against the bill.

The Puerto Rican issue is likely to figure to some extent in the pending gubernatorial campaign. Judge CRUMPACKER'S availability for the nomination is now being favorably discussed, and in case of a deadlock in the convention, there is more than a probability of CRUMPACKER being selected as a compromise candidate. His vote against the Puerto Rican bill has made him a popular factor in State politics.

The Republican leaders unhesitatingly denounce, in interviews, the action of the Hoosier delegation. Ex-President Harrison privately remarked two days ago that the measure was very unwise, and his opinion has been generally circulated. To-day, when approached, he said:

"I do not feel that I care to say anything offhand in a newspaper interview on a matter of such grave importance. I may prepare a careful article for some magazine on the subject, but I have not made up my mind yet."

Sergeant at-Arms Dan Ransdell, of the Senate, came in this morning and dropped in the Columbia Club, where his ears were set buzzing with the bitter denunciation of the Administration's course. At the Marion Club there was the same high feeling. Postmaster Heuss said the act was one of political suicide. He pronounced the Congressional action as outrageous. Ex-Attorney-General Ketcham, Federal Judge Baker, Ex-Supreme Justice B. K. Elliott, and many other prominent Republicans, in interviews, showed how unwise was the action of the Congressmen.

State Chairman Hernley set out for Washington this afternoon to protest against further progress of the bill. He was reticent as to his mission. Governor Mount wrote Senator FAIRBANKS a letter a few days ago, pointing out the grave political danger in passing the bill. Almost every business man and politician interviewed condemns the matter in the strongest terms.

At the Republican clubs there is much talk of Roosevelt for President, and frequent comments are made that an anti-McKinley delegation will be sent to the Philadelphia convention.

REPRESENTATIVE LITTLEFIELD INDORSED.

PORTLAND, ME., *March 1, 1900.*

The Portland Board of Trade to-day emphatically indorsed the views expressed by Congressman Littlefield against the Puerto Rican bill, and praised him for his "courageous stand" in the matter.

In this connection keep in mind that the most partisan and hidebound Republicans in all the land, outside of East Tennessee and the mountains of Kentucky, are the Republicans of Indiana.

Why, even ex-President Harrison, in an authenticated interview, said on Saturday, March 3: "Yes; I regard the bill as a serious departure from right principles."

So far have things gone in Indiana Republicandom.

But perhaps you would rather hear the voice of a "dyed-in-the-wool" Republican paper?

This is from the Washington Star of March 11.

NO REASON FOR A TARIFF.

There is no longer an emergency money question connected with the Puerto Rican tariff matter. The House, upon the President's recommendation, passed a bill returning past revenue duties collected from the island, and the Senate yesterday, with an important amendment, indorsed the measure. The amount thus made available for public purposes in Puerto Rico is a trifle over $2,000,000—a sum almost equal to what the emergency tariff bill would produce during the two years to which it is limited.

The question then recurs, to adopt parliamentary lingo, on the reasons for erecting a tariff wall around Puerto Rico. Ready money for the island has been provided. It is not necessary to levy a tariff tax in order to settle the question about whether Congress may do this thing or that thing as to a new possession. The Philippines are not involved. Congress will have as free a hand when the Philippines are reached as it now has. Why, then, this tariff proposition, and why, especially, should it be insisted on in the face of an overwhelming public sentiment against it?

It is useless to beat about the bush. The Republican party is in power, and is responsible for legislation. In the matter of these new possessions it is making very important history, and it is within eight months of having to answer to the people at the polls for the deeds done in the body. The question of imperialism as it now stands is comparatively harmless. The country is not overrun with soldiers, nor is there any Man on Horseback on the horizon. Expansion is an accomplished fact, and the people not only accept the situation but recognize the importance of the new condition in all calculations about the future. They want the new possessions held and want their affairs well administered.

But what will the people say if the Republicans start in by legislating against the new possessions? What will they say if the first measure of importance applying to them is shaped by a few protected industries in the United States? The Man on Horseback does not exist. But how about the Man on a Sugar Barrel? How about the Wooden Indian? Does the Republican party purpose making this campaign with those two imposing figures in the foreground? Can it hope to conquer in the sign of sugar and tobacco?

The two editorials from the Star of March 21 are edifying reading for all:

TINKERING NOT IN ORDER.

The latest compromise suggested as to Puerto Rico is that the tariff shall cease whenever the civil government shall certify to the President that the

duties so collected are no longer necessary for the support of the island. What would this be but to transfer to Puerto Rico the unseemly scheming which we are now witnessing here on this very subject?

Once establish the tariff by act of Congress, and the sugar and tobacco growing interests of the United States will exert themselves to the utmost to prevent the repeal of the law. All the persuasive influences of a powerful lobby will be brought to bear in Puerto Rico against any certification of the conditions suggested. And the civil government of Puerto Rico, it may safely be assumed, will never be superior to the everyday human nature of which it will be composed. Besides, if sugar and tobacco carry the day here, why should they not be strong enough to carry the day in Puerto Rico?

If the Puerto Ricans are worthy to decide this question, why not let them decide it now? They are anxious to do so. The whole case is made up. Their immediate necessities are to be relieved by the bill returning to them two million and odd dollars of revenue duties they have already paid to the United States, and there is only to be considered now the proper plan for raising revenue for the future. The great majority of the people of the United States are opposed to a tariff for this purpose, and all the people of Puerto Rico are. Free trade between the island and the United States is the generally expressed desire.

Why should it not be established? Why not start the first civil government off in sympathy with the prevailing sentiment there and here on this subject, rather than hampered with a tariff bill which it will want to get rid of at as early a day as possible, but which will be supported by all the corrupting agencies known to up-to-date lobbying?

The supporters of this tariff measure are engaged now not in considering the question on its merits, but in devising a trick to help them escape from a hot corner. They are trying to save themselves at the expense of their party and the country. They can not hope to succeed, for the only serious threat against Republican success in November is embraced in this bill, and if their party goes down they, of course, will go down with it.

PUERTO RICO'S PLEA.

The interview with Delegate Larrinaga, of Puerto Rico, which appears in the news columns to-day, puts the case of the island upon a basis of easy understanding. The islanders want civil government and a market. They hope for free trade, not because they believe the Constitution applies to them of its own force, but because they believe that the United States will act equitably toward them and grant them this inspiration to feel in touch with the Republic. Their present condition is deplorable and demands immediate relief. Charity and emergency measures will not reach the vital issue or encourage capital or restore activity to the plantations and prosperity to the island. Permanence is required, fixed laws and forms of government, definite tariff rates, if any at all, and a prospect of assured employment for the people.

This is a reasonable proposition, and should strengthen the case of the island in the Senate. It will not do for the tariff faction to declare that Puerto Rico's willingness to sacrifice principle for a market to enable it to live justifies the inequity of a tariff imposition. Free trade is required by every consideration of fairness, of precaution, of shrewd political management. The Republican party, by heeding the voice of the American people to-day and passing a free-trade bill, will not only enshrine itself in the respect and love of the Puerto Ricans, but it will immeasurably strengthen its position at home.

The pleas uttered by representative Puerto Ricans such as this delegate are piteous in their emphasis. Mr. Larrinaga declares that if they were not a Christian people the Puerto Ricans would welcome extermination in preference to the slow death of trade depression and insecurity under military government certain to ensue. This little island, he says, was self-supporting and affluent before the American occupation, and with the least degree of considerate legislation it could once again become prosperous, with plenty of money for current expenses and for needed improvements. Will the Senate crush this gem as a worthless thing, or cherish it as of value and beauty?

On the subject of the "moving influence," "mysterious and inexplicable." Hear this from the Star, of March 7:

MR. OXNARD'S WORK—PUERTO RICAN TARIFF BILL HIS INSPIRATION—INFLUENCE BEHIND THE MEASURE—SUGAR TRUST AND TOBACCO PEOPLE BROUGHT PRESSURE—ARE WILLING TO TRADE.

The amendments proposed to the Puerto Rican tariff bill by Senators DAVIS and NELSON, of Minnesota, to extend the customs laws to that island have been instantly met with a proposition to trade. The supporters of the bill are ready to accept a provision that breadstuffs—in which Minnesota is particularly interested—may be admitted free. It is understood also that if the meat-product interests are determined in opposition to the bill as it now stands, an amendment excepting meat products from the tax will be accepted. There is a disposition to trade anything necessary to render the passage of the bill perfectly safe and to quiet the resentment of a considerable commercial element, so long as the sugar trust and tobacco interests are cared for.

INFLUENCE BEHIND THIS BILL.

The influences behind this bill, which neither the Republican leaders in Congress nor the President are able to resist, though the President, in yielding and in urging others to yield, still insists that the bill is not a good one, though he acepts it, are those which Mr. Oxnard can command. Mr. Oxnard is the great original anti-expansionist, a commercial anti-expansionst, yet men in Congress who profess to want the American flag carried to the ends of the earth yield to his demands. Mr. Oxnard began his fight against the growth of this country by opposing the annexation of Hawaii.

One of the most determined fights ever put up in Congress was that made by him against the raising of the American flag over Hawaii, and his method of attack was similar to the method employed by him now to have a tariff collected upon Puerto Rican sugar and tobacco. He had letters written to men in Congress by alleged farmer sugar-beet producers from various parts of the country, protesting against the annexation of Hawaii, and insisted that it was the poor farmer, not the innocent sugar trust, that wanted protection. Exactly the same thing was done in this case. Members of the Ways and Means Committee attempt to justify their support of the Puerto Rican tariff, as the opponents of the Hawaiian annexation attempted to justify their position, by asserting that they were receiving petitions from "the farmers" against interference with the beet-sugar industry.

SUGAR-TRUST INFLUENCES.

It is asserted on behalf of Secretary Root that, while he wrote the Puerto Rican bill, he did so merely in response to a request, and without approving of the proposition.

The facts of the case appear to be that influences, chiefly of the sugar trust and tobacco people, were brought to bear upon the President and Congress at about the same time, and that the President and the Republican members of the Ways and Means Committee consulted together as to what was best to do in the matter some time—ten days, it is said—before the public had been informed that there was any plan to overthrow the President's recommendations for free trade with Puerto Rico. The President insisted that his position was right, but yielded to the pressure brought to bear in favor of the abandonment of his position.

MR. OXNARD'S WORK.

Before this Mr. Oxnard, it is said, had held a conference with members of the Protective Tariff League in New York, and there had inspired the movement which resulted in the present bill. It is said also that he had prepared substantially the bill afterwards reported from the Ways and Means Committee, and that this bill was in the hands of Mr. RUSSELL, of Connecticut, who disputes with Mr. Root the authorship of the present bill, it being based on the one he presented. As a matter of fact, the Russell bill appears to have been the basis of the bill prepared by Mr. Root, who undertook merely to put it in better shape without giving it his approval.

It appears that, without being too exact as to mere phraseology, Mr. Oxnard is really entitled to the credit of the authorship of the bill, it being done by his inspiration, if not by his hand.

But perhaps you would like something more specific, something showing the consideration to be paid by this "moving influence," "mysterious and inexplicable." Anticipating your desire, the Star on March 23 published what follows:

A MATTER OF MONEY—CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTION IN RETURN FOR PUERTO RICAN TARIFF—SERIOUS STATEMENT OF A REPUBLICAN—DESPERATE EFFORTS WILL BE MADE TO PASS THE BILL—PEACE COMMITTEE TO CONFER.

"The action of the Iowa legislature can not affect the situation in Congress. The deal has been made. It is a matter of money for the campaign, and the tariff measure will be carried through."

This statement was made by a Republican member of the House who supported the bill in the House by his vote.

"You may as well set it down that the deal will be carried out," he added. "The carrying out of the recommendation of the President for free trade with Puerto Rico would have deprived the party of a very considerable contribution. The adoption of the reverse policy insures a very large contribution.

"The possible unpopularity of the Puerto Rican tariff was balanced against the certainty of money to use in the campaign, and the decision was in favor of the campaign contribution. It was not expected that the storm of protest would be as strong as it is, but it is now too late for a change."

The Star never told a lie on a Republican yet, and, so far as I know, never published a false or unauthentic interview with anybody of any political faith. The Post bears witness to the character and standing of its rival and contemporary in an editorial dated March 24, as follows:

CAN SUCH THINGS BE?

We reproduce from the Washington Evening Star of yesterday an utterance so remarkable, not to say astounding, as to call for the most careful and vigilant inspection:

"'The action of the Iowa legislature can not affect the situation in Congress. The deal has been made; it is a matter of money for the campaign, and the tariff measure will be carried through.'

"This statement was made by a Republican member of the House who supported the bill in the House by his vote.

"'You may as well set it down that the deal will be carried out,' he added. 'The carrying out of the recommendation of the President for free trade with Puerto Rico would have deprived the party of a very considerable contribution; the adoption of the reverse policy insures a very large contribution.

"'The possible unpopularity of the Puerto Rican tariff was balanced against the certainty of money to use in the campaign, and the decision was in favor of the campaign contribution. It was not expected that the storm of protest would be as strong as it is, but it is now too late for a change.'"

It is quite unnecessary to say to our local readers that the Evening Star is not a yellow journal, or a sensation monger, or an irresponsible purveyor of scandal and excitement. If the Star declares—as it does in this instance—that a member of Congress has made the statement above quoted, it is perfectly safe to assume that it speaks the truth.

The Star has everything to lose and nothing to gain by disseminating falsehood—and we may add, upon our own motion, that the Star does not bear the reputation of reckless or unsupported statement. We feel that we are warranted, therefore, in assuming that our esteemed contemporary speaks with knowledge and conviction when it quotes—if anonymously—a member of the House as declaring that the Puerto Rico tariff bill has been inspired by the detestable and base purposes of a campaign fund. To say that is to say that the Republican party is using the Administration and the Congress as the foodpad exploits the defenseless wayfarer—for mere plunder in the form of cash!

We have frequently wondered, and as frequently asked, what there is behind all this astonishing determination in Congress to afflict Puerto Rico with a tariff. Unable to understand it ourselves, we have appealed to the country at large for enlightenment—for even a suggestion. Every consideration of honor and good faith and justice demands that we should treat Puerto Rico as the President eloquently indicated in his message last December. Almost without exception, the press—especially the Republican and the independent press—has supported this demand.

And now comes the Evening Star, as if to answer the almost passionate anxiety of the country, explaining in deliberate terms that the tariff against Puerto Rico has been devised, not for any purpose of statesmanship, not even in mistaken loyalty to national honor, not even to establish a precedent in the public interest, but simply and solely to placate certain corporations which will contribute handsomely to a party campaign treasury!

If this be the case; if Puerto Rico is to be sacrificed to the sordid uses of a political contest; if these innocent and trustful people, who welcomed us with open arms and confided their destinies to our honor and generosity, are to be immolated on the altar of a detestable and mean party emergency; if it be true that the Republican Congress, backed by the Republican Administration, deliberately intend to trade upon the misery and the helplessness of a people who have thrown themselves upon our mercy, then we say—and we believe—that the country will make haste to denounce and to condemn and to rebuke an infamy so monstrous and so indefensible.

This is our first experiment in proconsular government. Rome had some experiences ages ago. Are we to expect the same results, legislation founded on intrigue and produced by corruption? If we begin thus with little Puerto Rico, so near our doors and whose people possess our sympathies, what are we to expect when you come to deal legislatively with the domestic affairs of the Philippines, a thousand in number, at our antipodes and whose people have incurred hatred of so large a proportion of our own? All shades of newspaper opinion at the city of Washington

blend into one color of opposition on this question. Hear without comment the following utterance from the Washington Times, Democratic:

THE PUERTO RICAN CRIME.

As far as the House of Representatives is concerned, the crime against our suffering fellow-Americans in Puerto Rico, and against the Constitution of the United States, is complete. The Republican party and its Administration have crossed the Rubicon. They have at last thrown off all pretense of respect for the fundamental law of the country or of the rights of its inhabitants sacredly guaranteed by that law. They have registered the declaration that henceforward they will own no allegiance to the Constitution, oaths of office to the contrary notwithstanding, and will do no act of legislation that is not in the interests of and dictated by the oligarchy of the trusts and monopolies they so humbly and criminally serve.

* * * * * * *

In view of the facts of the case, it would be folly for Democratic Senators to offer any serious or prolonged resistance to the Payne iniquity. The sooner it is placed on the statute books the sooner it will be wiped out by the Supreme Court. It is a dastardly outrage on the Puerto Ricans, who so gladly threw off the yoke of Spanish sovereignty and accepted ours, under the promise of our Government that they should enjoy the blessings and privileges of American institutions.

But they must bear their burden with what patience they may, knowing that the honest people of the country, which is equally theirs and ours, will punish their oppressers in November; and knowing also that there is a power in the United States which an Administration and a majority in Congress, owned, controlled, and operated by the trusts and monopolies, can not long defy, however great may be their combined ability to do mischief and commit public crime for the time being. That power is the Constitution, which will speak by the voice of its prophet, the Supreme Court—a tribunal which never yet has tolerated the impudent assumption that any territory under the flag and sovereignty of the nation can be considered or treated as foreign, or denied any basic right enjoyed by citizens of the component States of the Union.

Were it not for the cruel suffering which this infamy will impose upon nearly a million loyal Americans, we could regard the political situation created by the course of the trusts and their executive and legislative agencies not only with equanimity, but with positive delight. The defense of American justice and the Constitution against the designs and assaults of a robber enemy is an issue upon which a united Democracy can sweep the country. In this connection there is great encouragement in the record of yesterday's vote.

Out of all the Democratic members of the House only four could be found sufficiently open to trust influence to violate the principles of their party in the matter of monopolies oppressive of the people and their duty to support the Constitution. This is brilliant evidence that the vast majority of Democarts are still true to the faith of the fathers, notwithstanding the unfortunate differences that have kept the party disunited for years and given the organization of the oligarchy an enormous advantage on the political battlefield.

[Washington Times, March 8.]

THE REPUBLICAN SPECTACLE.

Mr. McKinley's position in regard to the attempt to loot the Puerto Ricans for the benefit of the oil, sugar, tobacco, and rum trusts is not any more pleasant or edifying to contemplate than it is comfortable for him. In spite of inspired denials, it is evident that before the interested magnates made their now historical descent upon him and compelled him to deny his words, his conscience, and his oath to defend the Constitution, no man in the country was more thoroughly convinced than he that "duty and good faith," as well as the fundamental law of the land, demanded that the illegal exactions of Dingleyism should not be imposed upon the commerce of Puerto Rico.

It is true that, wishing to evade the constitutional consideration involved, he made his recommendation to Congress without referring to the sacred right which the island possessed, under American sovereignty, to the relief he proposed. Secretary Root was at one with the President, and even more strenuously urged that free trade should be accorded with as few words as possible.

Both of these trained and ruseful politicians realized that the little trade with Puerto Rico could not hurt the trusts. By permitting it they believed that the constitutional status of our separated Territories might be avoided until after the Presidential election, and that the Administration would be able to achieve popularity through a policy of apparent equity and generosity toward a suffering American community. The White House attitude was completely illustrated in the Payne letter of January 24, in which the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee delared that Puerto Rico was entitled to free trade, because that right had been recognized in the case of "every other State and Territory, and of Alaska, not organized into a Territory."

Under what promises or threats Mr. McKinley was induced to change his mind it is not for us to say. What is important in the present connection is that, having changed it, he felt compelled to convert all the Republicans in Congress possessed of consciences who had followed him originally to his new way of thinking or, at least, acting. It is notorious that it took many White House conferences with Representatives inclined to be honest to so deprave them that they would consent to save the Payne infamy from defeat; but success finally crowned the effort, and a great many Republican members are now sorry that it succeeded. From end to end of the country the people are denouncing this Administration surrender to the trusts, and Representatives by the dozen who supported the infamous measure are booked for defeat in the November elections.

To cap the climax Mr. McKinley, the Jove without the assistance of whose thunderbolts HENDERSON, PAYNE, DALZELL, and CANNON would have been helpless to jam the bill through the House, is now, with characteristic unctuousness, attempting to shift all the blame on the legislators who obeyed him and voted for it under duress. He causes it to be advertised that he is still, as he always was, in favor of free trade for Puerto Rico, and that he only surrendered his convictions on the overwhelming demand of his party in Congress. A similar explanation is made in behalf of Secretary Root, who drew the Payne bill, but "only because the act was forced upon him." By whom? It was not PAYNE or his followers in the House. It must have been the missionaries whose arguments were so powerful with Mr. McKinley.

It happens that the unfortunates who were coerced by the White House into support of a measure which their souls and—what is more to the point—their knowledge of political consequences, abhorred, are riotously minded toward the amiable chief who is attempting to make them carry the bag, while he poses as the pure person who always contemned the crime. They say that they will not stand it; that the Administration shall not use them for a nefarious purpose and then run away and hide behind a hedge of consistent virtue, while they have to face political ostracism and death because they have been persuaded to obey their party rather than their consciences. Verily, in dealing for a valuable consideration, with the mammon of unrighteousness, Mr. McKinley has not added a cubit to his stature, and assuredly he has made soreheads among the House Republicans to an extent that will be visible in the future.

The subterfuge resorted to, in order to allay the indignation which is boiling over throughout the country, is only another evidence of Administration panic and paresis. That the free-trade Northwest may be reconciled, and the threatened punishment of Congressmen from that section and the Middle West be averted, the Administration influence now proposes such alleviations as are included in the amendment to the Payne bill offered by Senator MCCUMBER of North Dakota, which provides for free trade in all cereal and meat products.

Ultimately the willingness to trade will lead to an offer of a tariff surrender on every commodity enumerated in the Dingley law except those controlled by the trusts. That may help to appease party anger in Congress, but it will only increase the luridness of the spectacle which the Administration is presenting to the country. It will only emphasize the picture already hung on the walls of history. The Administration is ready to violate the dictates of humanity and to defy the Constitution that trust profits may be protected; but protection in other directions it will cheerfully surrender Only oil, sugar, tobacco, and rum are sacred.

Washington Times, March 18, says:

A MOST SIGNIFICANT VOTE.

What would the great men who evolved the Constitution of the United States have thought if they had been in the Senate Chamber on Friday. On that day, with hardly more care or ceremony than would have been devoted to the confirmation of a postmaster, a proposition going to the very root of American rights under the Constitution was dismissed perfunctorily by a vote of 36 to 17, 34 Senators not voting. Of the majority all but 1 were Republicans. Of the minority all were Democrats but 3.

The vote was taken on an amendment to the Puerto Rican revenue bill offered by Senator ALLEN, as follows:

"*Provided*, That the Constitution was, by force of the treaty concluded between the United States of America and the Kingdom of Spain at the city of Paris, France, April 11, 1899, extended over the island of Puerto Rico and its inhabitants."

Mr. ALLISON moved to lay the amendment on the table, and the motion prevailed:

YEAS—36.

Allison,	Foraker,	Lodge,	Ross,
Baker,	Foster,	McBride,	Sewell,
Bard,	Gallinger,	McComas,	Shoup,
Beveridge,	Gear,	McCumber,	Simon,
Carter,	Hale,	McMillan,	Spooner,
Davis,	Hanna,	Penrose,	Thurston,
Deboe,	Hawley,	Perkins,	Warren,
Elkins,	Kean,	Pritchard,	Wellington,
Fairbanks,	Lindsay,	Quarles,	Wetmore.

NAYS—17.

Allen,	Chilton,	Harris.	Tillman,
Bacon,	Clark, Mont.	Kenney,	Turley.
Bate,	Clay,	McLaurin,	
Berry,	Cockrell,	Morgan,	
Butler,	Culberson,	Rawlins,	

What are we to understand by this? In the golden days when the Senate was, and was recognized as, the most dignified and able deliberative body in the world; in the days, in fact, when its great figures were Webster, Clay, Calhoun, Cass, Benton, and such men, compared with the Hannas, Beveridges, Wellingtons, Pettigrews, Kyles, and Hales of to-day, such a basic definition of constitutional power and vigor, if there had been any doubt about its truth or applicability, would have been debated for days and weeks. But here we have the statement of a self-evident truth—self-evident because it has been held and applied in the case of the Louisiana purchase, the Mexican cession, and the Alaska purchase—calmly voted down.

It is an astounding thing for the country to contemplate. Only a few weeks ago the President was urging that justice and good faith demanded that the tariff barriers between an American island and the American mainland should be torn down. His Secretary of War pleaded with Congress to the same end. The Governor-General of Puerto Rico represented that nothing less would prevent the present famine in the island from becoming universal. And Mr. McKinley's own special commissioner declared in his formal report that nothing could avert general destruction of Puerto Rican life and property but the unrestricted domestic free trade to which, as all constitutional lawyers know and all honest Americans believe, Puerto Rico is entitled under the Constitution.

It is our duty and privilege to congratulate the Democratic minority in the Senate upon its course in voting solidly for the Allen amendment, supporting the principle, and the sacred principle, that the Constitution follows the flag. But a single Democrat—Mr. LINDSAY, of Kentucky—sided with the majority on the occasion under review; and his adherence to the faith of the fathers has been too variable and uncertain in the past to make his new stand in favor of the views advanced by the proprietors of the Republican Administration either surprising or worthy of present consideration.

The question that the Senate has so flippantly passed by is one which the American people hold to be more important than any now before the country. They can no longer appeal to Congress, it seems. They must await the final action of the Supreme Court.

On March 24, the Washington Times, referring to the unanimous resolutions of the Iowa legislature condemning the action of their Representatives in this House and the bill of interterritorial tariff for which they voted, said:

The more the Administration forces in Congress pondered over this unanimous declaration by the Iowa house of representatives yesterday the more uncomfortable and desperate they felt. They might defy the comments of their own party organs in Chicago and refuse to believe the evidence of their senses concerning the tidal wave of denunciation flowing toward them from the whole Mississippi Valley, but they could not ignore a monumental and official fact like the Iowa resolution.

There is every evidence that the blow was as staggering as it was unexpected. It was a remarkable commentary upon Senator FORAKER'S prediction of ten days ago, that the storm would blow over and the country would forget all about the iniquity in a short time. On the contrary, each succeeding day has only added to the popular excitement and indignation. At last the Administration has overloaded that patient ass, the American people. It has submitted to everything from Eaganism, Algerism, and Sampsonism down to the deal between Gage and the Standard Oil bank, with scarcely an audible murmur. But violation of a solemn pledge to Puerto Rico and deliberate inhumanity toward the people of that national territory, in defiance of the Constitution of the United States and at the demand of the trusts, is the last straw.

Mr. McKinley and his principal advisers and the Republican Senators and Representatives are all amply convinced that the country is thoroughly aroused against them, and that if they carry out their purpose to make the treatment of Puerto Rico as foreign territory a party issue, and on that ground drive the Payne-Foraker bill through the Senate, they will incur a terrible risk of defeat in the impending campaign. But long immunity from the wrath of man and of God has rendered them callous, and in addition they are desperate.

Prominent men, close to the Administration, declare with open cynicism that the Payne-Foraker bill is a deal with the trusts for a heavy campaign contribution which can be secured in no other way. The outburst of national protest and anger is much greater than had been expected. Nevertheless, as between public opinion and the cash promised by the trusts, the Administration will consider the latter and force Congress to persist in the unconstitutional and criminal oppression of Puerto Rico.

The natural presumption is that in adopting this course the Administration feels itself strong enough to defy the consciences of the American people and the principles held sacred by them. The experience of 1896 seems to have impressed the Republican leaders with the conviction that the people are a negligible quantity compared with the possession of a huge corruption fund. But can they be right in entertaining such a theory?

No doubt there are as many purchasable votes this year as there were four years ago, and quite as many politicians of the baser sort ready to stuff ballot boxes and pervert returns. On the other hand, there are vastly more voters who know the Republican party for what it is than were thus illuminated in the former campaign. It has pretty well thrown off the mask of hypocrisy by this time, and is hardly ashamed to acknowledge itself the servile creature of the trusts and monopolies it most notoriously is.

Therefore it is barely possible that the impudent position assumed by the Administration and its following, after the bursting of the Iowa bombshell, is neither as good nor as safe politics as the trust-Republican combination may imagine. But any doubt on the subject is liable to be dispelled on the 6th of November next.

Washington is the political metropolis of the country. Let us hear from the great commercial centers, and first from that marvelous American growth—Chicago:

[Special dispatch to The North American.]

REPUBLICAN EDITORS VOICE THEIR OPINIONS.

CHICAGO, *March 5.*

The Times-Herald, which is edited by Mr. H. H. Kohlsaat, the representative supporter of the McKinley Administration in the West, will say editorially to-morrow morning:

"Senator DAVIS, of Minnesota, has raised the true standard of American obligations to Puerto Rico, around which all Republicans can rally for the salvation of the party from the amazing blunder of the 15 per cent House compromise with our duty. Mr. DAVIS's free-trade amendment to the Senate bill comes not a day too soon nor goes a step too far to save his party from the direful consequences of that unaccountable aberration from the straight path of national justice and honor.

"From every section of the Union Republicans have called upon their Republican Representatives to undo the great wrong contained in the tariff provision of the Puerto Rico bill.

"We in the great West know that that demand is almost unanimous throughout the Republican party in this section. We know, too, that if it is complied with—if the Republicans in Washington act upon Senator DAVIS's amendment promptly—that in two week's time the mistake will be forgotten in thankfulness that it was remedied.

"But if that wrong is persisted in—if the Republican party in Congress, through false pride or in obstinate servility to the mysterious power behind the House bill, enacts its Puerto Rico tariff into law, it will become the overshadowing issue in the Presidential campaign.

"How can the Republicans meet such an issue? Up to the day Mr. PAYNE introduced the amended Puerto Rico bill in the House, every report, pledge, message, and tradition of the Republican party was committed to the principle of no customs barrier between parts of the United States. Republican sophistries will be choked back into Republican throats by the report of Republican pledges, professions, and principles.

"We do not know what they think in Washington would be the result of such a campaign; but here in the West we know that such a tidal wave of popular indignation would sweep across the prairies that the Democrats would capture the House of Representatives, even if they did not defeat President McKinley.

"Senator DAVIS has shown the path of duty to his party, which is the only path open for its salvation it can take and be forgiven, its blunder forgotten, and its campaign saved. It can refuse and prepare for the penalty which fate exacts from those who despise the warnings of honor, justice, and duty."

And "on to-morrow morning" "Editor Kohlsaat" did say it "editorially. Later he proceeded to say other things, to wit:

[From the Chicago Times-Herald—Republican.]

NO QUESTION OF RATE.

Whether the Puerto Rican tariff is 25 or 5 per cent, indeterminate or for two years, makes not a particle of difference with its justice. It will not be acceptable to the American people because of the plea that it is such a little breach of "our plain duty," as acknowledged by President McKinley.

* * * * * * *

[From the Chicago Times-Herald.]

"AFRAID OF THE HOUSE"—PROGRAMME THAT "WOULD DRAG DOWN ANY PARTY, HOWEVER POWERFUL."

Senator ALDRICH could hardly have grasped the full meaning of his plea for the Senate's acceptance of the House Puerto Rico bill. The argument he used was that an amendment would endanger the whole programme, because it would make it necessary for the House to vote once more, and, as he said, "we do not know whether or not we can hold the House again."

On the supposition that this is a popular government, the Senator's own programme thus appears as a political trick to defeat the popular will. Why is it that there is doubt if the House can be held again? Simply because the House has been hearing from the people. Having a regard for their representative character, as well as for their own convictions and the prospect of future punishment, the Congressmen feel that they have committed a mistake which they should rectify. They recognize that the power which they wield is delegated to them by their constituents; that it belongs in the last resort to their constituents, and that it should be employed as those constituents decree.

This is undeniably the correct theory, but what is the proposed practice of Senator ALDRICH? He admits in effect that there is no question about the trend of public sentiment, and then suggests a betrayal. For the present the Congressmen have the advantage of position. They are in office for a fixed term and may do as they please. Therefore they should use their advantage in a way that is antagonistic to the people.

Naturally the question arises, What is the consideration for this conduct? The Senator would probably reply that it will be found in the interests of his party. But no party has an interest in offending the public. This persistence can be referred only to some organized, selfish force that is playing for a personal profit, and that force can be discovered only in the lobby.

To this complexion does it come at last. The implied alliance would drag down any party, however powerful.

[From the Chicago Times-Herald—Republican.]

RING DISCIPLINE.

It may be said that the lower tariff of the bill and its disposition of the revenue are "compensating benefits" for the lost trade, but it is impossible to escape the "plain duty," and the Senate committee did not try to do so. It made free trade a feature of its own bill, so that this policy was twice sanctioned in the highest councils of the party.

The change, so far as the House is concerned, was brought about by a few members acting like autocrats. If they finally succeeded in whipping all but a small minority of their party into line, that was not because the majority was persuaded that they were right on principle. It was simply because they arrogated to themselves the authority of leadership and harped on the dangers of a division in the ranks.

Aside from the incidental benefits to the lobby, it may be said that the party plea has been used solely for the purpose of preventing their personal humiliation. Whether the other party authorities will be as solicitous on their account as the House remains to be seen. It is to be hoped that the Senate will reject the bill, that its Republican members will take a broader view of party policy, and not imagine that the fortunes of half a dozen individuals are of more importance politically than a wise consistency and devotion to principle.

[Special to the Post.]

MEANS PARTY DEFEAT—EDITOR KOHLSAAT ON THE PENDING PUERTO RICO BILL—MUST UNDO GRIEVOUS WRONG—UNIVERSAL SENSE OF AMERICAN JUSTICE AND HONOR OFFENDED BY ACTION OF THE HOUSE—THE COUNTRY'S INDIGNATION WILL NOT DOWN, AND ADMINISTRATION CAN NOT TOO QUICKLY REALIZE THE "STUPENDOUS AND HUMILIATING BLUNDER" THAT HAS BEEN MADE.

CHICAGO, *March 4, 1900.*

The Chicago Times Herald, stalwart in its Republicanism, and whose editor, Mr. Kohlsaat, is a close personal and political friend of President McKinley, prints an editorial which, in the vigor of its attack upon the pending Puerto Rico tariff legislation and its prediction of dire results to the party if the bill be passed, be fairly sensational in character. With the heading "Undo the great wrong to Puerto Rico," the Times-Herald will to-morrow say:

"It must be evident to the Government at Washington by this time that the treatment of Puerto Rico as alien to our institutions, foreign to our markets, and only entitled to our charity, contemplated in pending legislation, offends the universal sense of American justice and honor. When such a cool-headed and conservative constitutional lawyer and Republican as ex-President Harrison says, 'I regard the bill as a most serious departure from right principles,' it is time for the Republican majority in Congress to face the situation with the courage and wisdom that dares to acknowledge a grave mistake and undo a grievous wrong. Mr. Harrison merely packed into one sentence the well-nigh unanimous sentiment of Republicans of the Mississippi Valley.

"In the popular mind Puerto Rico occupies a very different place from Cuba or the Philippines. It came under the protection of the Stars and Stripes more than willingly—gladly. The people do not forget, if politicians do, that we sent an army under General Miles to conquer Puerto Rico. That army went prepared to meet the fiercest resistance, not only from the soldiers of Spain, but from the inhabitants of the island. What was the fact? From the landing at the port of Ponce to the entrance into San Juan the resistance was nominal and the welcome was generous. General Miles and his soldiers were everywhere greeted as deliverers. When they entered San Juan the children, dressed in white, strewed flowers before the feet of our marching host.

"OUR PLAIN DUTY," SAID THE PRESIDENT.

"Our conquest of Puerto Rico was a peaceful ovation. There was no haggling over terms, no talk of independence, no quibbling about relations. General Miles pledged the protection of the Stars and Stripes, and Puerto Rico accepted the pledge with all that it implied.

"When we contrast the attitude of the Puerto Ricans, loyally accepting the situation and confiding their future without question or condition to the honor of the United States, with that of the Cubans and Filipinos, we understand how the American people feel bound to extend to the former ungrudgingly every privilege and benefit that American institutions afford.

"This sentiment was reflected in the report of Governor-General Davis, of the Puerto Rico Commission, and of Secretary of War Root. It was embedded in President McKinley's message of last December in words that met with instant approval throughout the Union. It seems little short of providential that the common will of 75,000,000 Americans to less than a million Puerto Ricans should have found such simple yet imperishable expression in the very heart of a state document of over 26,000 words long.

"But there it is, telling us 'our plain duty' in a sentence that can not and will not down.

"How came it that the President, moved by the same impulse that yet sways the vast majority of his fellow-countrymen, has permitted himself to lend his influence to the perpetration of a political blunder that has sent a shudder of apprehension throughout the Union? It is a question that is being asked in every hamlet and home in the United States, and upon its answer depends more than was dreamed of in the mysterious meeting from which the Puerto Rico bill came without a father and without a sponsor who would give to it his name.

PATERNITY OF BILL NEVER ACKNOWLEDGED.

"To this day no man has acknowledged the paternity of the bill, which, like a veritable apple of discord, threatens to bring disruption to a great party.

"While we can not trace the parentage of the Puerto Rico bill beyond the doors of the Ways and Means Committee, it is not difficult to comprehend how, having found its way into the House of Representatives, it became a party fetich that has involved Congress and the President in a serious conflict with popular sentiment. Having become a party measure, the well-nigh irresistible influence of party discipline and traditions were enlisted on its behalf. But even these were not strong enough to insure its passage through the House. A majority of Republicans were opposed to the principle of the bill and faithful to the thought and purpose of the President's message.

"The defeat of the bill was imminent, and the prestige of the Republican majority in the House was in peril. Then the President was appealed to. It was represented to him that nothing could save the party from a humiliating division and defeat but some sign that he receded from the recommendation of his message. The leaders of the party were permitted to suggest that he had changed his mind; but this was not sufficient to bring the recalcitrants into line. The President was again appealed to, and under pressure

from the party leaders in the House he personally urged several Representatives to support the bill so as to preserve an unbroken Republican front in the House."

FRAUGHT WITH DIRE POSSIBILITIES.

"Thus was the grievous blunder committed. How grievous and fraught with what dire possibilities, not only to the Republican party, but to the country, neither Congress nor the President could have foreseen. But they must realize now that the tariff section in the Puerto Rico bill has aroused a storm throughout the country that will not down.

"If Congress and the President persist in their present course, nothing can save the Republican party from defeat next November. It will surely cost them the House of Representatives, and it may cost them the Presidency.

"Worse than any of these possibilities, it may involve the election of Bryan, with all that that implies.

"But one course is open to the Republican party. Let it face the situation with the only spirit that can compel respect in the presence of a stupendous and humiliating blunder. Let it acknowledge the mistake and make haste to regain popular confidence by undoing the contemplated wrong to Puerto Rico.

"There is no shame in retreating from the verge of a precipice before taking the last irretrievable step. The only salvation for the Republican party is through the gate that gives free trade to Puerto Rico.

"The country looks to President McKinley to rise to the full stature of a statesman who dares to acknowledge a mistake and to undo a wrong."

Now, hear the Chicago Inter-Ocean, another straight Republican organ which protests against the Republican Puerto Rican tariff:

THE REVOLT OF DECENCY.

Men who are protectionists to the backbone, whose lives and fortunes have been devoted to the advocacy of protection as a policy, will revolt and are revolting against the proposal to exclude the people of Puerto Rico from full and free participation in the benefits of national trade and against a scheme to debar the people of the United States from the advantages of free intercourse with American territory that has been won by expenditure of their blood and treasure. Cuba and Puerto Rico were not redeemed from serfdom in the spirit of the cry, "Help the trusts!" Nor are they to be administered in such a spirit.

And in another issue of the Inter-Ocean I find this ultra expansionist organ using this language:

The Puerto Rican tariff bill is in effect a betrayal of the doctrine which in the last two years has become synonymous with Americanism and Republicanism.

Thousands of telegrams and letters have gone forward to Congress from all parts of the Union in protest against thus nullifying the platform of the Republican party. The people of the Middle West should join in this demonstration. They should multiply the letters and telegrams a hundredfold. Every man interested in the welfare of the nation, in the policy that is to carry us forward in the world's commerce, in the doctrine by which the Republican party must stand or fall in the elections of next fall, should telegraph or write to his Representative and Senators to correct the great wrong done by the House last Wednesday.

The Middle West gave first impulse and momentum to the expansion policy. Every man in it to-day should rally to the aid of the President. In his message of December 5, 1899, William McKinley declared: "The markets of the United States should be opened up to her (Puerto Rico's) products. Our plain duty is to abolish all customs tariffs between the United States and Puerto Rico, and give her products free access to our markets." This declaration still stands. It is the voice of the President rebuking the Republican Congressmen who would break faith with the people.

These Congressmen, with six honorable exceptions, repudiated every recommendation of the President. They declined to recognize Puerto Rico as a Territory or part of the United States. They simply provided new tariff regulations between the United States and Puerto Rico on the principle that the island was but one degree removed from foreign territory.

The President in his message clearly defined the Republican policy. This fact was universally recognized at the time. If a Territorial bill had been presented on December 6, 1899, there would have been no opposition on the part of Republicans or Democrats. The President's recommendations appealed to both parties and to the whole people, because they followed the precedents of Louisiana and Florida and fulfilled the pledges of the United States to its new possessions. But with delay there came into the field a lobby representing the sugar and tobacco interests of the East, and all Republican members except six were induced to betray the party's policy. This action was taken in defiance of nine-tenths of the Republican newspapers, East and West, North and South. It was taken in the face of popular protests from every part of the country.

In the Senate there has been substituted for the House Puerto Rican bill a measure following the recommendations of the President in some respects, but containing the atrocious tariff clause. If this bill should pass, the betrayal of the expansion policy would be complete and beyond recall. Therefore, there should go forth to Washington from every city and town in the Middle West at once a general protest against the outrage. It should be made so clear that the common sense of the party and the conscience of the people are arrayed so strongly against this measure that the Senate will not dare to countenance the wrong to Puerto Rico.

The President is right. Let the people stand by him. Let them serve notice of their intent on their Representatives in Washington. And let them act quickly, lest they act too late.

It is a pity this great though partisan newspaper can not see a little further into this great problem, and while recognizing that Puerto Rico should have a Territorial government within the Union, also recognize the grave peril of retaining the Philippines at all—peril to our institutions if we violate the Constitution by governing them as a province inhabited by subject peoples, peril to both institutions and industries if we govern them constitutionally—as a Territory and a part of the United States—their people vested with the constitutional rights of freedom of trade, freedom of travel, and freedom of religion, and with local self-government. But hear the Tribune, another Chicago Republican journal:

UNCONSTITUTIONAL.

Many lawyers who are competent to pass upon questions of this kind believe that any attempt to establish discriminating duties as against a part of the territory of the United States will be declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court, and if this shall be the ultimate fate of the present bill and all other measures like it, few tears will be shed by those members of the Republican party who are not controlled in their opinions by the financial or business interests of other people.

In another issue the same paper actually suggests that you and the President need "advisers," and need them in the shape of men of sense who know something about "government."

The Administration has fallen into difficulties in many directions. It is evident the Administration is in urgent need of judicious advisers. By "advisers" we do not mean editors of newspapers, but men who have had experience in public life. The President should consult more frequently than he seems to have done men who know something about legislation and know it by experience in legislative or executive offices. They should be men who have served in a city council or a State legislature, if not in Congress; and men, too, who are not so far removed from the people as to be ignorant of their sentiments and emotions. Much used to be said of the President's purpose to keep his "ear near the ground." If his ear has been "near the ground" of late it has not been in close relations with American soil.

The Republican majority in the Senate has appointed a "steering committee" made up of its most judicious members. That committee has assumed control of legislation in the Senate, and to a certain extent in the lower branch. While Republican Senators have picked out as advisers the persons in whom they justly have the most confidence, the President has trusted too much to men who have not had experience in public life and whose immature opinions have led him astray.

Instead of sticking resolutely and firmly to his original and righteous views regarding some great questions, the President has been persuaded by incompetent advisers to abandon those views. He was right in the first instance as to Puerto Rico. Had he stood by his own sound intuitions he would be now one of the most popular men in the United States.

Unhappily, he was induced to abandon his convictions and give up an impregnable position at the instance of a few special interests or of possibly disinterested but altogether ill-informed advisers. Nor is that all. He was induced to bring his influence to bear upon Representatives to "get them into line." He sent for recalcitrant members and absolutely entreated them to vote, against their convictions and against the wishes of their constituents, for a measure which he himself at the outset strongly and properly opposed—a bill which flew in the face of his own positive recommendations to Congress. There are some Republicans who can not turn corners as sharply as the President can, and they are not sorry for their lack of flexibility in this respect.

The President, without needing to do it, has assumed the whole responsibility for the passage by the House of the maimed, mutilated, crippled, and inadequate Puerto Rico bill, a measure which eventually will be repudiated by both Houses of Congress. He might have kept his hands off and let the House "work out its own salvation in fear and trembling," and have looked to the Senate and a conference committee for judicious legislation on the subject.

A storm is gathering. The House Porto Rico measure will have to be sacrificed. It is scarcely supported by anybody. The three newspapers in Chicago which have stood by the President are against him in this matter. So is the Indianapolis Journal, while all Indiana is in a tumult and a ferment over it. It is evident that the feeling against the House bill is becoming more intense. The only mode of allaying it is for blundering leaders to admit they have led the party from its true course and promise an immediate return to safer ways.

There is need of a judicious "steering committee" in the House. There is still greater need of a pilot in the Cabinet. There is great need of fresh material there—of men who are not "amateurs" in politics, but who are experienced in public life, who are trained in the arts of statesmanship, and who know the temper of Congress and of the people. Men who are destitute of these qualifications, who are influenced by social considerations in Washington, and who deem it the acme of human felicity to be asked to dine with the British ambassador are not fit constitutional advisers for an American President. He should have at his council board men who look at American interests from an American point of view.

That is what is needed. The sooner that need is met the better. If President McKinley wishes to retain the confidence of the public, he will bring into his Cabinet before long advisers more sagacions than some of those he has there now. Otherwise the feeling will go abroad that the Administration is nerveless, spineless, and without convictions, adopting good policies only to abandon them at the dictation of incompetent advisers.

Then the Chicago Journal, an independent paper, joins Representative SWANSON, Senator PROCTOR, and others who have paralleled your policies with those of Lord North and poor, foolish, obstinate George III. Hear:

[From the Chicago Journal—Independent.]

MR. M'KINLEY AND LORD NORTH.

Up at the White House plain duty appears to have collided with party unity, and, so far as anybody can see, has come off second best. * * * The President has shown pretty plainly where he stands. He is ready to sacrifice the interests of a people to the exigencies of party politics. It is a hard thing to believe about Mr. McKinley, but he has lent plausibility to it by his significant failure to say a word against the bill when he knows a single syllable would have defeated it long ago.

If anything was needed to insure injustice and corruption in our dealings with our dependencies and make it reasonably certain that our government of them was to be one long, miserable failure in everything that could redound to their benefit or ours, it will be supplied in this effort to inject the spirit of party politics into our administration of their affairs. If the President has been correctly quoted, he has disposed of all pretext that the tariff was needed to supply revenue for the island. The islanders will know they are being taxed not to supply their public wants, but to promote party unity in another country. Lord North's tax on tea was nothing to this.

In the following brief blast it goes further and asserts that Spain herself, with the worst Government in Christendom, was more just, generous, and enlightened in her dealings with Puerto Rico than you are in yours! To what are we fallen!

[From the Chicago Journal—Independent.]

WHEN DID SPAIN DO WORSE?

What did Spain ever do to the present inhabitants of Puerto Rico that was worse than the things the tobacco ring and the sugar trust, through a lot of servile Congressmen, are proposing to do to them, and to which William McKinley, conscious of his "plain duty," to quote his words, seems willing to assent rather than embarrass his party? If that is the spirit in which Puerto Rico is to be governed, what have the inhabitants of the Philippine Islands to hope for from submission to American rule?

Then hear this from another Chicago paper:

[From the Chicago Record—Independent.]

"THE PLAIN DUTY."

It is the "plain duty" of Congress to provide for free trade between the United States and Puerto Rico. The advocates of this policy apparently are

in the ascendency. They should not allow themselves to be induced through a caucus compromise to forego the fruits of victory. Let the policy of justice to the Puerto Ricans prevail.

Thus speaks the great city of the mighty West. Let us hear from the London of the New World—New York:

[From the New York Sun—Republican.]

NO DELAY.

The essential justice of the situation demands that the free trade of Puerto Rico, which the bill promises in two years, should be made to begin now.

[From the New York Times—Independent.]

THE COUNTRY'S VERDICT.

The opposition to this measure within the Republican party in the House is as nothing compared to the opposition, without regard to party, throughout the country. The American people do not like meanness; they do not like perfidy; they do not like cruelty. And with these base qualities the bill the House has passed is branded.

[From the New York Mail and Express—Republican.]

A COMPROMISE WITH DISHONOR.

The fatal weakness of the measure, we believe, is that, like most compromises, it signifies nothing. It is neither free trade nor protection, imperialistic nor anti-imperialistic, and therefore is just the legislation that demagogues thrive on. It is so easily susceptible of misrepresentation that no one will fear convincing refutation of his charges, no matter how he maligns its purpose and spirit.

We have not believed that the Republican party should be compelled to defend such a law, particularly when it is to be the first general legislation affecting our new possessions. Rather have we looked for a measure that would embody in its terms and principle a clear, explicit, and vigorous expression of the disposition of our people toward the Puerto Ricans, and that if it erred at all it would do so on the side of the island people. The bill passed by the House yesterday, however, is a weak response to that sentiment. It dallies with a situation that should have been met decisively, cordially, and promptly. It lacks heart and force and will have many enemies, but few friends here and in Puerto Rico.

A great opportunity for the country and for the Republican party has been needlessly frittered away.

[From the New York Evening Post—Independent.]

OUR NATIONAL FAITH.

The bill now goes to the Senate. The duty of all who have fought it while it was before the House is to keep up that fight while it is pending in the Senate. Indeed, they should now redouble their efforts to avert the national disgrace involved in the enactment of the bill into a law.

This fight should be made in behalf of the national honor. Questions of constitutional construction are interesting subjects for discussion, but the issue of good faith in redeeming our pledges to a suffering people is the fundamental one. That is the issue to keep before the American people until they force their representatives in the National Legislature to do justice.

[From the New York Evening Post—Independent.]

A SHAMEFUL SPECTACLE.

The open contempt with which the wishes and needs of the Puerto Ricans themselves have been treated will be an eye-opener to many and a serious burden for the Republican party to carry. The cool brutality of the whole affair is well brought out by the statement which the Puerto Ricans themselves made. This Government has actually negotiated a reciprocity treaty the effect of which is to give the inhabitants of Trinidad free food and free agricultural implements at the very moment it is proposing to tax its starving subjects in Puerto Rico 15 per cent of the high Dingley rates on the same articles. If such a thing is done the Republican party will be on the defensive from the very beginning of the campaign.

[From the New York Evening Post.]

MR. M'KINLEY'S POSITION.

President McKinley's attitude in this whole matter is to be discussed on higher than personal grounds. The poor figure he cuts as a man we pass by, but as the incumbent of a great office he has brought humiliation upon it as well as upon himself. To "stand by" him is impossible for his most earnest supporters, since he does not stand by himself. No man can serve two masters, nor a single master with two minds, neither of which he himself knows. "I had hoped," sneered a Democrat in the House yesterday, "that there was one question of which the President was not on both sides."

There was no answer to the taunt, for there could be none. Mr. McKinley is quoted vehemently both for and against the Puerto Rico bill, and he sits silent under the open charge of double dealing. The only question on which he is known to have firm and unchangeable opinions is that of his reelection. It was the unconcealed threat to defeat that which set him to jumping back and forth over the Puerto Rico fence with such agility. But why could he not have confronted his sordid and minatory visitors, if not as a brave man, at least as a courageous President? Why did not his office, if not his character, make him despise their threats?

[From the New York World—Democratic.]

ROBBERY AND HYPOCRISY.

The pretense that "all the money collected will go to the Puerto Ricans" is of a piece with the rest of the fraud and hypocrisy and robbery that are back of this bill. The duties paid upon the food and clothing of the starving and naked Puerto Ricans will not go back to the poor wretches who pay them. It will go to the carpetbag officials and other agents of the government that Mr. McKinley has set up there.

The bill violates the Constitution. It imposes upon the Puerto Ricans the tyranny of taxation without representation against which our forefathers rebelled. It violates the promise of General Miles to the inhabitants, never disavowed by our Government, that "Puerto Rico under the American flag will enjoy the same privileges and the same immunities as the citizens of the different States and Territories of the Union." It makes of Puerto Rico a "crown colony" instead of an American Territory.

After the London of the New World, let us see what the Athens of America thinks. I have in my introductory remarks quoted somewhat from the Boston newspapers. Hear furthermore these from Boston:

[From the Boston Post.]

NOT FOR PARTY CAUCUS TO DECIDE—RIGHT OF CONGRESS TO LEVY A TARIFF TAX ON PUERTO RICO.

We believe that the United States Government has no more right to collect duties upon goods imported from Puerto Rico than upon the products of Oklahoma or Arizona.

This is the view held also by Congressman McCALL, Congressman LITTLEFIELD, and other Republicans who have an old-fashioned regard for the Constitution. And, however Congress may vote on the question, it is the Supreme Court of the United States that must finally decide it. The matter is of too great and far-reaching importance to be allowed to rest upon the authority of a majority of a party caucus. It might be permissible, so long as Puerto Rico and the Philippines are held under military rule, for the President, by his authority as Commander in Chief, to levy taxes and tariffs in extraconstitutional form. But Congress, which is itself a creature of the Constitution, can not override or nullify the provisions of the source of its authority.

This body is restrained by limitations which do not exist in the case of the Executive acting as the supreme military power. Sooner or later the Supreme Court will have to pass upon whatever act of this character Congress may pass. This court is composed of six justices appointed as Republicans and three appointed as Democrats. But it is unlikely that party designations will rule in the judgment of this matter. Judge Brewer, as is known by his public utterances, does not sympathize with the imperialist policy. Judge Harlan holds traditional ideas of the relations of Congress and the Constitution. In short, if the Republican tariff bill for Puerto Rico is passed, there is a very likely chance that the whole scheme, including the Philippines and all the rest, may be ripped up by the Supreme Court.

[From the Boston Journal—Republican.]

A WANTON TAX.

There is no need of tariff discrimination against Puerto Rico to protect any American industry. The sugar product of the island is only 45,000 tons, or less than one-quarter of that of Hawaii—and Hawaiian sugar has been coming duty free into the United States for many years without appreciable effect upon domestic cane and beet producers. Puerto Rican tobacco is of a quality that does not compete with the Connecticut Valley or Virginia leaf. Coffee is the Puerto Rican staple of the future, and coffee has been on the free list for more than a quarter of a century. There is no reason in tariff conditions, therefore, why Puerto Rican products should be subjected to even 15 per cent of the Dingley rates.

[From the Boston Journal—Republican.]

THE FULFILLMENT OF A PROMISE.

Months ago President McKinley and Secretary Root pointed out the course which ought to have been taken. It was direct, intelligible, fair to the Puerto Ricans, just to all concerned. It was the unqualified admission of the island within our tariff system, with absolute freedom of commercial intercourse. The Journal considered this proposition at length at the time, and heartily approved it as the proper fulfillment of our plain obligation to the Puerto Rican people whom we had brought beneath our flag.

[From the Boston Traveler—Independent.]

"SOLD OUT."

"Sold out" is the only fitting epitaph to describe an Administration whose pledge to the world has been broken, by whose recreancy to the high principles it caused to be promulgated the American flag is made to stand for indirection and oppression, instead of liberty and relief for oppressed peoples. Shame upon President McKinley for eating his own words, publicly spoken, upon the rights of Puerto Rico.

"There should be no discriminating tariff against our new possessions." At the bidding of the great sugar and tobacco trusts he now says let them be taxed without representation. Let the Constitution be forced to permit of this grave injustice.

Sold out to sugar and tobacco!

I have previously quoted from the Boston Transcript. Let us hear further from the "City of Homes"—Philadelphia. The North American (Republican) on March 8 says:

It is evident that what the leaders of both parties at the capital still need to learn is that the country is not thinking of tariff percentages or points of constitutional construction in connection with Puerto Rico. The people know simply that it is our plain duty to deal justly with the inhabitants of this American island; that our plain duty will not be done until the Puerto Ricans, who supposed they were becoming Americans when they threw off their allegiance to Spain, are treated as Americans.

Anything short of that will be condemned by the sense of fair play, which the people of the United States have not lost. No fine-spun explanations of the necessity of sacrificing Puerto Rico in order to establish a precedent for use in the Philippines will satisfy. If the Philippines can not be retained without committing a crime against justice and liberty in Puerto Rico, it is highly probable the popular judgment will be that it would be better to turn the Philippines over to the Filipinos than to hold them at any such cost. If freedom does not follow the American flag when it is carried beyond this continent, then it had better be kept for use only where it does mean freedom.

This Puerto Rico outrage is breeding a rebellion against expansion. If we are not to expand except as imperialists, making ourselves hated as oppressors where we go, there will be an irresistible demand for the abandonment of a policy that can not be brought into harmony with the Constitution and that denies to others the rights which we claim in the Declaration of Independence for ourselves as natural and inalienable.

The Republican leaders at Washington are leading the Republican party away from Republicanism. President McKinley is face to face with a crisis, party and personal. The North American hopes to see him return to his message of December and take his stand inflexibly upon his recommendation of free trade with Puerto Rico. That stand was right and politic, and should never have been departed from, no matter what the nature or the strength of the adverse pressure. And we believe the President will return to it. He is too wise a man, too good a politician, to antagonize stubbornly the will of the masses of his party and the conscience of the American people.

[From the Philadelphia North American—Republican.]

SIX HONEST REPUBLICANS.

We congratulate the six Republicans who held out to the last against a pressure seldom felt, and seldomer resisted, and voted in accordance with their views of the Constitution and their personal sense of their duty to their country. Any country is the better for the possession of such high-minded and patriotic citizens—men who act upon the often quoted but seldom heeded maxim that "He serves his party best who serves his country best."

[From the Philadelphia Ledger—Republican.]

THE PUERTO RICO INFAMY—ROBBED AT HOME AND ABROAD.

On the day that the Republican majority of the House imposed upon Puerto Rico the rigors of a law intended to operate only against aliens—a law which, in the case of any part of this country, is opposed by the Declaration of Independence, which presents as a just cause of the Revolution taxation without representation, and which is condemned by the Constitution, which declares that all Federal taxation must be uniform throughout the United States—several hundred of the people of Puerto Rico, employed in the construction

of military roads for the Washington Government, went on strike to secure an increase of remuneration for their labor from 3 cents to 5 cents per hour.

It appears that these workingmen, recently brought under the benevolent safeguard of the country's flag, are compelled by the United States Government's contractors to work on Government work under "the old flag" ten hours a day for 30 cents, or less than many of our workingmen here justly receive for a single hour's work.

It would be interesting to learn what the Republican leaders in and out of Congress think of the contractors of the Government who are constructing the military railroads, paying a wage of 3 cents an hour, or 30 cents for the labor of a ten-hour day, to their Puerto Rico employees. It might be similarly interesting to learn what our workingmen here at home think of their Government making all the money it can out of the Puerto Rican workmen by levying unconstitutional taxes upon them, upon the one hand, while on the other it pays them 30 cents a day on which to pay the taxes and sustain life.

[From the Philadelphia Ledger—Republican.]

SERVING THE TRUSTS.

The bill is a purely selfish one. It is directly in the interest of two of the most notorious trusts in the country. If the sugar trust and the New England Tobacco Association were out of the way, there would be no effort to starve the people of Puerto Rico, under the plea of giving them a government.

[From the Philadelphia Press—Republican.]

A BACKWARD STEP.

Complete freedom of trade between the United States and Puerto Rico is the ultimate condition of affairs between the Union and its dependency to which all look forward. Every step toward this is desirable.

[From the Philadelphia Evening Telegraph—Republican.]

WORSE THAN SPAIN.

What the Puerto Ricans need, and what they rightfully demand, first of all, is a fulfillment of the express and implied promise that their condition would be improved under American control, instead of being made worse, as is actually the case, than it was while they were subject to the corrupt and inefficient rule of Spain.

[From the Philadelphia Record—Independent.]

PETTY LARCENY.

The bill in the form in which the House passed it should be dubbed the petty larceny bill, and for the credit of the country and to save our weak-backed President from the disrepute of his own nerveless vacillation the Republican leaders in the Senate should fall foul of it when it shall reach that body and strangle it in committee. The people of the United States stand pledged to a different course of action toward the unfortunate people of Puerto Rico. They should make their pledges good in spite of protectionist repudiation.

But now, "Ho, for the Middle West," Indianapolis:

[From the Indianapolis News.]

PRESS WILL NOT BE SILENCED—WILL NEVER GIVE UP THE FIGHT AGAINST THE PUERTO RICAN TARIFF ACT.

Our friends in the East need not fear that the people and papers of Indiana will give up the fight against the Puerto Rican tariff act. They have enlisted for the war. And as the days go by the more clearly does it appear to them that the President has made a grave mistake—a mistake from every point of view. He has hurt his prestige, seriously weakened the party, and injured the standing of the country in the eyes of the world. After all the "explanations" that have been made, and in spite of the attempts to "educate" them, the people of Indiana, unlike Mr. McKinley, adhere to the opinion that we ought to do what the President said was "our plain duty."

The virtue and vigor of a free and untrammeled press have rarely been more plainly illustrated than by the conduct of the American newspapers since the Puerto Rican tariff measure was proposed. There are defenders of it among the press, but they are few and far between. The prominence, the persistence, and the force with which the measure has been opposed by the press in all parts of the country is one of the best guaranties that the people can have of a great defense and guardianship of liberty. As long as the press is not hampered by law, and is undeterred by private interests, that is, as long as it is free and honest, so long the people have a most potent defender against invasions of every liberty, be these what they may.

In the Puerto Rican case there is apparently no cessation of opposition. Day after day, first one, then another, and sometimes all together, there are shots at this measure. Why should we treat Puerto Rico with less consideration now that she is ours than we did when she belonged to Spain? It is recalled that there was a reciprocity treaty negotiated with Spain when Mr. Harrison was President, which put Puerto Rican sugar, molasses, coffee, and hides on the free list, while it gave a number of our products, including flour, free entry to the island. What we were willing to do then we hesitate to do now.

Now, when the island belongs to us, when we are responsible for the care of its people, we refuse to do what we were willing to do when it was a colony of Spain. We have just now negotiated a treaty with the island of Trinidad, a British possession in the West Indies. It will receive all articles of machinery, implements of husbandry, and nearly all food supplies free, the free list being larger than the list of articles admitted free from Puerto Rico by Executive order, but all of which it is proposed to tax under the bill that Congress is now considering. Thus we are proposing to treat the possessions of other countries better than our own, and discriminating among our own possessions! Verily, the American people will not stand this.

[From the Indianapolis Journal.]

MISTAKE OF ADMINISTRATION—"CAMPAIGN OF EDUCATION" ON THE PUERTO RICAN TARIFF WILL FAIL.

If the attitude and policy of the Administration regarding the Puerto Rican tariff bill are correctly foreshadowed by Washington dispatches, it will add another to the mistakes already made in this matter. It is said to have been decided upon at a Cabinet meeting to inaugurate a campaign of enlightenment and education of the people, in the belief that when they understand the question in all its bearings they will withdraw their opposition to the House bill and admit that in the peculiar circumstances of the case a tariff on commerce between the United States and Puerto Rico is proper and necessary.

It is said the campaign of education will include evidence that the proposed tariff is only a temporary measure; that it is necessary to establish a precedent for the Philippines, and that its real effect will be to give the Government a free hand in fostering Puerto Rican industries. All this ground has been gone over. It is straw twice thrashed.

The people have considered the matter from a broad and liberal point of view, without regard to temporary expedients or makeshift policies, and they are of opinion that a fair construction of the Constitution in the interest of national honor and justice requires that the door to trade between the United States and Puerto Rico, both ways, be thrown wide open.

No argument of political expediency or party advantage can lead the people to look at the matter differently. They breathe a different atmosphere from that which sometimes pervades party caucuses and conferences in Washington, and they must be permitted to reach their conclusions in their own way. No campaign of education is needed in this case. It is not only unnecessary, but it will be politically injurious.

[From the Indianapolis Journal—Republican.]

A BAD BILL AT BEST.

The Journal has already stated the reasons why, in its opinion, the bill should not be passed. Those reasons relate to the constitutionality, the justice, the fairness, the wisdom, and the expediency of the measure. All the arguments in favor of it are based on sordid and mercenary considerations which should have no place in the policy of a great nation toward the people of a newly acquired territory. The bill should not be passed at all, and the two years' proposition does not help it any.

[From the Indianapolis Press—Republican.]

A DAMAGING COMPROMISE.

The American people do not take kindly to invasions of their primary rights. They see in this Puerto Rican measure—or if they do not now they will see later—a dangerous departure in constitutional construction. It means a reversal of American traditions.

I have previously read to the House a part of another strong editorial from the Indianapolis Journal, and a special from Indianapolis appears earlier in my remarks.

The same cry comes from all parties in Baltimore:

[From the Baltimore American—Republican.]

COLONIAL RIGHTS.

There should be no discrimination. Puerto Rico should be made to feel that her interests are identical with our own. This can not be done by raising a tariff barrier between her and this country. The recommendations made several months ago by President McKinley, Secretary Root, and Governor-General Davis were made after fullest investigation and careful thought. They were then the wisest, considering all conditions. The true manhood of the nation, considering first the good of the people of Puerto Rico, fails now to comprehend how, in so short a time, those recommendations can be said to have been erroneous and opposed to the best interests of all concerned.

[From the Baltimore Herald—Republican.]

ADVICE TO THE SENATE.

In justice to the people of Puerto Rico and in recognition of their reasonable claims upon the generosity of the United States, it is to be hoped that the Senate will resist the imposition of a duty. The population of the island was led to expect liberal treatment, and was induced to welcome American control by promises which, if not very explicit, are none the less binding. Having lost the Spanish markets as a result of the war, Puerto Ricans may rightfully look to us for assistance.

[From the Baltimore Sun—Democratic.]

POLITICS AND INHUMANITY.

The purpose of the Administration in setting up a tariff barrier between the United States and a part of its territory is very plain. The President holds that Congress has the right to govern our dependencies without regard to the Constitution—in fact, to keep the territory which we have acquired by purchase, conquest, or annexation permanently outside of the Constitution.

From this point of view, as stated on the authority of Mr. Henry L. Nelson, Congress has the power to establish one tariff system in Puerto Rico, another system in the Philippines, and a third in Hawaii; or, if it pleases, to impose duties on the products of Puerto Rico and the Philippines, but to admit the products of Hawaii to the United States free of duty. In order to establish this principle the starving and indigent Puerto Ricans will be taxed, ostensibly for the purpose of raising revenue for the island, on articles of food and deprived of all the privileges which the Constitution gives to the people of the country by which they have been annexed. To maintain this extra-constitutional theory, therefore, the party in power has deliberately committed itself to an act of inhumanity unparalleled in the history of the United States.

The refrain is taken up by the rival cities, Cincinnati and Louisville:

[From the Cincinnati Commercial-Tribune—Republican.]

A HELPLESS PEOPLE.

If permitted to sell their products in the United States free from duty and buy what American products they need duty free, the Puerto Ricans will be able to pay all the taxes that will be required to raise money for the support of the insular government. To give them less than this is to take criminal advantage of helplessness.

I have previously quoted some strong language from this same Commercial-Tribune, and also from its Democratic rival, the Enquirer.

[From the Louisville Courier-Journal—Democratic.]

THE PRESIDENT'S DOWNFALL.

In December last the Republican party, speaking through its President, who owed his nomination—whatever may be true of his election—to his zeal for protection, said it was the "plain duty" of this country to give free trade to Puerto Rico. Now, political exigencies may change. Policies must necessarily be modified to meet changing conditions. But expediency does not change the moral law. "The Ten Commandments will not budge." A "plain duty" in December is a plain duty in February.

The fear that an honest discharge of this duty might change the vote of Connecticut or some other State next November has nothing to do with the obligation. The President has once or twice admitted that he has been coerced into doing certain things by the compelling force of the Almighty. But "let no man say when he is tempted he is tempted of God: for God can not be tempted with evil, neither tempteth He any man. But every man is tempted when he is drawn away of his own lust and enticed." No man is tempted of God to disregard a plain duty. Nothing can be clearer than that.

Then there is a word to be said by Kansas City:

[From the Kansas City Journal—Republican.]

UNFAIR AND UNGENEROUS.

Even if the bill pass both Houses and receive the President's signature, the fact will remain that the Puerto Ricans are being treated unfairly and ungenerously at the hands of the country from which they had a right to expect better things.

[From the Kansas City Times—Democratic.]

THE ISLAND'S CONDITION.

Peurto Rico is run down and needs good care for a time, but we have "infant" industries crying for the sustenance that might otherwise go to her. They have their millions as the potent weapons of political warfare, while she is impoverished in claims, except in the inferior class that appeals only to Christianity and humanity. This is a terrible handicap in a contest where practical politics seek to decide.

Both parties join in one voice of protest from Detroit:

[From the Detroit Tribune—Republican.]

TO REPUBLICAN CONGRESSMEN.

Congressmen, especially those from Michigan, have been bombarded with letters and telegrams telling them to stand firm for free trade with Puerto Rico and the honor of the nation. It remains to be seen whether the people or the protected interests will conquer. The struggle is being watched by the people, and there will be a day of reckoning for those Congressmen who capitulate to the capitalists when they come up for reelection.

[From the Detroit Free Press—Democratic.]

THE PRESIDENT'S SHAME.

Party zealots may applaud the President's performance as a precious example of peacemaking. They may extol his party loyalty in subordinating his personal convictions to considerations of expediency and advantage at the threshold of a Presidential campaign. They may say, "Behold the secret of William McKinley's political success."

But to the American minds that are unclouded by selfish political or commercial considerations, the consent of the Executive to a compromise that involves faithlessness to the noblest national traditions is anything but inspiring or sagacious. It will open the eyes of Americans who were sincere in their desire to extend the blessings of our republican institutions to oppressed and benighted peoples, and it will be seized upon by the foes of empire as confirmatory of all that they have claimed concerning the sordid character of the imperialist programme.

Then not only does the New Haven Chamber of Commerce pass resolutions calling on you to halt in your mad career of imperialistic legislation, but these resolutions are approved and reenforced by the most intellectual and statesmanlike Republican newspaper in Connecticut, perhaps in New England. You all know it. It is edited in that seat of learning, Hartford:

[From the Hartford Courant—Republican.]

THE CONNECTICUT OPINION.

There is something very significant in those resolutions of the New Haven Chamber of Commerce, protesting against a tariff upon Puerto Rican products. That is a large and representative body of business men, made up without regard to politics. It was widely known that such resolutions were to come up, and yet there was not an adverse vote. We must admit that the sentiment of the New Haven business men reflects the general sentiment of the State, as far as we have tested it. The message of President McKinley, a recognized leader of protection, advocating free Puerto Rican trade as a matter of justice, set the drift of thought all that way, and things are not especially different now from their condition when the message was read and received with applause in Congress. The feeling is widespread that we owe it to these people not to choke them to death with our embrace of welcome.

[From the Hartford Courant—Republican.]

AN APPEAL TO THE SENATE.

"No question is settled until it is settled right." This question of fair play to the Puerto Ricans has not been settled. It has been evaded and postponed. We were bound—we are still bound—in honor and decency and conscience to see to it that the people are no worse off but better off for coming under the sovereignty of the United States. They had lost the best of their old markets. We were bound—and are still bound—to make that loss good to them. Our duty was our interest, too. Better a thousand times the appropriation out of the Federal Treasury for the urgent needs of the island which President McKinley had in view than the raising of the money by a tax upon its struggling industries and a denial of its legitimate hopes.

What the purblind and blundering leadership in the House has done is grievously to disappoint the people of Puerto Rico, to chill and alienate them, and to put a new weapon in the hands of the Republican party's enemies. To say that to give free trade to Puerto Rico would have been to recognize Puerto Rico as an integral part of the United States is—with all necessary respect for a number of honorable Congressmen—to talk puerile nonsense. The Republican Senators have now an opportunity to do their country and their party a service of importance. Perhaps they may see it and improve it. We are not building any very sanguine hopes on the chance, however.

Upon this position and the expressions of the Hartford Courant the Washington Post writes this:

"THE BAD POLITICS OF IT."

Inasmuch as the tobacco interest of Connecticut was one of the principal factors in effecting that sudden an amazing change which arrayed the House of Representatives against the President's earnest recommendation of free trade for Puerto Rico, it may interest our Republican friends in Congress to learn what the Hartford Courant, the leading Republican paper of that State, thinks of the Puerto Rican tariff bill. "The bad politics of it" is the caption of a recent Courant editorial calling attention to extracts which it reproduces from "seven representative Republican journals of the great West—two of them published in the State of President McKinley and Senator HANNA."

The Courant says the bill strikes nearly all the other journals of that class out there in the same way; that not merely these big city newspapers but also the newspapers of the little cities and towns are crying out at the folly of it. It could easily fill a page, it says, with their outspoken protests against it.

That is the simple truth, and it seems to us to present a situation to which the leaders of the dominant party in Congress can not afford to be blind. The Courant adds:

"The amazement with which the Republicans of the West viewed it at first is rapidly changing to anger. The indications are that, if it were submitted to popular vote by referendum, it would be beaten a thousand to one. There is good reason for fearing that Indiana is not the only State of the Middle West that will be instantly moved over into the 'doubtful' column by its enactment.

"Is it wise politics, we again ask the politicians of the Senate and House 'steering committees,' to jam through by sheer force of party discipline a measure so obnoxious to millions of voters whose votes will be wanted—and needed—eight months from now?"

The two or three Republican Congressmen who have taken pains to inform the Post of their disapproval of its plainness of speech on this question will possibly find it convenient to write to the editor of the Courant. In common with every other independent journal and nearly the entire Republican press, the Post promptly indorsed President McKinley's view of "our plain duty" in this matter. The Post stands with the President, with his latest Republican predecessor, with President Schurman, of the Philippine Commission, with the leaders of thought in education and religion, and with the masses of the people, "the plain people," as the Philadelphia Press designates the general run of voting citizens.

In performing its imperative duty as an independent newspaper, it is not compelled, as it has sometimes been, to set itself against the current of public sentiment. It will be fortunate for the Republican party if its leaders in both Houses of Congress will give heed to the warnings of such judicious counselors as the Hartford Courant and those "representative Republican journals of the great West" to whose deliverances the Courant invites their attention.

From the far-off West, "where Oregon rolls," this:

[From the Portland Oregonian—Republican.]

THE PRESIDENT'S MASTER.

The probability, as the Oregonian supposes, is that the President, who said a while ago that it was "our plain duty" to grant struggling Puerto Rico free trade, has been badgered by selfish protected interests into silen acquiescence in this bill. In the ancient day it was said: "There are three things that are never satisfied, yea, four things that say not, 'It is enough.'" In the modern day there is a fifth. It is the "protected grafter."

From Milwaukee, "where good beer is made," this:

[From the Milwaukee Sentinel—Republican.]

DECEIVED.

If Congress does not do "our plain duty" by Puerto Rico and give her free trade with this country, if it takes the other term of the alternative, the Puerto Ricans will be justified in looking with contempt upon future American protestations of disinterested affection.

And this from the Milwaukee (Wis.) Sentinel:

SOME POINTED OBSERVATIONS ON THE PUERTO RICAN ISSUE.

Whenever the members of a political party are sharply divided in opinion upon an important question, each side accuses the other of doing the party harm. Thus Senator HANNA assures the Republican advocates of free trade with Puerto Rico that their persistence is injurious to the Republican party. At the same time those Republicans who disagree with Mr. HANNA are convinced that the party will lose a good many votes by giving Puerto Rico anything less than free trade.

As we have already taken sides in this controversy, and have seen no reason for modifying our opinions, we can not of course aspire to the office of judge between the contending forces. But it seems to us that pretty good reasons can be given for believing that it is the opponents of free trade with Puerto Rico who are doing the party most harm.

Say that they are successful and that the Republican party refuses to give Puerto Rico free trade. Upon what hypothesis can this course be explained? Not by saying that free trade with Puerto Rico would have made the island part of the Federal Union and brought it under the Constitution, because Senator DAVIS has shown by his amendment how free trade may be given at the same time that any constitutional right to free trade is denied.

Not by saying that the constitutional question involved can not be brought before the Supreme Court except by imposing a tariff, for a suit to recover duties on goods already sent from Puerto Rico to the United States would bring before the court precisely those constitutional questions which the opponents of free trade are anxious to have the court settle. Not by dropping constitutional questions for questions of revenue. Not by saying that the money which Puerto Rico needs can be raised only by a tariff between the island and the United States.

The President, by recommending an appropriation from the Treasury, and the House of Representatives, by passing a bill appropriating about $2,000,000, have shown that there is one other way of giving Puerto Rico what she needs. The Puerto Ricans themselves, by declaring that they prefer internal revenue taxation, and by submitting estimates of a greater revenue from this taxation than the proposed tariff will yield, have shown that there is a third way. Not by saying that the duties will all be paid by the sugar trust and the tobacco trust, and that these combinations now own all the sugar and tobacco on hand, because the governor-general of the island has said that Puerto Ricans are still in possession of these commodities.

None of these hypotheses is in accordance with facts. No tolerably well-informed person will be satisfied by any one of them, or by all of them, as an explanation of the refusal of free trade to Puerto Rico. But there is another hypothesis. Let us look at it. Certain protected industries, among which most conspicuous are the sugar trust and the tobacco trust, objected to free trade with Puerto Rico. They objected still more strenuously to free trade with the Philippines, and looked upon free trade with Puerto Rico as the thin edge of the wedge.

Therefore, they sent their agents to Washington, where these agents have assured Congressmen and Senators that the workingmen and the farmers are fiercely opposed to free trade and will vote against the Republicans unless a tariff be imposed. And many Senators and Congressmen have believed, upon wholly insufficient evidence, what these agents said. Next these same agents have informed the party managers that if free trade is given te Puerto Rico, not a dollar will be given to the party campaign fund by either the tobacco trust or the sugar trust. And the party managers have been impressed.

Now, this is only a hypothesis. But who can doubt not only that it is the explanation upon which the Democrats will insist, but also that it is easier to believe than any of the "Constitution" or "revenue" explanations? If the voters of the United States think that protected interests should control the policy of the United States toward its new possessions, then a refusal of free trade to Puerto Rico is "good politics." If the voters do not believe this, then it is Mr. HANNA and the Republicans who agree with him that are doing the party the most harm.

From everywhere in the North and East and West hear the voices of a self-respecting press:

[From the Minneapolis Times.]

ONE OF CHAUNCEY'S CHOICEST.

Senator DEPEW's statement that the workingmen of this country with one voice demand a protective tariff against little Puerto Rico is one of his choicest jests. He could get a laugh at almost any banquet by repeating it.

[From the Rockford (Ill.) Republic—Republican].

UNPOPULAR AND UNJUST.

There is more danger in the Puerto Rican bill than its promoters in Congress dream of in their ostrich-like philosophy. The bill seems strong in the support of hired trust attorneys in the lobbies and occupying seats in

both Houses of Congress, and they are striving with desperate energy to force it through in defiance of the most powerful and general popular protest that has ever been aroused by proposed Congressional legislation.

[From the Los Angeles Times—Republican.]

FROM A FRUIT-GROWING STATE.

Our fellow-citizens of Puerto Rico, United States of America, are entitled to the relief which even the pending measure would afford. But absolute free trade with the United States proper would suit them better, and as a matter of simple justice they seem to be entitled to it.

[From the Cleveland Plain Dealer—Democratic.]

THE PRESIDENT'S SURRENDER.

Once more President McKinley has surrendered to dictation. He knows what is his "plain duty," but has promised he will not do it. That promise secured the passage of the bill, the principle of which had been condemned by all conversant with the situation in Puerto Rico, including the President himself.

[From the Buffalo Express—Republican.]

A NATIONAL DISGRACE.

Is the starvation of a people by the Government responsible for their welfare less criminal when enforced for industrial or fiscal reasons, or to establish a constitutional precedent, than when enforced as a war measure to put down rebellion against national authority? The United States stands shamed before all the world that eighteen months of our rule have brought the Puerto Ricans to such a pass as this.

[From the Peoria (Ill.) Journal—Republican.]

THE POLITICAL DEATH KNELL.

That Puerto Rican measure will sound the death knell of several Congressmen if they are not careful. When the people get in earnest they are not to be fooled with, and there is no doubt that they are in earnest in that matter.

From all over Dixie land, where the people revere the written Constitution as the only shield for themselves and their posterity, and where a conservative adherence to the traditional policies of the Republic and a loving obedience to the teachings of the fathers are still in vogue, these voices come:

PUERTO RICAN ROBBERY.

To enable that party to regain the ground it had lost, the bill to use the duties already paid on Puerto Rican products coming into our markets was devised. It was dictated by politics. But will this bill cure the blunder which the Republicans have made? It is very doubtful. The whole country understands now that the Republicans, in all they are doing in respect to Puerto Rico, are guided by political considerations. They are not trying to assist the poverty-stricken people of Puerto Rico; they are trying to reelect Mr. McKinley.—*Savannah News.*

The Republican press of the country is almost of one thought on the Puerto Rico tariff question. The Republican party in Congress is almost a unit upon it also. But the press and these leaders are, strangely enough, on opposite sides. If the press represents the sentiments of the Republican masses, the leaders in Congress have made a great big mistake.—*Mobile Register.*

The claim of Mr. CANNON that the sugar and tobacco in Puerto Rico are owned by the trusts, hence the proposal to tax these articles, is unique, to say the least, but it will hardly succeed in deceiving anyone.—*Birmingham News.*

With the abolition of Spanish rule in Puerto Rico the natives had an impression that the island had become a part of Uncle Sam's domain. The Republicans have apprised them of the fact that they have been turned over to the trust syndicates, with no Constitution to bar the rapacity of the latter. This is, indeed, a cheerful condition.—*Jackson Sun.*

[From the Atlanta Constitution—Democratic.]

A DISGRACE TO AMERICA.

The proposition does not even possess the merit of honesty. The suggestion that the tax be imposed for only two years is a confession that it is blackmail under form of law, a holding up of an innocent people by a highwayman, aided and abetted by the United States Government. If the tax were to be imposed as a perpetuity, honesty might be claimed, but the offer to make it temporary is full proof that there is a beneficiary held out waiting for the spoils. Was ever a more infamous raid made upon the offerings of charity? Were ever a people more outraged than the islanders who welcomed the United States flag? History fails to chronicle such a case, and if the scheme of taxation is carried through, it will be a lasting stigma upon the American name.

[From the Charleston News and Courier—Democratic.]

THE FINAL APPEAL.

The only hope of the Puerto Ricans against the outrage perpetrated by the bill lies in an appeal to the Supreme Court by some one adversely affected by the special tariff. As was repeatedly shown by the speeches in Congress in opposition to the bill, it has been invariably held by the United States Supreme Court that all territory acquired by the United States becomes ipso facto a part of the United States, and under the protection of the Constitution. Therefore the special tariff, if resisted by litigation, can not be enforced, unless the Supreme Court has become so thoroughly Republicanized (in a party sense) as to reverse all its previous decisions on the same question. We shall see what we shall see.

Why, even "Southern Republicans" who generally ask nothing but the party label, are "passing resolutions" and protesting against you as, in this respect, wrongdoers and iniquity workers! Read this Washington Post account of doings in Fairfax, Va.:

A WORD FROM "THE PLAIN PEOPLE."

The Post ventures to remind its valued and valiant contemporary, the Philadelphia Press, that there is a very considerable contingent of "the plain people" over in Fairfax County, Va., who do really and urgently need its most powerful ministrations. They are Republicans and they mean to be loyal, but recent events have placed them in an unhappy situation, as has been the case with their political brethren all over the country. They held a convention on Monday, the 19th instant, and here is the result:

"*Resolved*, That the Republicans of this county indorse the Administration of William McKinley and his devotion to the principles of the party he represents, and regret that he has been called upon, under pressure, to modify his action, as outlined in his message, in regard to the question of trade with Puerto Rico, believing, as we do, that the American flag carries with it the pledges and protection of the Constitution; but having full faith in his loyalty and devotion to the best interests of all the people, we indorse him for renomination and election as President of these United States."

The Press will perceive that these "plain people" experienced great difficulty in being loyal alike to the leader of their party and to their own convictions. Had they been less "plain" and more shrewd and diplomatic, they would have avoided any embarrassment by ignoring all rumors of a change of views on the part of the President. Their true policy would have been to frame a resolution congratulatory of the President's Puerto Rico policy, so clearly and forcibly enunciated in his message.

They might, with superb effect, have embodied in their resolution that impressive sentence in which "our plain duty" is so clearly pointed out that it can not possibly be mistaken. But, being merely "plain people," lacking in finesse, in cunning, and in the art of using words to conceal thoughts, they spoke from their simple, honest hearts just what they thought—just what millions of "the plain people" in forty-five States are thinking.

It is true they amount to nothing, but when they "dare cheep" against the party, sentiment must be strong, indeed.

But why not hear the Puerto Ricans themselves? Sixty-six per cent of them are "white people," and they are supposed to be "free," and the petitioners below referred to at least are "21." Hear what they say:

ASK STABILITY, NOT RELIEF—NEEDS OF PUERTO RICANS PRESENTED BY PETITION AT SAN JUAN—DISTRESS AND ALARM DAILY BECOMING MORE HARASSING FOR WANT OF A FIXED POLICY—UTTERLY UNABLE TO HOLD OUT MUCH LONGER.

SAN JUAN, PUERTO RICO, *March 19, 1900.*

A large gathering of 10,000 people, headed by the San Juan Chamber of Commerce, assembled at the palace of the governor-general to-day to submit a petition with reference to the needs of the island. The deputation selected to present it was received, in the absence of General Davis, who was indisposed, by Lieutenant-Colonel Hall, adjutant-general. On behalf of General Davis, Lieutenant-Colonel Hall expressed pleasure at seeing so many people who were interested in a question of such importance, and assured them that Puerto Rico would receive justice. An account of the proceedings will be transmitted to Washington.

The crowd was orderly, and dispersed without confusion amid "vivas" for the United States and the governor-general. Following is the text of the petition:

"The people of Puerto Rico, of all classes, represented by the mayor of this city and by the chamber of commerce, in peaceful assembly convened, call upon Governor-General Davis respectfully to direct his attention, and through him the attention of Washington, to the following most salient points of the present critical condition of the island:

"First. The consternation into which the business community in general has been thrown on account of recent cabled news from the United States, setting forth the negative attitude of the Senate as regards the tariff question.

"Second. The utter inability of the island to hold out much longer under existing conditions, as the Senate's delay in coming to a decision on the tariff simply aggravates the almost absolute state of penury throughout the island.

"Third. The urgent necessity of a final settlement of the question as a means of saving to their owners, mostly men of small means, the sugar and tobacco crops, which would pass under the control of speculators if a conclusion is not soon reached, this being the time for planting new crops, and a failure to act promptly being also calculated to have most prejudicial results.

"Fourth. The distress and alarm that are daily becoming more harassing in all branches of trade, owing to the virtual lack of a fixed and definite standard for transactions, and the grave apprehensions as to the future, now so generally entertained by all merchants.

"Fifth. The absence of buyers for products, which, with the loss of their former markets, as a consequence of the new régime, are now at a practical standstill.

"Sixth. The enormous depreciation of property, more especially on plantations, and the ruin staring a majority of the planters in the face as the result of the unnatural uneasiness which has made itself felt among capitalists and loan institutions, leading them to curtail or to shut off entirely the credit necessary in moving crops.

"Seventh. The lack of power as well as the absence of credit to contract a loan for the relief of most of the present necessities and the development of resources.

"Eighth. The need of undertakings of a public nature, instead of relief supplies, which, although necessary, tend to make paupers of the working classes.

"These statements, respectfully made, your petitioners respectfully request the Governor-General to bring to the knowledge of the Government at Washington, trusting that a favorable solution may speedily be found,

"ANDRES CROSAS.
"*President of the Chamber of Commerce of San Juan.*
"M. IGOZCUE,
"*Mayor of the City of San Juan.*"

If you hope, after defying both the Constitution and public opinion, still to remain in power by "dodging the issue," you may find food for reflection in the following editorial from St. Louis:

The St. Louis Republic says:

IT CAN NOT BE DODGED.

Senator DAVIS's amendment to the Puerto Rican tariff bill recently passed by the House of Representatives is an awkward attempt at a compromise of principle by means of which it is hoped that the Administration and the Republican party may escape the penalty due for the passage of that iniquitous measure.

The Davis amendment proposes to grant free trade to Puerto Rico on a peculiar assumption that certain provisions of the Constitution apply to that island without necessarily extending to the Philippines. In this manner it would be possible for the tariff imperialists to surrender their original position favoring the taxing of Puerto Rico and yet have a fighting chance left to exact the Philippine tribute. The trick is eminently characteristic of its originators.

It is not likely, however, that it will fool the American people, now so thoroughly awake to the peril of that lofty contempt for the Constitution and the rights of Americans so flagrantly manifested by the passage of the Puerto Rican tariff bill by the House. Nor is it likely that, when the expected Republican backdown on that issue comes, the President can be effectually shielded from blame by the claim that he urged free trade for Puerto Rico in his message to Congress last December.

No one denies that the President was on the right side then, but he flopped later in a most pitiable manner. Speaker HENDERSON, Congressman WATSON, of Indiana, and other Republicans in the House assert that the Administration influence was exerted to secure the passage of the Puerto Rican tariff bill.

The President and his party must face the people on this vital issue. They have shown their purpose under a misapprehension of public sentiment. They stand committed to the repudiation of the Constitution on behalf of the tariff trusts. The people will pass judgment on that record.

But there are people who affect to despise newspapers.

Let such take counsel from those whom you yourselves have in the past recognized as great men, pure men, and patriots.

Ever since I have been in Congress there has been one giant Republican intellect that has towered above the rest of you like a giant among pygmies—sometimes narrow, intolerant, and bitter in his partisan zeal, but a marvel of quickness, penetration, and common sense, a great man—Thomas B. Reed.

He opposes your oriental expansion, colonial government, and imperialistic policies.

Benjamin Harrison, ex-President, whom you have delighted in times past to honor, appeals to you to do justice under the Constitution to the people of Puerto Rico. Ex-Senator Edmunds, ex-Senator Henderson, Carl Schurz, ex-Senators Boutwell and Sherman, Senators HOAR, MASON, DAVIS, PROCTOR, and others—members of both Houses or retired full of honors, I can not name them all—appeal to you to halt. Boards of trade and commerce, Republican conventions, State legislatures join in the appeal.

Your President has said in his message:

It must be borne in mind that since the cession Puerto Rico has been denied the principal markets she had long enjoyed and our tariffs have been continued against her products as when she was under Spanish sovereignty. The markets of Spain are closed to her products except upon terms to which the commerce of all nations is subjected. The island of Cuba, which used to buy her cattle and tobacco without customs duties, now imposes the same duties upon these products as from any other country entering her ports. She has therefore lost her free intercourse with Spain and Cuba without any compensating benefits in this market. Her coffee was little known and not in use by our people, and therefore there was no demand here for this, one of her chief products. The markets of the United States should be opened up to her products. Our plain duty—

This is strong language: "Our plain duty."

A great American, whom all good men love, once said: "Duty is the noblest word in the English language."

Our "plain duty"—"plain" is obvious, palpable, undeniable.

Our plain duty is to abolish all customs tariffs between the United States and Puerto Rico and give her products free access to our markets.

And yet this "plainness" has become "obscurity" for no publicly expressed reason, save the one expressed in this debate, to wit, "Lest Finley should grow rich!" And even "Finley" existed when the President wrote his message. Your Secretary of War, in his report of November 29, 1899, has used these words, which he can not unpublish, though he may regret that they arise to rebuke him:

The question of the economic treatment of the island underlies all the others. If the people are prosperous and have an abundance of the necessities of life, they will with justice be easily governed, and will with patience be easily educated. If they are left in hunger and hopeless poverty, they will be discontented, intractable, and mutinous. The principal difficulty now in the island of Puerto Rico is that the transfer of the island from Spain to the United States has not resulted in an increase of prosperity, but in the reverse. The industry of the island is almost entirely agricultural. The people live upon the products of their own soil and upon the articles for which they exchange their surplus products abroad. Their production is in the main of coffee, sugar, and tobacco. The prosperity of the island depends upon their success in selling these products.

So long as the island was a part of the Spanish possessions there was substantially free trade with Spain and with Cuba. The total exports from Puerto Rico for the four years preceding 1897 averaged about $16,609,000, of which an average of less than one-sixth part ($2,630,000) was sold to the United States and an average of one-half ($8,025,000) was sold to Spain and Cuba. Immediately upon the transfer of the island from Spain to the United States Spain erected a tariff barrier against the introduction of Puerto Rican products. The interests of Cuban agriculture led to the erection of a similar barrier in the tariff adopted for Cuba, so that Puerto Rico was debarred from the principal markets which she had previously enjoyed, and at the same time this country has maintained its tariff against Puerto Rican products just as it existed while the island was Spanish territory. The result is that there has been a wall built around the industry of Puerto Rico.

Even before the hurricane of August 8, 1899, two crops of tobacco lay in the warehouses of Puerto Rico, which the owners were unable to sell at prices equal to the cost of production. Their sugar shared the prevailing depression in that commodity, arising from the competition of bounty-fed beet sugar. Their coffee was practically unknown in the United States and had no market here. It is plain that it is essential to the prosperity of the island that she should receive substantially the same treatment at our hands as she received from Spain while a Spanish colony, and that the markets of the United States should be opened to her as were the markets of Spain and Cuba before the transfer of allegiance.

Congress has the legal right to regulate the customs duties between the United States and Puerto Rico as it pleases, but the highest considerations of justice and good faith demand that we should not disappoint the confident expectation of sharing in our prosperity with which the people of Puerto Rico so gladly transferred their allegiance to the United States, and that we should treat the interests of this people as our own; and I wish most strongly to urge that the customs duties between Puerto Rico and the United States be removed.

Alas! that the dread of Finley's wealth should have shunted his train of thought!

Your military commander in Puerto Rico joined his voice to theirs. Professor Schurman, the president of the Philippine commission appointed by your President, Mr. McKinley, writes the following letter to a personal friend:

ITHACA, *March 12, 1900.*

DEAR SIR: I agree with you that the United States is under obligation to extend its tariff laws to the island of Puerto Rico. But I can not accept your contention that this obligation is derived from the Constitution, which, in my judgment, does not of its own force apply to annexed territories. The obligation is moral, not constitutional. As the President said, with equal truth and felicity, it is "our plain duty."

We are bound to this course by solemn promises. The supreme and irresistible reason for removing all customs barriers between the United States and Puerto Rico is the promise made by General Miles, when first landing American forces on the island, that the Puerto Ricans should enjoy the same rights, privileges, and immunities as the people of the United States. On this understanding the Puerto Ricans accepted American sovereignty, not only without opposition, but with joyful trust and confidence.

The present issue is simply this: Shall we repudiate, or shall we fulfill, the national engagements? Shall this great Republic break faith with the little island of Puerto Rico? Having secured the fruits of General Miles's promise, shall we now renounce the promise?

The American people will not tolerate any faltering with solemn obligations. Recognizing the national good faith as the Nation's chiefest good, they will condemn any violation of it as the blackest crime. All over the country this Puerto Rican question has stirred to the deepest the national heart and conscience; legislation, inspired by a breach of good faith, will bring a terrible Nemesis. It is said that a tariff is needed between Puerto Rico and the United States to provide a case for the courts to determine the extent of our jurisdiction over the new dependencies, especially the Philippines. I answer that no convenience, no expediency, no other obligation ever justifies a breach of the national good faith.

Let me add, too, that this Puerto Rican legislation is testing us before the eyes of the Filipinos, who keep well informed of all our doings. They will judge by this legislation of the value of American promises. When the ablest and most statesmanlike of Aguinaldo's emissaries to the Philippine commission once expressed the fear that the American Government might not keep the promises it was making, for Spain, said he, made promises and broke them, I silenced him with the reply: "Signor, the United States is not Spain."

Is he now to learn, are all the Filipinos now to learn, that in the first legislation for our new dependencies we prove faithless to our pledges and recreant to our obligations? Such an exhibition of ourselves will strengthen the hands of Aguinaldo and the insurgents, because unhappily it can be used to support their persistent statement that the Americans are no more trustworthy than the Spaniards.

At the very moment when we need to inspire confidence in the minds of the conquered Filipinos, shall we commit an act which will confirm their distrust of us, quicken their suspicions, and breed new, and perhaps, ineradicable antipathies? God forbid!

I clipped it from the Washington Post of March 16. Can you not afford to heed your own "High Insular Tycoon and Paramount Imperial Mogul?"

The two greatest constitutional lawyers who have served in either House of Congress within my personal recollection were Senators James Z. George, of Mississippi, and George F. Edmunds, of Vermont.

The former is dead; the latter still lives. Here is a letter from him to Senator PROCTOR, published in the RECORD:

PHILADELPHIA, PA., *March 21, 1900.*

MY DEAR SIR: I have yours of the 20th instant, and, both as an American citizen and an original and constant Republican, am very glad to learn that you are opposed to legislation having the effect of imposing on the people of Puerto Rico—whether we call them citizens or subjects of the United States—any kind of revenue burden or benefit that is not common to the whole people of the United States. Any such measure, if enacted, will, I believe, be unique in our whole history. It will imitate and parallel the acts of the British Parliament which forced our fathers to resistance and revolution and led them to establish a Constitution which, in studied and explicit terms, forbade any such discrimination.

I know there are many gentlemen engaged in public affairs, whose intelligence and patriotism are above question, who believe that our Constitution does not embrace the Territories, and that as to them the President and Congress possess the same omnipotent powers that the British Crown and Parliament have always possessed over their posessions. While I think that position is untenable as a matter of law, I believe the proposed action is still less defensible viewed in the light of those principles of liberty, justice, and equality of rights we all profess to believe in, and which, whether we believe in and practice or not, are still living, and will live and bear fruits more and more among men, in spite of all the tyrants, well-meaning or otherwise, in the world.

I need not weary you by referring to the often stated arguments on the general subject, but I will mention one aspect of it which, so far as I have noticed, has not been particularly adverted to. Congress is the creature of the Constitution, and not the reverse. A law passed by Congress is its creation, a mere expression of its will, which it may repeal or change at pleasure. If, therefore (assuming that the Constitution does not exist in Puerto Rico), Congress were to enact a statute declaring that the present Constitution shall be extended over and be in force in that island, the Constitution gets its only force there by the virtue of the statute. It is a statutory Constitution, and nothing else, and a repeal of the statute would extinguish it.

But the Constitution, as such, I suppose all admit is not subject to the control of Congress, either to enlarge or diminish, to expand or contract, or to be applied to or withdrawn from any people or place. It is not a movable thing like the Ark of the Covenant of the Israelites, to be set up and moved here or there, as the tribes might wander. It is the actual event and condition, and not the legislative or executive will that must, in the nature of things, determine the status of a man or a country under it.

The instances in which Congress has declared in statutes organizing Territories that the Constitution and laws should be in force there are no evidence that they were not already there, for Congress and all legislative bodies have often made enactments that in effect merely declared existing law. In such cases they declare a preexisting truth to ease the doubts of casuists. Puerto Rico and its people came under the sovereignty of the United States by force of the treaty with Spain, and I think all will agree that if any part of the people of the island levied war against the United States or adhered to our enemies, etc., they would be guilty of treason. But treason is an exclusively defined constitutional crime, and it can not exist on the island unless the Constitution that defines it is in force there.

Apart, however, from considerations of fundamental equal law for all who owe allegiance to our flag of liberty and justice, there are, it seems to me, other very weighty and commanding reasons why we should treat the people of Puerto Rico on the basis of absolute civil equality of right and circumstance with the citizens of our States and home Territories, and in doing so; if, as is contended, the Constitution is not in force there, we make no precedent for the territories on the other side of the globe; for, like all measures within the discretion of Congress, each subject must of course be dealt with when it arises under its own peculiar circumstances and conditions. These people gladly yielded to our dominion on assurances, never disowned or withdrawn, of our commanders and other officers that they would become free and equal citizens of the Republic with all the rights implied by that term.

The geographical position of the island makes it, to my mind, especially important that its people should become and remain completely and earnestly loyal, and intimately acquainted and interested with the people here, and

bound to us by ties of business and friendship common to all. If we do not abandon or impair or imperil our supremely important and exclusive interests—common between our country and the Central American Republics and other American States—in relation to the Nicaragua Canal, Puerto Rico will in times of stress be the key of the situation. It was for this reason that, before peace with Spain was attained, I was earnestly in favor of holding the island, although I was opposed to taking dominion over the Philippines, excepting Guam. Pardon this too lengthly note, and believe me,

Faithfully, yours,

GEO. F. EDMUNDS.

Hon. REDFIELD PROCTOR,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

There is much worth hearing and remembering in the following letter from ex-Senator Henderson, one of the few left of the Republican "old guard," survivors from your better days:

FAIR TREATMENT OF PUERTO RICO—IT MUST HAVE ALL THE BENEFITS AND ALL THE BURDENS OF OUR LAWS.

EDITOR POST: I deeply sympathize with you in your defense against the charge of "free-trade" tendencies. We started out with thirteen States. We now have forty-five. All of the additional thirty-two, except Texas alone, were held by us as Territories previous to their admission into the Union. Did anybody ever propose to levy tariff duties on the commerce of any one of these Territories?

The tariff has been with us an active and exciting political topic ever since 1789. It has been discussed only in connection with foreign commerce. To be a protectionist has been to favor duties on the commodities of foreign countries. Trade between the States and Territories of the United States has always been free and untrammeled. This freedom of trade was a sine qua non of the Union. Without it the Union was originally impossible and without it the Union can not endure. Equality of taxation is crystallized in the Constitution. To remove it is to break the great compact upon which it is founded.

If the protected interests shall be able to wage wars at the common expense in order to create additional home markets for their products and then compel consumers here to pay tariff duties on the commodities of those annexed or subjugated countries, then the Union exists only for the purpose of dispensing bounties to the favored classes.

Puerto Rico, if annexed at all, has been annexed by the common blood and treasure of the people of the United States. We knew its products before we took it from Spain. One of these products is sugar. I do not produce sugar; I am a consumer of sugar. My money has gone into the acquisition of this territory. Have I not the same rights in the products of this territory and in its people that Mr. Oxnard has? He grows sugar and I consume it. Shall he take the whole benefit of the acquisition and I get nothing? I consume tobacco and I manufacture cigars. I need both wrappers and fillers in my business of cigar making.

Connecticut alone of the present admitted States grows tobacco suitable for wrappers. It produces from 10,000,000 to 15,000,000 pounds of these wrappers per annum, on which there is a tariff duty of $1.85 per pound. Connecticut, of course, is benefited by this enormous protective duty on foreign tobacco. But Connecticut demanded that Puerto Rico should be brought into the United States. It is now no longer a foreign State. It is now a part of the great Republic. Connecticut claims all the benefits of the transaction and leaves me none. It accepts the good and rejects the bad; or rather, it appropriates the blessings and shuffles off on me and others all the burdens.

I have a right, both constitutional and moral, to receive from Puerto Rico free of duty its oranges, its lemons, and other fruits. California and Florida object. On what ground? Simply because they are unwilling to accept the consequences of competition. The people of these States have the benefit of an enormous tariff duty on these articles, and they wish to force me still to pay them the bounties of protection. Is it right? Is it just to me and others who stand in the same situation? They know it is unjust. They know it is immoral and against conscience. They know it is unconstitutional. They vainly imagine, however, that under the old slogan of protection to American interests they can blind the people yet a little longer. What are American interests? The interests of Puerto Rico are now as much American interests as those of New York, Pennsylvania, Connecticut, or California.

Gentlemen of Congress, the only way to settle your differences is to treat Puerto Rico as a part of the United States. Give to it all the benefits and all the burdens of all your laws. Puerto Rico must pay the same tariff which we pay on goods of foreign production, but not one cent on goods produced in the United States. Between us and Puerto Rico trade must be free. You must cease to vote away money from the Federal Treasury as a cloak to cover political wrongs. The people see through the very thin gauze which mantles your pretended charity.

J. B. HENDERSON.

WASHINGTON, *March 27, 1900.*

The Washington Post on March 5 published the following extract from a sermon by the Rev. Dr. Smith, of Indianapolis:

PUERTO RICAN TARIFF A CRIME—INDIANAPOLIS CLERGYMAN DENOUNCES THE MEASURE—CRUMPACKER FOR GOVERNOR.

INDIANAPOLIS, IND., *March 4, 1900.*

The Rev. Dr. Smith, pastor of the most prominent and fashionable church here, said to-day in his sermon:

"To listen to a few magnates and burden Puerto Rico with a tariff is a criminal course. Some of our politicians are smarting under the lash of public censure, and are studying the art of being two-faced and two-voiced to extricate themselves from an awkward dilemma.

If the islands are equal to our average State on the score of intelligence, then we violate our law in laying a tax without their consent; our national enthusiasm for expansion or imperialism may carry our people so far as to override common sense and common honor. Let us keep hands off those famishing isles if we can not nurse them into strength of brain and life and love for us because we guarded them in their day of stress.

I am led to presume that the Rev. Dr. Smith is a Republican by two facts, he is pastor of the "most fashionable church" in Indianapolis, and he preaches politics from the pulpit and not merely "Christ crucified"—as was recommended by one Paul of Tarsus, who, however, did not have a "most fashionable" church.

Although none of the members of the old Cleveland régime are in high repute with the members of either party, the following utterance of ex-Postmaster-General Don Dickinson will furnish thinking men food for thought:

[Special to the Post.]

DICKINSON ON PARTY BLUNDERS—FORMER POSTMASTER-GENERAL CONDEMNS THE M'KINLEY ADMINISTRATION.

DETROIT, MICH., *March 9, 1900.* "Napoleon used to say that a blunder was worse than a crime, and in our foreign and domestic policy the Republican party, within the past few months, has been guilty of a whole series of stupendous blunders, executive, diplomatic, and legislative, the crowning one of which is the Puerto Rican tariff business," said Don M. Dickinson this morning. Mr. Dickinson, it will be remembered, was Postmaster-General under President Cleveland, but deserted the Democrats on the monetary issue in 1896, speaking from Republican platforms for the gold standard.

"First in the late series, the Administration sustains the deal of the Secretary of the Treasury with the Central National Bank of New York regarding the purchase of the custom-house, which was discreditable, to say the least, if not disgraceful," continued Mr. Dickinson. "Next, it resurrects and galvanizes into life the Clayton-Bulwer treaty, and especially that part of it most offensive to the people of the United States, which was never ratified by the Senate and was therefore invalid.

"Next, it has actually attempted to engage in a contract with Great Britain by which we are not permitted to build or control our own waterway on this continent giving us connections with our Pacific and Atlantic seaboards, except under conditions which Europe and Great Britain may name. Could there be a more complete surrender of the Monroe doctrine?

"Then comes this Puerto Rican tariff. Puerto Rico is as much American territory as Florida was after its acquirement and before it was organized as a Territory, and, therefore, protected by the fundamental law, the Constitution of the United States, which imposes a duty upon Congress to legislate for the protection of its people.

Legally, in my opinion, you can no more apply a protective tariff to imports from Puerto Rico to New York than you can from California to New York; nor can you impose a tariff upon goods exported to Puerto Rico from any State. But, bad as that is, their backing and filling, their weakness and vacillation in this matter, seem to be gaining for the majority in Congress and the Administration the contempt of the American people.

Our people admire bravery even in wrong-doing, but they despise a cowardly policy. I can not imagine what the leaders are about, except on the theory of the old Latin proverb, "Quos deus vult perdere, prius dementat" (Whom the gods would destroy, they first make mad).

As "a straw to show which way the wind blows," even in Connecticut, and how it has affected the "smaller fry," hear this, which I clip from the New York Evening Post's special report as republished in the Washington Post of March 3:

[From the New York Evening Post.]

SENTIMENT IN CONNECTICUT—A REPUBLICAN LEADER BOLTS M'KINLEY BECAUSE OF THE PUERTO RICAN BILL.

NEW HAVEN, *March 1, 1900.*

Feeling here is very bitter against Representative N. D. Sperry for his vote yesterday in favor of the Puerto Rican tariff bill, in defiance of the sentiment of both parties in his constituency. It is certain to affect the vote for him should he be renominated, and there are well-grounded rumors of an attempt in his own party to defeat his nomination.

A more significant evidence of local Republican sentiment is the declaration yesterday here of John L. Hutchinson, of Middletown, an active party worker, ex-collector of internal-revenue for the district, and a delegate in 1893 to the national convention which nominated McKinley. Mr. Hutchinson criticised severely the President's lack of backbone in the Puerto Rican tariff matter, and declared that he would not vote for him if renominated.

I have already made mention of the resolutions of the house of representatives of the State of Iowa. They were passed by a unanimous vote of that Republican body. Here they are:

IOWA ON PUERTO RICAN BILL—CONCURRENT RESOLUTION CONDEMNING TARIFF MEASURE UNANIMOUSLY ADOPTED BY LOWER HOUSE OF THE LEGISLATURE.

DES MOINES, IOWA, *March 22, 1900.*

The house of representatives of the State to-day passed a concurrent resolution, by unanimous vote, declaring that the people of Iowa are unalterably opposed to a Puerto Rican tariff. The resolution was messaged to the senate, and will be taken up there next week. Representatives Kendall, Eaton, Byers, Theophilus, Temple, Carr, and others made speeches in favor of the resolution. While Republicans generally sympathize with the sentiment of the resolution, many of them regret its passage at this time, feeling confident as they do that Congress will not pass the tariff bill.

The resolution was introduced by Representative Kendall, as an amendment to a resolution introduced by Representative Eaton, memorializing Congress to appropriate $5,000,000 for the St. Louis Exposition in 1903. The Puerto Rican resolution follows:

"*Be it resolved*, That the people of Iowa are unalterably opposed to the establishment of any tariff duties between the United States and any territory acquired as a result of the Spanish-American war, the people of which accepted the sovereignty of this Government without resistance, and voluntarily passed under the jurisdiction of its Constitution and laws."

I understand that the leader of the Iowa delegation in this House [Mr. HENDERSON, the Speaker] holds that the members of the Iowa legislature "knew not what they did." Perhaps the truth is that "exalted station" has carried the Speaker further from the people than the Iowa legislators feel that they can go.

The Washington Post in an editorial of March 23, taking these Iowa resolutions as a text, well says:

IOWA GIVES A NUDGE.

We imagine that the action of the Iowa legislature, yesterday, communicated a very unpleasant reminder to quite a number of our western statesmen who, for the past few weeks, have been slipping about on Capitol Hill in their rubber shoes and pooh-poohing the idea that the American people were really interested in free trade for Puerto Rico.

After this, however, the Iowa Congressman, like the Indiana article, will have something to think about. Senator Allison and Mr. Speaker Henderson, who is generally supposed to have thought that it wasn't loaded—these two very prominent gentlemen will find it expedient to retire to their respective closets and take a thinking part. The Iowa legislature, without a dissenting voice, and, apparently, without the smallest wish to produce one, spoke for the President's free-trade recommendation and thereby set him up against the Republicans of the House who have conspired to frustrate his benevolent and righteous plans.

As all good Republicans should do, they have backed the leader of their party and frowned upon those who would confute and baffle him. They have come out fearlessly and frankly for the policy defined by Mr. McKinley in his message of last December, and they have, incidentally, served notice on their Representatives in Congress that they have serious convictions concealed upon their persons, and that it will not be healthy for Republican officials to disregard them.

The advocates of the Puerto Rico tariff bill have spent a good deal of time

and eloquence in trying to persuade their coadjutors in Congress that the country does not feel very strongly in the matter; that there is nothing in it more than a demagogue outcry and an unthinking popular applause. We may say, moreover, that this propaganda has had a certain success—what the French call a "succès d'estime"—and that a great many gifted statesmen have been lulled into false security by listening to their seductive pleadings. But we fail to see how any really wise politician can misinterpret or ignore the warnings that have come to them from Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin, Minnesota, and—more recently and in formal terms—from Iowa.

Not since the outbreak of the war with Spain have we witnessed a popular demonstration so potent and so unmistakable. This question has touched the country's conscience. The feeling now prevalent is based on something much more substantial and enduring than mere sentiment. It is an impulse of honesty and justice and good faith. This Iowa declaration will put an end to the fatuous complacency that has prevailed in certain august quarters. It calls a halt upon the tiptoeing into secret places and the finger-on-the-nose business, and the general air of knowing satisfaction recently observable among the leaders. It will make certain gentlemen wish that they had adhered to their original purpose, and it will strengthen other gentlemen who were quick to recognize the wisdom of the President's original attitude and to feel the force of the popular approval thereof.

I have quoted from the New York Board of Trade and Transportation. Would their opinion be reenforced by the expression of that of the commercial and manufacturing interests of Baltimore, the "city of conservative business habits"? If so, digest this:

CONDEMN PUERTO RICAN TARIFF—MERCHANTS AND MANUFACTURERS' ASSOCIATION FAVORS NICARAGUA CANAL.

BALTIMORE, *March 21, 1900.*

The Merchants and Manufacturers' Association of this city, one of the leading commercial bodies of the South, to-day adopted, without a dissenting vote, resolutions strongly condemning the Puerto Rico tariff bill and favoring the Nicaragua Canal. The resolutions follow:

"*Resolved by the Merchants and Manufacturers' Association of Baltimore,* That we hereby express our conviction that justice demands the removal of all trade barriers between the United States and our recently acquired colonial possession of Puerto Rico, and that the inhabitants of the island of Puerto Rico be admitted to the same rights and freedom in trade that is accorded to citizens of our own country.

"*Resolved,* That we are opposed to the passage of any law by Congress which provides for the imposition of taxes upon trade between Puerto Rico and the United States contrary to the freedom of commercial intercourse which now prevails between the several States and Territories, and we therefore request our Senators and Representatives in our Congress to advocate such legislation as will establish free interchange of commerce."

Resolved by the Merchants and Manufacturers' Association of Baltimore, That the constantly increasing commerce of the world makes the construction of a ship canal connecting the Atlantic and Pacific oceans a greatly desired necessity, and that from investigations hitherto made, we believe the construction of such a canal is practicable, merely involving questions of time, cost, supervision, and title.

That, in our opinion, the most feasible route for a trans-isthmian canal is that known as the Nicaraguan route, and we therefore respectfully urge our Senators and Representatives in Congress to exert their influence in behalf of such measures as will tend to secure the construction of the Nicaraguan canal under the supervision of the United States.

It would, perhaps, be well to conclude this very incomplete, but, at any rate, representative array of utterances of legislative, conventional, and trade bodies, distinguished men and newspapers, by this clinching and conclusive editorial from the Washington Post, Administration:

"CHEAP AND COWARDLY."

The Chicago Times-Herald shows, as the Chicago Inter Ocean has done, the reason why it is proposed in Congress to violate the nation's pledge to the people of Puerto Rico, the pledge given them in behalf of the nation through a proclamation by General Miles when he landed on their island with an invading army.

The Times-Herald, in common with every other influential newspaper west of the Alleghenies, with a single exception, believes that it will be a national disgrace full of peril to the Republican party to pass the Puerto Rican tariff bill. And there is significance in the fact that President McKinley and his Administration have no more sincere and devoted friend than Mr. Kohlsaat's newspaper. That paper, in its issue of the 20th instant, says, in reply to many inquiries "for fuller and definite information concerning the origin of the present folly which has been foisted upon the party by its 'leaders' in the House of Representatives," that the matter is as inexplicable to-day as it was when the Committee on Ways and Means reported the 25 per cent tariff measure. In both the House and Senate, it says, the Puerto Rico bills went in free trade lambs and came out tariff wolves.

Having said that, our Chicago contemporary proceeds to inspect the statements made to the Senate Committee on Puerto Rico by Henry T. Oxnard, of Oxnard, Cal., the representative of the beet-sugar industry, and Herbert Myrick, of Springfield, Mass., chairman of the "League of Domestic Producers," and claiming to represent the beet sugar, cane sugar, tobacco, wool, cotton, fruit, vegetable, rice, and nut producers. It says Mr. Myrick fairly threatened the committee with the loss of 500,000 votes to the Republican party if it fulfilled the pledge of the President to give free trade to Puerto Rico.

But the Times-Herald finds nothing in the testimony given before the committee, including the threat of Mr. Myrick, to justify the committee's departure from its original bill, which gave free trade to Puerto Rico. And here is the Times-Herald's conclusion:

"The truth is that the consistency and honor of the Republican party were sacrificed for cheap and cowardly political reasons, and the moral sense of the party was outraged at the bidding of the smallest fly that ever buzzed around the hub of progress."

That is the opinion, not of one newspaper, but of the almost unanimous press of the United States. That voice comes out of the heart of the great Northwest. It is the voice of the people. Can the Republican leaders in Congress afford to defy it? Are they so confident of victory in this year's campaign as to believe they can with impunity pass a measure against a more formidable opposition in their own party than was ever before brought to bear by members of any party against any proposed action of their friends in Congress? Do those Senators and Representatives understand that they are proposing to endow the opposition with a greater wealth of campaign capital than all that they now possess?

Is it possible that Republican statesmen and politicians are going to invite the Democratic national committee to fill its campaign text-books and its reams of literature with citations from President McKinley, ex-President Harrison, President Schurman, of the Philippine Commission, ex-Senator Edmunds, 10,000 Republican editorials, and various speeches of Republican Congressmen, all condemning the Republican Congress?

Just imagine a campaign in the Northwest under the conditions which the passage of this bill will create, and you have a situation that would appall the boldest spell binder, and compel the Republican editors to either stultify themselves or bear in silence the thickest, heaviest, fiercest storm that ever burst on the heads of campaigners. And that storm would consist of Republican writings and speeches. Is it best to persist in the "sacrifice of the consistency and honor of the Republican party for cheap and cowardly political reasons"?

Let there be no doubt in the minds of the people at any time, present or future, concerning party responsibility for this more than shameful state of affairs.

Lest there may be an attempt on the part of some of the majority to wriggle out, I call attention to the—

VOTE ON PUERTO RICO BILL IN HOUSE, APRIL 30, 1900.

An analysis of the vote shows that six Republicans—Representatives CRUMPACKER of Indiana, FLETCHER and HEATWOLE of Minnesota, LITTLEFIELD of Maine, LORIMER of Illinois, and MCCALL of Massachusetts—voted with the opposition against the bill, and four Democrats—Representatives DAVEY and MEYER of Louisiana, DE VRIES of California, and SIBLEY of Pennsylvania—voted with the Republicans for the bill. In addition, Representative WARNER (Republican) of Illinois was paired against the bill with Representative BOUTELLE (Republican) of Maine for it. Two other Republicans—Representative LANE of Iowa and Representative FARIS of Indiana—were absent and unpaired. They were understood to be against the bill.

Of the four votes in favor of the bill classed above as Democrats, one is that of Mr. SIBLEY of Pennsylvania, who is not now, nor was ever at any time, a Democrat, although he voted for Bryan on account of free silver in 1896. He is now reported by the newpapers to be seeking a Republican nomination for Congress.

Two of the votes were cast by gentlemen who peculiarly represent the Louisiana sugar industry. It has become a proverb that "sugar knows no politics." The seven Republicans voting as paired against the bill, and in a less degree the two who though absent have proclaimed their opposition, deserve from the country that meed of praise and gratitude which is always deserved by men of firm resolve, fixed principles, and moral courage.

This is especially true and worthy of mention when such men are members of Congress, because the virtues they have displayed are not those in which politicians ordinarily excel.

Mr. SULZER. I ask the gentleman from Iowa to yield some of his time now.

Mr. HULL. Will the Chair kindly state how much time has been used on each side and how much time is remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. An hour and fifty-two minutes have been used on the Republican side, and an hour and twelve minutes upon the Democratic side.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, I want to take about ten minutes, possibly—not more than that. I want to be called down if I undertake to exceed that.

The CHAIRMAN. It will give the Chair pleasure to call the gentleman down. [Laughter.]

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. LACEY having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. PLATT, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bills and joint resolution of the following titles; in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 1918. An act granting an increase of pension to John E. Higgins;

S. 2651. An act granting a pension to Henry Hill;

S. 1578. An act granting a pension to George W. Campbell;

S. 1246. An act granting a pension to Charles A. Perkins;

S. 1245. An act granting a pension to Oliver Demon;

S. 2290. An act granting a pension to James Richardson;

S. 2753. An act granting an increase of pension to David H. Morey;

S. 1601. An act granting an increase of pension to John Thornton;

S. 1603. An act granting an increase of pension to John W. Kaump;

S. 3078. An act granting a pension to Charles Weitfle;

S. 2539. An act granting an increase of pension to Capt. Milton H. Daniels;

S. 258. An act granting a pension to Coryden Bevans;

S. 3380. An act granting an increase of pension to Hamilton K. Williams;

S. 2335. An act granting an increase of pension to Maj. John W. Blake;

S. 2900. An act granting a pension to Hannah G. Huff;

S. 351. An act to increase the pension to Samuel S. White;

S. 1400. An act granting a pension to William Lyman Chittenden;

S. 2764. An act granting an increase of pension to William Murphy;

S. 3200. An act granting an increase of pension to Luke H. Monson;

S. 2483. An act granting an increase of pension to Lewis C. Beard.

S. 2215. An act granting an increase of pension to Robert J. Koonce;

S. 2276. An act granting an increase of pension to George W. Ragland;

S. 3418. An act granting an increase of pension to Eliza Adelaide Ball;

S. 2296. An act granting an increase of pension to John J. Sears;

S. 316. An act granting an increase of pension to Louann A. Perry, of Wallace, Kans.;

S. 3289. An act granting a pension to Isabella Underwood;

S. 3215. An act granting an increase of pension to Andrew F. Dinsmore;

S. 2154. An act granting an increase of pension to William A. Owens;

S. 1890. An act granting a pension to S. E. Treadway;

S. 1996. An act revoking and annulling the subdivision of Pencote Heights, in the District of Columbia;

S. 2926. An act to prevent dangers to navigation from rafts on the Pacific Ocean;

S. 1612. An act providing for the purchase of metal and the coinage of minor coins and the distribution and redemption of said coins;

S. 2870. An act concerning disbursing officers of the Subsistence Department of the Army;

S. 3270. An act for the relief of Nathan S. Jarvis;

S. 3249. An act to remove the charge of desertion from the naval record of Charles C. Lee;

S. 3060. An act for the relief of James C. Drake;

S. 1596. An act to equalize and regulate the duties of the judges of the district courts of the United States of Alabama;

S. 3662. An act granting an increase of pension to Louise D. Smith;

Senate concurrent resolution:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the statue of Oliver P. Morton, presented by the State of Indiana, to be placed in Statuary Hall, is accepted in the name of the United States, and that the thanks of Congress be tendered the State for the contribution of the statue of one of the most eminent citizens and illustrious statesmen of the Republic.

Second. That a copy of these resolutions, suitably engrossed and duly authenticated, be transmitted to the governor of the State of Indiana;

S. 3300. An act granting an increase of pension to Luke H. Monson;

S. 3352. An act granting a pension to Sarah Kersey;

S. 1939. An act authorizing the President of the United States to appoint a commission to study and make full report upon the commercial and industrial conditions of China and Japan, and for other purposes; and

S. R. 72. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States to appoint David Bagley as an additional cadet at the Naval Academy, Annapolis, Md.

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

H. R. 99. An act to establish a military post at or near Des Moines, Iowa; and

H. R. 9497. An act to amend an act providing for the construction of a light-ship to be located near Cape Elizabeth, Me.

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

H. R. 470. An act granting a pension to Jane Dykes;

H. R. 3538. An act granting an increase of pension to Charles Ross;

H. R. 6700. An act granting an increase of pension to Maria Andrews;

H. R. 6701. An act granting a pension to Serelda C. McGrew;

H. R. 3012. An act granting a pension to Sarah Claggett;

H. R. 2597. An act granting an increase of pension to Charles Kauffung; and

H. R. 1763. An act granting a pension to Ella F. Sydnor.

ARMY APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its sitting.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Republican Congressional committee, I feel an interest in the charges that Republicans voted for the Puerto Rican bill in order to secure a campaign fund, as made in the Star that was published last night and reproduced in the Post this morning. I want to say to this House, Mr. Chairman, that in my judgment no man who is worthy of belief would make such a charge and withhold his name from the public. And so far as I am concerned, and those with whom I am associated, I pronounce the charges absolutely false. I believe, if the charge was made as stated, that the man making it will never dare let his name be known so that he can be proven a common falsifier; and I believe that a paper of the character of the Star has no right to send out to the public such grave charges affecting the integrity of members of Congress anonymously, so that the members are helpless to prove the falsity of any such accusations.

We heard in this debate on yesterday some very strong statements in regard to the crime we are committing in trying to enforce the authority of this Government in the Philippine Islands. We have heard to-day a large amount of newspaper criticisms and newspaper opinion upon the present situation in the United States and in the islands. It struck me that while we are reading extracts, it would be a good idea for my Democratic friends to learn the high estimation in which they are held in the Philippine Islands.

I have here some extracts that were taken from a prisoner captured just outside of Manila in the month of November, with certain papers upon him, which translated read as follows; and if my friends will follow this reading, they will see that, while they have enthusiastic admiration and love for the insurgents, for those who are killing our soldiers and defying our authority, at least those gentlemen, who are rather ignorant as to the location and as to politics in this country, are equally in love with them. This is a translation made from papers found on a prisoner who was captured trying to get the Filipinos who had enlisted with us to go over to their side, on the promise that they would give them commissions if they would go and see that they were properly rewarded after the next election.

I do not charge that these articles were ever published, but they were circulated among the Filipino insurgents and throughout the islands as if they had been, and the ignorant Filipino supposed them genuine.

[From the Hongkong Daily Press.]

THE AMERICAN AND FILIPINO DEMOCRATS.

LONDON, *September 7, 1899.*

The Democratic party of New York sustains the candidacy of Mr. W. J. Bryan for President of the United States in the coming elections.

In a meeting held yesterday by this party, a banquet was given in honor of "Aguinaldo, chief of the Filipino revolutionists," who was acclaimed as a true hero.

Here is another dispatch:

[From the Times Weekly. London edition of the 8th of September, 1899.]

"UNITED STATES.

"President McKinley arrived in Philadelphia on the 5th of September, 1899, for the purpose of attending the encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic.

"On Tuesday the representative Democrats from the vicinity of Chicago held a caucus (meeting) in Cooper Union. The speakers denounced energetically the policy pursued by President McKinley in the Philippines * * * and declared in favor of Mr. Bryan as candidate for the Presidency. The meeting cheered Aguinaldo, who was acclaimed as one of the heroes of the world.

"'Por los Democratas de la tribuna de Chicago' 'Tribuna' has the sense of the meeting place for a legislative body such as Congress, thus creating the impression that would be conveyed by Democratic caucus of the House of Representatives.'

"President arrived in Philadelphia on the 5th day of September for the purpose of attending the encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic.

"On Tuesday a meeting was held in Cooper Union by the Democrats. The speakers denounced emphatically the policy of President McKinley in the Philippines, and declared for the candidacy of Mr. Bryan for the Presidency. The meeting gave three cheers for Aguinaldo, who was declared to be one of the heroes of the world."

This and the one on the other page are translations of papers taken off a native who was tried before me this morning and found guilty of trying to get soldiers to desert and go over to the other fellows, promising them commissions, etc., if they would only go. As we were unable to prove that he was ever in the service, could not make a case against him of being a spy. They were merely writings pretending to be copy of articles that appeared in various newspapers. When you take in consideration that "Aggie's" last peace commissioners asked if a concurrent resolution of Congress would be able to tie the President's hand, you can see that the effect of the speeches you sometimes hear about are worth more here than they are in the United States.

Thinking that you might be able to make good use of these, I had a translation made for you. The originals are in the files of the S. P. C. No. 322.

A great many of the natives think that Congress will do something this winter that will make all the army leave here; and if they can see that is false, the end may come sooner.

I simply want to show by this that the insurgents are looking to the Democratic party for whatever hope they can have of ultimately driving American power from the Philippine Islands; and the war has been continued and will continue by the word that is sent from here that if they can only hold out until after the Presidential election during next fall, the Stars and Stripes will be removed from those islands and the government will be turned over to the men who have defied our authority.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that these men—that is, our friends on the other side, who believe in maintaining the supremacy of the Government—should let this great Government of ours settle in our own way and in our own time what will be done. They ought to cease such speeches as the gentleman from Tennessee made yesterday, denouncing us for asserting our authority.

I now yield thirty minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PARKER].

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, it is true that the amount appropriated by this bill is large. It represents the pay and the support and the supply of nearly 100,000 American soldiers, most of whom are fighting in the Philippines for the establishment of order and such good government as we are going to furnish them as soon as they stop shooting at us. Mr. Chairman, we shall vote the bill for the support of those soldiers, who

ask of us that when we vote to support them there we should not stab them in the back by attacking the military of the United States for putting down the insurgent rebellion in those islands.

One gentleman on the other side shrieked at us, "Where is your policy? Why don't you declare your policy? Why don't you say what you are going to do in those many islands occupied by many tribes?" Any American will declare our policy to be that when they shoot at us we will shoot back until they stop shooting, and then give them such a government as they are able to maintain and are willing to maintain. When the people of those islands, or rather the peoples of those islands, for they are many, each of them, are willing to and able, or any of them are willing or able, to accept free government, then, in so far as they are able, we will grant it. But until then I denounce the spirit that will vote money to the soldiers on the one hand, and then be ignorant enough to lend wings to the bullets against them, and force to the powers that fight against them, by talking as we have heard members talk here.

Mr. Chairman, it is not my purpose further to discuss the appropriation mentioned in this bill, but the circumstances of the case render it necessary that something should be said now as to what shall be done with our Army in the future. A large part of it is enlisted only to the 1st of July, 1901. Officers and men leave the United States service at that time. Are any of these officers to be taken into the old line? Are these men and regiments to be taken into the Army then? These are questions that will shortly come before this very Congress, probably at the next session.

Our brave defenders are entitled to know what provision is to be made before their absolute discharge. We want no such spectacle as when the magnificent army of 250,000 men which was enlisted for the war had to be discharged because the war ended and because a proper and permanent army bill did not go through both Houses of Congress. What is more, the question of army reorganization is upon us. The Secretary of War truly says, in substance, that when we remember that at the outbreak of the Spanish war we had neither modern rifles nor smokeless powder, it is well to be careful that we shall not drift back into something like the same conditions.

When we remember that in a war against a power not of the first class it took us months of weary waiting to obtain supplies, equipments, clothing, equipage, and transportation for our comparatively small Army; when we remember the weary sickness and deaths that attended that work, we must remember also that the people have not forgotten, and that they will demand of us such an organization of the Army of the United States as shall make it capable of instant, immediate extension, and mobilization without friction, so as to be able at least to furnish the first fighting line against any power on the globe; and if we do not do that, if we do not realize what is asked of us, or at least attempt it, we shall fail in our duty.

Considering the present temper of the House and their desire to get through with this bill, I have given up the idea that I had of placing before the House a carefully elaborated speech on the subject of army organization. If I do it, it will be under the leave to extend my remarks. But I can not refrain from indicating the points which I think are salient. And first, if an army be properly organized, its small size will not prevent the power that owns it from being a great military power. Germany is probably the greatest military power in the world, all in all, not perhaps in numbers, but certainly in efficiency.

But history tells us the military greatness of Germany dates from the time when Napoleon ordered that only 90,000 men should be in the German line, and when she passed this 90,000 men through the line as a process of education, keeping them in active service only two, three, four, and up to six months, until she could turn them back to their own homes as educated soldiers who knew their duty.

In this way she obtained several hundred thousand men ready to take the reserved stores of arms and march against that very Napoleon who had made that order—not only trained men, but young men, with young officers who had not grown old as officers of the regular establishment, but had the welfare of the nation at heart and were alive. The modern military motto is short service and a trained reserve, that no nation that wants to be a real military power can do without. Short service avoids expense and keeps the ranks small, while a trained reserve will fill those ranks, as Germany filled hers when she called her men to go against France in 1870 and when the millions marched to the border on a few days' notice.

This plan does not involve conscription. It is just as applicable to a volunteer army, and our Regular Army is a volunteer army. Let a man be enlisted for a period part of which he shall serve with the colors, and during the other part be at his home, ready to join those colors in case of necessity, and you have the Swiss system and the German system.

The Germans have enlarged the time of service with the colors to two years, with several years more at home ready to join on call. The Swiss allow only a few months for the training of the soldier, longer in the artillery and cavalry, and shorter in the infantry. Both nations have the system of short service, and a reserve, a system eminently American, one fit for a people's army, one fit for a nation which says that the President shall be Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States and of the militia when actually called into service of the United States.

There are some strange things about this curious provision for short service. It wakes up the officers as well as the men. If an officer has a lot of old soldiers and gets in a few recruits daily, he leaves their training to the first sergeant. But if men are only enlisted for two years, and half of the men are new every year, and if a company officer has to present the company for inspection within three months from the time it is brought to him, he must be alive.

He takes them into the regiment, and the regimental commander must be alive to present the regiment in three months to the brigade, one-half of which is composed of new men, and the brigadier-general has to be alive for three months to present his brigade in time for maneuvers in the autumn. This work runs through successive years. Thus the officers are working constantly, not simply to maintain an old and established regular army, but to train the people of the nation so that they shall be ready for the call to arms.

This plan makes it necessary to have local recruitments. Imagine the first regiment, say, of the United States infantry, with less than half of its active members in the ranks, the others having graduated from the school of war and being ready at call.

That first regiment, when it sends for its men, wants to find them together. If they are found in one State, in one city, in one locality, all that it does is to give notice to the men to repair to the halls where their guns and uniforms are kept, to put on their uniforms, to hang up their citizens' clothes, and march to the front to do their duty until they return and hang up their uniforms, put by their guns, and take their places among the people again.

One further consideration; local recruitment prevents desertion. A man does not dare to desert when his comrades live in his own neighborhood.

Again, this plan makes the army a part of the people. And the army ought to be part of the people, with sympathy the one for the other. I do not know whether the sentiment of this country can be now brought forward to such a step as to feel that the Regular Army, like the militia, should be part of the people, most of them living among the people, although subject to the call of their officers, and yet citizens following the pursuits of peace.

Whether our people are ready to adopt a plan so foreign to that of the standing Army as it has been understood may be doubtful; but it is certain that this step, which has made the German and Swiss armies a citizen army, has been the power that has worked for peace through the great continent of Europe.

Mr. RIDGELY. May I ask the gentleman a question? I am in perfect accord with the sentiment of the gentleman's speech; but I want to ask him if he does not believe and know that there is a constant pressure in this country to separate the Army as much as possible from the citizenship.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. I am not talking of what pressure there may be; I am talking of what ought to be. I do not believe that the gentleman's suggestion is correct; but I know that it is not germane to my argument, which is directed to what we should do as patriots.

Mr. RIDGELY again rose.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. I have but ten minutes, and I hope the gentleman will not press his inquiry further.

Mr. RIDGELY. The gentleman's remark suggested that there was something in the way of doing this thing.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. I did not go into what was in the way.

Mr. RIDGELY. You mentioned it.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Tradition has been in the way—tradition since the time of Washington has been in the way. We have regarded the Army as consisting of hired men enlisted from day to day. Thank progress and the management of the Army that it now contains a different set of men. Soldiers are now allowed to buy their own discharge; if they serve faithfully they are excused from service after a certain time; they are no longer flogged by way of punishment, and they are seldom imprisoned.

The usual punishment is by light fines and other small penalties. The general sentiment of the Army has raised its tone until we are proud to associate with the "boys in blue," whom we take by the hand. Regulars and volunteers throughout, they represent the great body of the people of the country—its youth and its bravery. And now is the time to put the Army upon a permanent and yet a popular basis.

Little of my time remains, Mr. Chairman, but I will proceed to another point. The Constitution says that the President shall be the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United

States. Mr. Chairman, he must be. No general in chief of the Army can take the place of the President in war. The Army and the Navy have to work together; he only can control both. In a war the question whether an advance shall be made is not always to be governed by purely military considerations.

The President is sometimes forced to try what is desperate. The advance and battle may be dictated, as at Santiago, by considerations not only of finance, not only of home policy, but probably (though we do not know it) by high and secret diplomatic policy. We had to try; we had to go ahead; no merely military considerations as to the danger or the season or the fevers or the smallness of our preparations could keep the President back, as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, from ordering that victorious advance, which came so near being a defeat, but which, nevertheless, was necessary then to end the war.

Under such circumstances nobody but the President can be commander of the Army. General Schofield, who had been General Commanding the Army, who had been Secretary of War, who had likewise been major-general for years, when asked about this matter in 1898, testified before the committee that it was impossible to have a permanent General Commanding the Army; that such general had only had a real command in one year, when the command was in General Grant; that at all other times, when others held that position, whom he named, it was impossible that the General Commanding, as well as the Secretary of War, should rule.

He advised that the place of General Commanding the Army should be a mere detail, as chief of staff for the President; that the President needed some one as his executive officer to do his will, to see that it was carried out; but in order that that should be done properly, the officer should be detailed from time to time. He suggested that the President has this absolute power now, not by law, but by the Constitution, but that a definite law would enable him to exercise it without injury to anyone's feelings if it were understood that the place of chief of staff, general in chief, or whatever it be called, the President's executive officer, should be a position held only for a short time and at his order.

In this way only can a military officer be put at the head of the staff departments as he should be, as well as at the head of the line. The President changes every four years. Make the general in chief really chief of staff, the President's own adjutant, named, as the adjutant is named in a regiment, by the President himself, from time to time, and that supervisory and benign power can be exercised over both staff and line.

Many other questions in the Army may be said to be subordinate. Give full military control over staff and line, and old traditions and the crust of departments will disappear, and the live man can make himself felt.

Another suggestion as to Army legislation: It is dangerous to try to specialize too much. It could sometimes be wished, especially in time of war, that every law on the subject of the Army were wiped off the statute books and that the moneys were given directly to the Commander in Chief to provide the men and to expend almost as he sees fit.

There must be rules and regulations, but there is such a thing as specializing too much. We are the only country in the world clever enough to educate our officers in all branches of the service. At West Point we educate the officer in engineering, artillery, infantry, and cavalry, with sciences and languages.

No other school in the world does that. Elsewhere they make artillery officers or engineer officers or infantry officers or cavalry officers, but they do not teach all branches. We do it, and we have felt the good of it, because when a man becomes a general and receives an independent command he must know something of all branches. He must be enough of an engineer to intrench his troops. He must know how to deal with cavalry and artillery as well as infantry. He must, to a certain degree, be master of all arms of the service. Above all, he must be a master of the art of transportation.

In General Grant's history of the civil war he spends more time discussing the relief of Chattanooga than any battle. He details with pride how he arranged his Northern railroads to ferry the cars across the Ohio River, so that they could be sent down and dumped as fast as they were unloaded, new cars being brought down with every train, with only wild-cat engines going back, so that he was able to supply that starving army and give them the provisions and munitions of war to go forward on their triumphal march.

We all remember that the only thing known about Sheridan before the war was that he was a good quartermaster, and it stood him in good stead when he got to fighting battles and making fast marches, and he kept his men fed. We know what that means in general. In time of peace remember that the Army should be so arranged that the officers should get full staff training, and that is one reason for the system of details to the staff department proposed by the Secretary of War, a Secretary whom all admire, a Secretary who at least knows what he does know, and who says that he has accepted a retainer to take care of the Army and that he is going to do it as well as a lawyer can.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. HULL. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey five minutes additional.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Now, Mr. Chairman, let us recapitulate, for there is no time for argument. Modern experience would dictate very radical Army reforms, short service, and a reserve, local recruitment and provision for the expansion of the Army from within, when it is needed, so that your 50,000 men can become 250,000 men by the filling up of their companies, and go forward under the same officers.

The men will thus be young and the officers kept active by the constant schooling that they must give. The President should have by law what he has by the Constitution—absolute control of the Army and the right to nominate his chief of staff from year to year, if he pleases, and certainly with every new President, unless it be a reappointment.

Wherever possible there should be details to the various branches of the staff, not only so that the staff may do its duty with more knowledge of the needs of the line, but so that the line officers may learn about staff duty. This is the naval system. A war college is proposed by the Secretary of War. We should have it by all means, even if we doubt whether it is possible to make these details and some promotions by examination and certificate of a war college. I am not much of a believer in examinations myself. It may be that we will do better by sheer seniority, with the understanding that the man must do full duty in any of these departments, and that every man shall be expected to do everything that he is detailed to, and to be an all-round man.

We will do well to take hold boldly of the question of the Army. No one loves it better than I do. Relatives and friends serve in it. Nor should there be much legislation, least of all by Congressional interference with its discipline. But this House should take hold boldly and see that our Army is properly organized and reserve stores sufficient kept for the national defense.

At the outbreak of the last war we had not enough rifles. The Military Committee had done its best to get them. I believe it was at the time of the Venezuelan scare that we inquired how many we had and what facilities, and we doubled the amount requested by the Secretary of War to provide the new rifle. We have not yet enough. They are not furnished to our militia. There are 100,000 in the National Guard and they have not got those arms yet. There is no reserve for war.

It is true the manufacture is still going on, and it is hoped that this want may be filled. Under the rules of the House it has been decided that the Military Committee can not provide additional machinery in the arsenals, even for the manufacture of small arms, much less for making cannon.

Large supplies of the best arms and ammunition are absolutely necessary for proper preparation for war. Everything else can be provided on the moment. What is more, they cost little to provide. A soldier's gun and ammunition cost but a few dollars, while his support for a year averages a thousand dollars. A nation of freemen should have a rifle ready for every man. The Boer war has shown what can be done by military preparedness, just as our own war with Spain showed us what it was to go into battle with black powder and rifles of short range.

It is admitted by all that cavalry and field artillery should be maintained in time of peace rather than infantry, because they can not be provided or drilled quickly in time of war. A few years ago it was the fashion to sneer at these arms, and we heard of nothing but fixed fortifications. The South African war has shown what artillery and cavalry can do and that infantry can not ever advance safely within the range of the modern rifle without first clearing the ground by the use of these arms.

Our present provision of 10 regiments of cavalry is too small, even for our present force of 100,000 men, and entirely too small if we should be forced to enlarge our Army or call out the militia. Our provision for field and horse batteries is simply ridiculous. The numbers of guns contained in the field, horse, and mountain artillery are, in Russia, 3,912; France, 3,048; Austria, 1,524; Italy, 1,266; England, 768—but now many more—Japan, 712; Bulgaria, 414; Portugal, 216; Servia, 276; Sweden, 276, and in the United States, 84.

It is now proposed to increase each of the field, horse, and mountain artillery so as to give them 144 guns in all. Of course we have others in reserve. Our Ordnance Department is made up of men of great talent, but it needs the willingness of Congress to provide our Army with what I venture to say they have not now—nonrecoiling carriages, which allow rapid-fire, Maxim, and other small repeating cannon—and to provide them in such a quantity as that they shall be available upon a sudden call of war.

We have said nothing yet of the militia, the National Guard. There is no body of men that so much needs the same provision of short service. The older men are relied upon for the defense of

homes, for steadiness and conservatism in the midst of insurrection or riot, but the experience of the late war has shown that the active list should be composed of those who are young and ready for active service; that they should be ready at the call of the President for service anywhere, and that the older men only should be reserved entirely for the proper functions of militia. I quote from the remarks of Governor Mount at the convention of 1900 of the Interstate National Guard Association.

How to organize and better equip a national reserve or national guard is the important question for your consideration. The National Guard is not wanting in promptness, patriotism, nor in drill, but it is deficient in that it has not taught the guardsmen how to meet the needed requirements of a soldier in active service. [Applause.] It has instructed him in the manual of arms, in squad, company, and regimental drill, but not how to march, camp, draw rations, properly prepare them, and observe sanitary conditions.

* * * * * * *

I believe it would be wise to organize a national reserve of 200,000 strong in lieu of the present National Guard. These should be mustered into United States service when enlisted, as well as into State service, and be subject to the call of the President in time of war. We saw the weakness of a National Guard in the Spanish war when called into camp—the next thing to decide whether they were going to the front to fight, and all the paraphernalia of remuster and reexamination had to be gone through. This is too serious a process for an efficient army in the emergency of war. They should be mustered under the vigilant inspection and examination of the United States, so that only men are enlisted who have the physique and the strength to become soldiers indeed. The officers should be appointed by the governors, the appointments based upon competitive examination rather than political reward or favoritism. [Applause.]

This reserve of the National Guard should be uniformed and equipped by the United States. State laws should be in accord with Federal requirements as to drill, care of uniforms, arms, etc., and yearly encampments for drill, discipline, camp training should be held under the supervision of United States officers. Regular troops should encamp and drill with these National Guard reserves. Under such provision the United States might have in reserve a formidable army without the cost and objection incident to a large regular army. The military spirit would be augmented in the State, the best men enlisted, with competent officers to command. Then the esprit de corps of the National Guard would not only be maintained, but it would be improved.

These are practical suggestions, and the militia, too, must be thoroughly armed, thoroughly equipped, and properly divided between the different branches of the service—in marching and camping, and of taking care of itself like a regular force. The people are done with the business of playing soldiers. They want the reality.

Mr. HULL. I hope the gentleman from New York will now use some of his time.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Chairman, since the commencement of this session of Congress several resolutions expressing sympathy with the South African patriots have been introduced in this House by myself and other members. The Speaker has referred these resolutions to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and, although ample time has elapsed, that committee has taken, so far as we know, no action, and apparently does not intend to take any action in regard to the same.

For that reason, and lest a more favorable opportunity shall not be available, I desire at this time to express and to place on record my condemnation of the unjust, the inhuman, the predatory, the cruel, and the barbarous war the Empire of Great Britain is ruthlessly and relentlessly conducting in South Africa to destroy and exterminate two brave little republics, sisters of our own, and as free and as independent as this Republic.

Mr. Chairman, the patriotic people of this country take a deep and an abiding interest in the life and death struggle between republic and empire now going on in South Africa. As an American citizen and a Representative in this Congress, I am not ashamed to have it known that my sympathy is now, always has been, and always will be with the heroic Boers in their magnificent struggle to maintain their freedom and their independence against the piracy of the corrupt oligarchy now controlling the policy of the British Empire.

I am with the Boers and I want to see them maintain their independence because they are right and because they are free and deserve to be free. In a contest between liberty and monarchy I want to see liberty win.

The cause of the patriots of South Africa is a just cause. No one who impartially reads history can honestly dispute it. They are defending their homes and repelling a tyrannical and a remorseless invader. England's attempt to steal their country is the outrage of the century, the culminating atrocity of criminal British aggression, and should be condemned by this Republic and by the Christian powers of the world.

In my judgment, if I mistake not public opinion, nine-tenths of the American people are against England in this bloody war of conquest for sordid gain and in sympathy with the Boers. The best thought of England condemns the conflict, and the awakening conscience of the British Empire demands peace with honor in the name of humanity, Christianity, and civilization.

In 1776 the patriot fathers of this Republic fought England to gain our independence. The South African patriots to-day are fighting the same country to maintain their independence. That is the only difference.

The courage of the Boers in the face of tremendous odds has challenged the admiration of mankind, and their heroism against almost insurmountable obstacles has won the respect of the civilized world. They are entitled to our sympathy, and we would be false to ourselves and to all our history if we did not give it to them. The sacrifices they have thus far made and the gallantry, heroism, and bravery they have exhibited are unequaled and unparalleled in the history of the world.

The story of the struggles, the hardships, the trials, and the triumphs of these brave people in South Africa is one of the saddest and one of the greatest pages in all history—an imperishable heritage to every lover of liberty, and to their hardy and valorous descendants an incentive to maintain their freedom, that can never be crushed. No true American can impartially read the history of the Boers without feeling a deep sympathy for them in their present struggle to uphold and defend their independence against English greed for gold, English tyranny, and criminal British aggression for land.

In regard to all the facts of the case there may be some honest difference of opinion; but if there is, it is based, I believe, to a large extent on misinformation or a lack of knowledge of all the circumstances. English agencies have been sedulously at work for some time unceasingly disseminating misinformation in regard to the Boers and the true situation in South Africa. Let me ask you all to search out the truth ere you pass judgment on the brave republicans of South Africa.

Let us briefly review the situation. We must not rely too much on the colored, the doctored, and the censored British reports from English sources in Cape Colony. England is now and always has been unscrupulous. In a war like this—a war against humanity—she has little regard for truth.

In South Africa there are two free and independent countries—one called the "South African Republic," the other called the "Orange Free State." They are duly organized Governments, republican in form, patterned to a great extent after our own, and recognized as free and independent throughout the world. As a matter of law and as a matter of fact, England has no more right to meddle with them or to interfere in their internal affairs than she has to meddle with Mexico or interfere in the internal affairs of the United States. These States are now and have been ever since the convention of 1884 free and independent States. There can be no controversy about this.

These brave South African patriots are a good deal like the patriots of our own Revolution. They love their homes, their freedom, and their liberty. They come from good old Saxon ancestors from the north of Europe. They love free institutions, the same as we do, for the sake of personal liberty. It comes to them naturally and by inheritance. Their love of liberty is not of a day or of a year, but of centuries.

They are a brave, a fearless, a patriotic, a liberty-loving, and a God-fearing people. Many years ago their ancestors emigrated from Holland, from France, and from other places in the north of Europe to Cape Colony in order to live under free institutions, enjoy the blessings of liberty, and worship their Maker according to the dictates of their own conscience.

The Puritan, the Hollander, the Irishman, the German, and the Cavalier came to this country for the same reason and for the same purpose.

These sturdy immigrants and their heroic descendants carved out unaided and alone their own destiny in the wilds of the Dark Continent amid unspeakable hardships and privations and gave to the world a civilization as good as our own. For a century and more, in sunshine and in storm, these brave people toiled and plodded on, and they builded, like the fathers of this Republic, better than they knew. Surrounded by savages, harassed by wild beasts, visited by famine and scourged by disease, in all the long weary and dreary years they never lost hope; they prayed to God and never despaired.

They are a simple Christian people, as honest as they are brave. They redeemed the wilderness, turned the desert wastes into sweeping fields of grain, made the jungle blossom and bloom like a rose, and dotted the hills with villages and towns. Notwithstanding all they had to contend with, they grew, they prospered, and they were happy until perfidious Albion came. From that day to this England has made cruel war on the Boers. She has repeatedly robbed them of their lives, their property, and their lands.

But the spirit of their love of liberty has never been broken. You can not conquer a brave people inspired by the love of freedom and battling on their own soil for their homes and their liberties. They will never surrender their principles. They will resist oppression and tyranny until they are exterminated by overwhelming and superior force. They know, like Patrick Henry, that resistance to tyrants is obedience to God. Their love of liberty is stronger and more tenacious than their love of life. Their history is an epic poem of one long heroic struggle against English greed, English tyranny, and English oppression.

These brave Boers are now fighting, perhaps for the last time, for republicanism against monarchy; for democracy against plutocracy; for home rule against the bayonet; for the ballot against the throne; for the love of home against the love of gold; for Saxon freedom against British tyranny; for the integrity of their country against a ruthless invader; for the schoolhouse against the army barracks; for religious freedom against foreign domination; for the fireside of civilization against the blazing torch of devastation; for free institutions against imperialism; and, above all and beyond all, they are fighting a battle for the rights of man. God grant that their liberties and their independence shall not be destroyed.

When we consider it all, how true seem the words of Lowell:

> Truth forever on the scaffold, Wrong forever on the throne;
> Yet that scaffold sways the future, and behind the dim unknown
> Standeth God within the shadow, keeping watch upon His own.

To-day in South Africa Truth is on the scaffold and in England Wrong is on the throne.

The absolute independence of the South African Republic was finally recognized by Great Britain in 1884, and ever since then it has been as free and as independent as our own great Republic.

Prior to the year 1884 these brave and fearless men and their ancestors had struggled and struggled for a century and more to establish what they now possess and what they are at present so gallantly fighting to maintain—a free and independent government of their own. Once, twice, three times has England violated her solemn pledge to them and trespassed on their sacred rights. She saw what they had wrought, and her greedy sons coveted it. The Boers were compelled by English greed and tyranny and power to move farther and farther inland. Whenever they thought they were secure and had the right to enjoy the blessings of liberty and self-government, England encroached on their domain, waged pitiless and savage war against them, and drove them farther and farther from the sea.

To their credit and their glory, however, be it said that every encroachment on their land, their rights, and their liberties has been manfully and stubbornly resisted. They were forced to move on, but they never gave up their freedom; they never surrendered their independence.

Prior to the present conflict Majuba Hill marks the place of the last contest with Great Britain of these valorous people for their homes and their firesides. Majuba Hill! Forever glorious in the annals of the South African Republic's struggle to maintain its independence. Majuba Hill to them is the same as Bunker Hill to us, and both will live in history to the end of time as an inspiration to man.

After this disastrous blow to British arms the convention of 1884 was entered into, and all other and prior treaties were annulled. By this treaty the South African Republic became free and independent and took its place among the nations of the world. And Lord Derby, then secretary of state for the colonies and a very different man from Joseph Chamberlain, distinctly stated in Parliament that the South African Republic was independent and free to govern itself. The question of England's paramountcy in South Africa was not mentioned, and never a word was said about British "suzerainty."

That great English statesman, friend of the Boers, friend of liberty and of Irish home rule, William E. Gladstone, said the word "suzerainty" was dropped on purpose.

Even as late as May, 1896, after the Jameson raid, Mr. Chamberlain said in the House of Commons:

> A war in South Africa would be one of the most serious wars that could possibly be waged. It would be a long war, a bitter war, and a costly war. It would leave behind it the embers of a strife which I believe generations would hardly be long enough to extinguish. To go to war with President Kruger in order to enforce upon him reforms in the internal affairs of his State, in which secretaries of state, standing in this place, have repudiated all right of interference—that would be a course of action as immoral as it would have been unwise.

Now, sir, I say, from the record, that it must be clear and plain to everyone who has reviewed the question from an English as well as a Boer standpoint that the South African Republic is and was since 1884 a sovereign and independent State. In proof of this I cite the additional fact that it was admitted to the International Postal Union, that it was a member of the Convention of Geneva, and that our own Government and all the other powers recognized it and appointed to it consuls. The United States consul at Pretoria to-day is acting in that capacity, not only for us but for Great Britain as well.

Under all the circumstances, it seems to me England is now precluded from raising the question of the independence of the South African Republic. For England to raise this contention at this late day is a mere flimsy pretext, an afterthought of Cecil Rhodes and Joseph Chamberlain, and constitutes a blunder worse than a crime.

The question of suzerainty was not raised at first in the differences with the South African Republic. There never would have been trouble if gold had not been discovered in the land. The rich find of gold there is at the bottom of it all. Love of gold is the cause of this cruel Anglo-African war.

Cecil Rhodes, the most daring and colossal grabber and manipulator of the century, coveted the Boers' golden land. He wanted it for his English chartered syndicate. He and Chamberlain instigated the Jameson raid, and Chamberlain repudiated it when the Boers made it a miserable failure. Cecil Rhodes plotted and planned against the Boers. He stirred up dissension among the people at Pretoria; he conspired in South Africa and in Europe to overthrow the Republics. He is the power behind the British ministry in this war, and Chamberlain is now, and always has been, his willing tool.

This conflict should be called Cecil Rhodes's war for gold and conquest in South Africa. He is responsible for all the woe, all the sorrow, all the despair, and all the misery this war has caused. He is the Pizarro of the nineteenth century.

Mr. Chamberlain and Mr. Rhodes began the present trouble by taking up the alleged grievances of the English aliens or uitlanders in South Africa. Mr. Chamberlain practically demanded they be enfranchised without abjuring or renouncing their allegiance to the British Crown. This proposition is, and was, preposterous. No government on earth would submit to it.

If the English aliens in the Transvaal wanted to become citizens of the Boer Republic, they had to comply with the law, just the same as English aliens in this country, in order to become citizens of the United States, must comply with our law and renounce forever their allegiance to the British Crown. The law there regarding naturalization is just about the same as the law here. If anything, it is more liberal.

But be these grievances of the foreigners in the South African Republic regarding franchise, taxation, and representation just or unjust, reasonable or unreasonable, it was no cause for this sanguinary war. As a matter of fact, however, the South African Republic was willing to comply with every request of the English Government regarding the franchise and all other alleged grievances of the uitlanders.

I think it can be safely stated that the Boers were willing to arbitrate all questions of difference between the two Governments; but England declined and began a systematic concentration of English troops on their frontier, which in itself constituted a practical declaration of war against them.

And, sir, let me say right here that if the friends and sympathizers of England urge as a reason for British interference and as a justification of this war the alleged grievances of the uitlanders in regard to the franchise, taxation, and representation in the Transvaal, the friends and sympathizers of the Boers answer that England's rules, laws, and regulations regarding American aliens in the British Klondike are more severe, more grievous, and more burdensome. And yet does anyone here urge a war with England on account of the grievances of American miners in the British Klondike?

From all the facts and circumstances in the case, I am convinced and clearly of the opinion that England has no right to interfere in the internal affairs of the Boers. Her pretexts for doing so are untenable, and her entire course in the matter has been selfish, cruel, unjustifiable, and dishonorable.

The war she is waging against them to-day is the most criminal, the most defenseless, and the most predatory war in all history. The Boers at all times were willing to concede every fair and just demand England made. Nothing would satisfy Rhodes and Chamberlain. They wanted the land of the Boers because it contained gold, and all the other incidental demands were merely pretexts. As soon as one was conceded, another and a harder one was made.

The truth is, and history will so record it, that England wanted the control of this country because it is the richest in gold in the world. England always puts in a claim where gold is found.

England is now, and always has been, the aggressor against the Boers. The concentration of British troops on the frontier of the Orange Free State and the South African Republic was a virtual declaration of war. England forced the war. England began it. The Boers yielded everything but independence to satisfy England. If the Boers had not struck for their rights, their firesides, and their independence when they did and as they did, they would have been overwhelmed by superior British forces before they could have struck a blow and resistance would have been useless. They were right in striking when they did.

I glory in the spunk of grand old Paul Kruger. He is one of the world's great heroes. He knew only too well how dangerous was delay, and everything that has occurred since he issued his defiant ultimatum to the British Crown has demonstrated his wisdom and his foresight. He is a grand old man, one of the world's immortals, and will always stand out on the pages of history as a friend of man, a lover of liberty, and a champion of freedom.

The ultimatum he issued to England rang round the globe, and will live in the world's history.

The Boers will never surrender their love of liberty. They can only be conquered by being exterminated, and England must not be permitted to exterminate them and steal their homes. Her criminal march of devastation must and will be checked.

America should do its duty. The great Republic, the beacon light of the world, in the name of liberty, humanity, and justice, must demand peace and make that demand good. We have the right to insist on peace with honor. We have the right to express our sympathy. We have the right to aid the Red Cross Society. International law gives us these rights, and we should exercise them. Why are we silent?

We sympathized with Poland, with Hungary, with Greece, with all the South American Republics, with Armenia, and with Cuba in their struggles for freedom. Many we helped. Why, I ask, in the name of all that is just and honorable, in the name of our glorious past, should we now refuse to lend our moral support, our sympathy, and our aid to the patriots of South Africa? Is the great light of the Republic going out? Is American sentiment dead?

A republic that has sunk so low that it glories in the downfall of a sister republic is in danger of destruction itself. A republic that refuses sympathy to a sister republic struggling to maintain its independence against monarchical agression is unworthy the name and in danger of monarchy itself. A republic that will secretly aid a monarchy to destroy a republic and blot out its free institutions is a republic rotten to the core, and will soon fall like a decayed tree on the banks of a turbulent stream to be swept away forever.

Mr. Chairman, in my opinion the defeat of the Boers will be the severest blow to republican institutions that has been struck in more than a century, and every friend of liberty the world over should fervently pray that Oom Paul may be successful. How patriotic citizens of this country can sympathize with Great Britain in this cruel, unjust, and unholy war against our two sister Republics is beyond my comprehension. Their defeat will be a terrible blow to free institutions on this hemisphere, and give thrones and empires a renewed lease of life at the very dawn of the twentieth century.

The Committee on Foreign Affairs, this Republican Congress, and this pro-English Administration of William McKinley will do nothing for liberty, nothing for the Boers, and secretly sympathize with Great Britain. Every liberty-loving citizen of the Republic should denounce and condemn these pro-English and imperialistic tendencies. This Republic should stand by republics—not against them. I want to see the right triumph, and if it does the Boers will maintain the independence of their country.

God bless the embattled farmers of South Africa is my fervent prayer, and from the ashes of the conflict may there arise a greater and a grander republic—the glorious United States of South Africa. [Prolonged applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. HULL. To whom does the gentleman from New York now yield?

Mr. SULZER. I will yield to the gentleman from Iowa to consume a part of his time.

Mr. HULL. I do not propose to go on now. We had sixty-five minutes each when the gentleman from New York took the floor, and we have the right to close the discussion.

Mr. SULZER. How much time has the gentleman from Iowa now?

Mr. HULL. We had sixty-five minutes when the gentleman from New York began.

Mr. SULZER. If the gentleman has no one to whom to yield who wants to use any time, he can yield it to me.

Mr. HULL. I will not yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SULZER. I ask the Chairman to recognize the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LENTZ].

Mr. LENTZ. Mr. Chairman, how much time have I?

Mr. SULZER. I ask the Chairman to recognize the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LENTZ] in his own right.

Mr. HULL. The Chairman can not do that, because the House has agreed to limit the general debate until 4 o'clock. The gentleman from New York knows that the Chairman can not recognize the gentleman from Ohio in his own right.

Mr. LENTZ. Mr. Chairman, I want to know how much time is left on this side?

The CHAIRMAN. Forty-five minutes.

Mr. HULL. I will yield the gentleman from Ohio five minutes of my time now.

[Mr. LENTZ addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. HULL. I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MARSH] out of my remaining time.

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Chairman, but for the very extraordinary speech just delivered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LENTZ], I should not trespass for even one minute upon the time of the committee. The speech of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LENTZ] was perhaps characteristic of the gentleman. In the absence of facts he drew liberally upon a very brilliant imagination. Just what the gentleman from Ohio was endeavoring to establish is somewhat difficult to ascertain from the remarks he made.

From the beginning to the end his speech contained nothing except one complaint after another. He has earned, if ever a man earned, the sobriquet of the great scold. He has scolded the Administration of the last three years. He has found nothing in it to commend and everything in it to scold and find fault with. There is nothing in the gentleman's speech that is calculated to build up and make stronger and more mighty the country that honors him with a position upon this floor. On the contrary, he has exhausted his great intellect in endeavoring to belittle his own country and the Administration thereof.

The most violent and vituperative enemy of the American Republic could have said no worse things than have been said by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LENTZ] to-day. The man who might be hung upon the gallows for treason to the country could not have uttered more diabolical and improper sentiments than has the gentleman from Ohio. [Applause on the Republican side.] And I want here, in my place, to characterize the gentleman's speech from the beginning to the end as a disgrace to the American Congress, as a violation of all the decencies that pertain to this House. He has misrepresented history; he has misquoted history; he has misrepresented the Administration; he has misrepresented the majority of this House. He has exhausted his whole vocabulary in unjust and false accusations against his country and against this Administration.

I make these remarks upon my own responsibility as a member of this House here, and as a gentleman outside of the House. [Derisive laughter on the Democratic side.] I am responsible for them here and I am responsible for them elsewhere. [Applause on the Republican side.] One of the beautiful things in the Constitution of the United States is, and one of the beautiful principles of the Constitution of the United States is, that no man can be punished under the law for words used in debate. Hence, the gentleman from Ohio goes scot-free notwithstanding the false representations and charges that he has made upon this floor to-day.

Mr. Chairman, the bill before the House is a bill appropriating money for the support of the United States Army during the next fiscal year.

Mr. LENTZ. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. MARSH. Yes.

Mr. LENTZ. I would like to have some of these documents that I read from the War Department contradicted. I understand the gentleman to say they were false. Now, which one of them is false?

Mr. MARSH. The gentleman will hear from me before I get through. If I had any language at my command to make my meaning more clear and emphatic than I have, I would use it; but I know of none.

Mr. Chairman, the bill under consideration is a bill appropriating money for the support of the Army during the next fiscal year. Notwithstanding the long diatribe of the gentleman from Ohio, he proposes to vote for that bill. I believe there is no contention here as to the propriety of passing the bill. But the gentleman confines himself to a denunciation of the condition of things that makes the appropriation necessary. He says that the war in the Philippine Islands is an unholy war, and that it ought to be stopped by diplomacy.

Why, Mr. Chairman, early in the spring of 1898, preceding the war with Spain, the President of the United States, who had been denounced and ridiculed upon the other side of this House, was endeavoring by all the diplomatic power in his possession to prevent this very war. Gentlemen upon the other side were nagging this side and nagging the Administration, charging that we were afraid to go to war. The President of the United States was using every instrument within his power by diplomatic proceedings to prevent the Spanish war. But unanimously, almost, upon that side of the House the cry was, "Down with diplomacy." Gentlemen insisted upon war. I am not finding fault with that side for the course they pursued at that time, because I was of the same opinion myself. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I had no more confidence in diplomacy then to settle and prevent war with Spain, or to settle upon proper terms the great questions that then existed, than I have to-day that diplomacy should be used to settle the troubles that exist in the Philippine Islands. I was for force then as I am for force now, and so long as there is one insurgent in the Philippine Islands who is resisting by arms the sovereignty and the authority of the United States Government, I shall be for force. Then, when we were at profound peace, gentlemen on that side were for war, and the President was for diplomacy. As soon as the war came on, before even the hundred days were over during which the war lasted with Spain, gentlemen upon the other side of the House commenced to cry for peace; and from that time until now they have

vociferously contended, in season and out of season, for peace, for pacification, for the settlement of these troubles by diplomacy.

Who was there in the Philippine Islands with whom to negotiate diplomatically? There was no organized government in the Philippine Islands with whom the Government of the United States could treat if it had been disposed to treat. As I said, before the war came our friends on the other side were for war and after the war came they were for peace. It reminds me of what a gentleman in my section of the country said a good many years ago, who was not very friendly to the Democratic party. He said there was one thing about the Democratic party, that in time of peace it was hell for war and in time of war it was hell for peace. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LENTZ] talks about the condition of things in this country in the days of Thomas Jefferson. He instituted a comparison between the expenses of the War Department under Thomas Jefferson and the expenses of the War Department under President McKinley.

Well, Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LENTZ] wants to go back to the days of Thomas Jefferson, I have no objection to his doing it, but I want to tell him that he will have to emigrate from this country to find conditions in all respects such as existed when Thomas Jefferson was President. You would not only have to stop the clock of time, but you would have to turn it back for a century. All the great improvements and advances that have been made in the arts and in the sciences, in human progress and human liberty, would have to be turned back one hundred years. If that is what the gentleman from Ohio desires, he will have to emigrate from this country, because the people will not consent to any such turning back.

Yet if the gentleman will make a computation he will find that in comparison with the population of 1800, the wealth of the country in 1800, the extent of the country in 1800, and the size of the Army in 1800, comparing them with the present day, he will find that the Army, even now upon a war footing, is not in excess of the proportion that existed in the days of Thomas Jefferson.

The gentleman talks about expense. It is expensive to maintain an army. It is expensive to maintain a great country like that which you and others here represent, a great progressive and growing country that has ceased to be a third, a fourth, or fifth class nation, but in the last two years is recognized by the powers of the world as stepping into the front rank of the nations of the world. Occupying that rank, occupying that position—and I am proud we occupy that advanced position among the nations of the world—there comes upon our Republic responsibilities that did not rest upon it in its youthful days under the Administration of Thomas Jefferson.

Can not the gentleman from Ohio recognize what has taken place in this country in a hundred years? Has he been asleep all this time; has he not read the history of the progress of the American people, of the world, since 1800, of the one hundred years that have passed? Oh, he says, we have abandoned the Monroe doctrine! We have not. The Monroe doctrine is to-day just as it has always been. There is nothing that this country has done in the last two years that militates in the slightest degree against the principles of the Monroe doctrine.

Those principles are living principles to-day, having just as much force and obligation upon us to-day as they did, and even more than they did on the day on which they were proclaimed. There has been no abandonment whatever of the Monroe doctrine growing out of the results of the Philippine insurrection. But the gentleman says that militarism has taken possession of the country; that the Republic is in danger because of the militarism that exists in the country to-day.

It became necessary to enlarge our Army because of the Spanish war and the Philippine insurrection; and yet, Mr. Chairman, you may take the Army upon a war footing as it is to-day, and it amounts to 1 soldier to 1,000 of our people; it amounts to 100 soldiers to 100,000 people; it amounts to a thousand soldiers to 1,000,000 of our people. Is there anything to be alarmed at in that condition and that strength of the military arm of the Government? Four-fifths of that army is being utilized outside of the limits of the United States, and is being utilized for the sole and only purpose of suppressing an armed insurrection and rebellion against the authority of these United States.

I hold, Mr. Chairman, that our title to the Philippine Islands is as complete as is our title to the State of Florida. We acquired each of them from Spain; we acquired each of them by treaty with Spain, and the duty of the National Government to maintain its authority in the Philippine Islands and suppress insurrection and armed rebellion against the United States is just as strong and just as powerful as it would be to suppress rebellion in the State of Florida. It rests upon the fact that the sovereignty of the United States extends over the Philippine Islands as well as it extends over the State of Florida.

Our title to the Philippine Islands and to Puerto Rico is as complete and as indefeasible as our title to the Louisiana purchase. We acquired one by a treaty which has no more sanctity and binding efficacy than the other; and while Florida contains one State and the Louisiana purchase contains fourteen States and Territories, the ægis and sovereignty of the United States is there, no more there and no more right to be there than it is in the Philippine Islands; and there was a time, an unpleasant and unhappy time, in the history of our country, a time that I hope to God will never come again in this land of ours, when it became necessary in order to maintain the integrity of the Union, to maintain and assert the sovereignty of the United States over all our territory, to wage a war four years long. That is what we are doing there in the Philippine Islands.

I say here that if the President of the United States should of his own motion abandon the Philippine Islands, withdraw the Army and Navy therefrom and allow them to go scot-free, he would be liable and subject to impeachment by the House of Representatives and conviction by the Senate. And in the prosecution of this armed force in the Philippine Islands the Administration is doing nothing more nor less than what is its bounden duty to do. Aye, more; the Congress of the United States, men on both sides of this House, I am glad to say—men on both sides of this House in the last days of the last Congress passed a bill, with a very few dissenting votes, authorizing the President to raise an army of 100,000 men. For what? To be sent to the Philippine Islands to maintain our sovereignty in the Philippine Islands, to maintain it in Puerto Rico if necessary, and to carry out the purpose of the Government with reference to Cuba. The Democratic side of this House bear a part of the responsibility of this existing Army, as well as this side that I am on. What did you expect the President to do with these troops when you voted authority to him to raise 100,000 of them? The war with Spain was over; peace had been declared.

The treaty had been ratified by the Senate of the United States and, I believe, by the Spanish Government, although the interchange had not taken place between the Executives of the two Governments; yet we were absolutely at peace with Spain; no war with Spain; no war with any country on earth; yet our Democratic friends, in the closing days of the last Congress, stood up here, with few exceptions, and voted authority to the President to raise 100,000 troops. Why did you do it if it was not for the purpose of asserting and maintaining the authority of the United States Government in those islands? Why, then, this complaining from the gentleman from Ohio, complaining of the President for doing the very thing that Congress, on both sides of the House, authorized him and clothed him with 100,000 men to do?

Did you give him that 100,000 men in order that the Secretary of State might write some diplomatic letters on the subject? No; you gave it in order to clothe him with the necessary military power to do just exactly what he has been doing in the Philippine Islands. And I say that if the mouth of the gentleman from Ohio is not closed, the mouths of a good many of you are; and it comes with bad grace from gentlemen who voted for that bill to attack the Administration for using these very soldiers in the very way and manner that you knew he was to use and expected that he would use them when you voted him 100,000 men a little over a year ago.

Mr. LACEY. Will the gentleman yield to me for a question in this connection?

Mr. MARSH. Certainly.

Mr. LACEY. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LENTZ], without attempting to vouch for the correctness of it, placed in the RECORD a statement that a thousand handcuffs were sent to the Philippine Islands to handcuff our soldiers there who are insane. He does not claim to vouch for it, but suggests it and puts it into the RECORD. I would like to hear from the gentleman from Illinois, a member of the Military Committee, what basis there is for it.

Mr. COX. I would like to ask the gentleman where it came from; the Military Committee never heard of it.

Mr. MARSH. I think it came from the brilliant brain of the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. RICHARDSON. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LENTZ] stated that he took it from the Evening Star.

Mr. COX. Who?

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. LENTZ, the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. MARSH. It is in keeping with a great many other things which the gentleman from Ohio indulged in.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman yield to me for a question?

Mr. MARSH. Certainly.

Mr. COX. It is said that the Democrats on this side of the House and the Democrats on the committee voted to authorize the President of the United States to call out a hundred thousand men. Upon examination the gentleman will find that there was no such authority conferred.

Mr. MARSH. I said nothing about the committee. I said that both sides of this House voted for the bill on the 3d day of March,

a year ago, to authorize the President to raise and recruit 100,000 soldiers and to use them until the 1st day of July, 1901. My recollection is that a majority of the gentlemen on that side of the House voted for that bill. I have not got the RECORD, but my recollection is that a large majority on the other side voted for the bill, and the query has occurred to me, Why did you clothe the President a year ago this month, after the war with Spain had closed—why did you clothe him with the power to raise a hundred thousand more troops unless it was to use them just as he is now and has been using them?

When you authorized that hundred thousand men to be enlisted did you expect the appropriation bill to be about the same as the war appropriation bill in the days of Thomas Jefferson? Of course you did not. You were fully aware when you voted the President 100,000 men, to be used until the 1st of July, 1901, that it would take over a hundred million dollars this year out of the public Treasury to defray the expenses thereof. And I submit that it is not the square thing for gentlemen upon that side of the House to find fault with the amount of this appropriation bill.

I submit that it is not the fair thing, and I do not believe many on that side of the House would indulge in it. I do not think there are many outside of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LENTZ] that would indulge in it. I do not think there are many on that side of the House who are disposed to criticise the Administration because the expenses of this Army this fiscal year have amounted to $127,000,000, or because the probabilities are that the expenses of this Army for the next fiscal year will be $112,000,000. It does not come with a good grace from your side, any more than it would come with a good grace from my side.

I believe that the great Democratic heart of this country, largely as it is represented upon this floor of Congress, is as anxious as I am, as are the gentlemen upon my side of the House, to assert and maintain the sovereignty and the power and the authority of the United States over every foot of land that we possess; and if the President should be derelict in that respect, if he should abandon the Philippine Islands to anarchy and mob law and mob rule and withdraw the Army and Navy therefrom, there are no men in the country who would be more prolific in their denunciations of the President than the gentlemen on the Democratic side of the House.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I did not intend to occupy even one-half of the time I have, but the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LENTZ] quotes what he vouches were the words of General Lawton. General Lawton, fortunately for him [LENTZ], is dead. General Lawton can no longer speak; he can no longer be heard. His memory may be traduced; he may be misrepresented, as many a man who has gone to his long home in the past has been misrepresented. That interview he vouches for, in my opinion, never was uttered by the tongue of General Lawton. I say that from my general knowledge of his character and from some things that came to us from his pen, that no man can deny. I will read from a letter written by him but a very few days previous to his death an extract, in which he says many other things:

> I wish to God that this whole Philippine situation could be known by every one in America as I know it. If the real history, inspiration, and conditions of this insurrection, and the influences, local and external, that now encourage the enemy, as well as the actual possibilities of these islands and peoples and their relations to this great East, could be understood at home, we would hear no more talk of unjust "shooting of government" into the Filipinos or of hauling down our flag in the Philippines.
>
> If the so-called anti-imperialists would honestly ascertain the truth on the ground, and not in distant America, they, whom I believe to be honest men misinformed, would be convinced of the error of their statements and conclusions and of the unfortunate effect of their publications here. If I am shot by a Filipino bullet, it might as well come from one of my own men, because I know from observation confirmed by captured prisoners that the continuance of the fighting is chiefly due to reports that are sent out from America.

That sounds to me much more like the real character of General Lawton than the purported interview which the gentleman from Ohio had read from the Clerk's desk.

Now, Mr. Chairman, a word further and I am through. I always feel like asking the pardon of the House when I have trespassed upon it even for a short time.

I did not participate in the Puerto Rican debate, for the reason that in February a year ago, by the courtesy of the House, I addressed it, and on that occasion I advocated the very lines that were adopted in the Puerto Rican bill that passed the House. I took the ground then and have been absolutely confirmed in it since, that the Constitution of the United States does not go proprio vigore into the territory that we may acquire; that its principles and guaranties can only go there by enactment into statute.

I moreover said in that discussion, having more particular reference to the Philippine Islands, in answer to what was said to me by a gentleman then on the other side, who is not here now, Mr. Dockery, whom I respect and honor very highly; in answer to a suggestion from him that the people of the country were opposed to the acquisition of these islands, that the workingmen and the farmers were opposed to the acquisition—in response to that statement of his, I said, while occupying the floor, that it had been the policy of the Republican party and of the country for forty years to protect American industry and American workingmen against the cheaply paid labor products of other countries; that now we had taken into our possession the Philippine Islands, if the country adhered to the economic policy to which it had been committed for forty years, the products of the cheap labor of the Philippine Islands would not be allowed to come into this country in competition with the better paid labor of our own workingmen. I said further, that when the workingmen and the farmers of our country understood, as they would understand, that Philippine cheap-labor products could not come here in competition with theirs, they would stand where I stood, in favor of extension and expansion, in favor of the acquisition and retention of those islands.

The Puerto Rican bill embodies the principle which I announced at that time and which I proclaimed in my own Congressional district on more than twenty public occasions during the last summer and fall. I do not intend to discuss that principle at any length.

I want to call the attention of the House to some statistics on the subject of Puerto Rico. It is claimed that this Puerto Rican bill is levying tribute upon the people of Puerto Rico; that it is oppressive upon them. I deny that it is either levying tribute in any sense of the word or placing burdens unjustly upon those people.

Let me call attention to the burdens that were put upon them under Spanish rule: For 1898 the estimates for customs under Spanish rule were, in round numbers, $3,377,000; taxes, in round numbers, $1,000,000; monopoly revenues, $184,000; postage stamps, $128,000; lotteries, etc., $309,000; other sources, $106,200, making $5,157,200 of taxes that were laid by Spanish authority upon the people of that island; and those did not include the local taxation of towns, cities, and villages. Note that the customs alone were $3,377,900. And none of that money went to the benefit of Puerto Rico; all went for the benefit of Spain, to be expended wherever she chose to put it; $1,152,000 went to the Spanish army.

Under the Puerto Rican bill as it passed the House the whole amount of taxes to be collected in Puerto Rico and in this country would amount to not exceeding $750,000, as against $3,377,000 collected under Spanish rule. Besides, every dollar of the $750,000 derived from duties imposed by the Puerto Rican bill goes to the benefit of Puerto Rico; not a cent of it goes into the United States Treasury, not a cent of benefit is to be derived from it by the people of the United States; but every dollar of that revenue goes to the people of Puerto Rico. We do not extend to Puerto Rico the internal-revenue system that we have for ourselves.

The extension of the internal-revenue system to Puerto Rico would be burdensome upon those people in the depressed condition of their business interests at present. Instead of the Puerto Rico bill being oppressive upon the people of Puerto Rico, you may, in my judgment, search the history of the world from the beginning down to this time without finding anywhere in all the history of legislation an instance where the people have been so liberally, kindly, and generously treated as the Puerto Ricans have been by that Puerto Rican bill and the bill that passed the other day devoting to the use of the Puerto Rican people the revenues derived from our taxation of imports from Puerto Rico, amounting to over two million and a half of dollars.

Search the history of legislation from the beginning of government and you can not find anywhere such liberality and generosity as have been displayed in the legislation of this Congress already enacted and in the Puerto Rican bill which passed the House and is now pending in the Senate.

Some members inquired what book I was reading from. I have been reading from Dr. Carroll's Report on Puerto Rico, made last November to the President of the United States. Dr. Carroll was sent to Puerto Rico by the President as commissioner, and this is his report.

Now, the Puerto Rican legislation which passed this House is temporary in its character. There is no civil government in Puerto Rico now that can levy taxes in the interim between now and the establishment of a civil government there. It takes some little time to establish a civil government. It may be done this year. I hope it will be done by this Congress. Even then it will take time to get that newly established government into operation so that it can legislate and by virtue of its legislation derive revenue to support the local government.

It takes the machinery of government one year after we have made the assessments, in my State, before we succeed in getting the money in the treasury to be available for use. So even if this Congress succeeds in establishing a government in Puerto Rico, it will take some little time, a year or two or three, before that government will be in shape to pass the necessary legislation to raise revenues and administer them.

So that this legislation is temporary in its character, and in my judgment is right. Now let me read you from what Dr. Carroll says. Dr. Carroll, speaking with reference to the future and

final disposition of things in these islands, says that reciprocal relations ought to exist between Puerto Rico and the United States; and I agree with him in that—that the time will come when those reciprocal relations ought to exist between Puerto Rico and this country, just as they exist between Arizona and the rest of the country. But I call your attention especially to what he says should be done in the meantime, in the interim. Speaking of the customs tariff collections as being $3,377,000 under Spanish law, he says:

It would seem to be prudent not to revise the Puerto Rican tariff so as *very greatly* to reduce the customs revenue, at least for the period ad interim.

That is the advice of Dr. Carroll, who is upon the ground. We have reduced them not inconsiderably either. We have reduced them from nearly $4,000,000, as they were under Spanish rule, to about $750,000 under the Puerto Rican bill, and more than half of that is paid at this end, and the other half at the other end.

So, Mr. Chairman, the principles involved in the Puerto Rican bill and the policy embodied therein, in my judgment, are correct. And I want to say here that it will be a matter of pride to the people of this country hereafter, it will be a source of great satisfaction to the people of this country hereafter, to you and to your children who come after you, that the first law of Congress placed upon the statute books after the acquisition of these islands, relative to these islands, asserts the principle that the Constitution, by its own vigor, does not go there.

I thank the committee for their attention. [Applause.]

Mr. HULL. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. TONGUE].

Mr. TONGUE. Mr. Chairman, a few days ago the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SIMS] commented upon the services, casualties, and pension applications of certain volunteer regiments engaged in the late war with Spain.

For some purpose which I do not understand he instituted a comparison between eight Northern regiments and eight Southern regiments. I quote from the record of the gentleman's remarks the following:

I now read, and insert as a part of my remarks, a list of eight regiments of volunteers who took part in the Santiago battles, with the list of casualties and number of applications for pensions.

Regiments of volunteers.	List of casualties in Santiago battles.				Number of claims filed on account of service.			
	Killed.	Wounded.	Missing.	Total.	Invalids.	Widows.	Dependents.	Total.
Second Massachusetts Infantry	5	40	....	45	424	15	28	467
First United States Volunteer Cavalry	15	76	2	93	209	16	16	241
Seventy-first New York Infantry	13	60	43	116	255	11	39	305
First District of Columbia Infantry	....	....	....	....	409	....	10	419
Ninth Massachusetts Infantry	....	....	....	....	552	15	78	645
Thirty-third Michigan Infantry	....	....	....	....	413	9	37	459
Thirty-fourth Michigan Infantry	....	....	....	....	466	9	60	535
Eighth Ohio Infantry	....	....	....	....	447	5	35	487
Total	33	176	45	254	3,175	80	303	3,588

It will be seen by reference to these tables that the 8 volunteer regiments had a total of 209 killed and wounded, and that the applications for pensions filed by these 8 regiments are 3,588, or 17 applications for pensions filed for each soldier killed or wounded.

It will be seen that the above 8 volunteer regiments are from Massachusetts, New York, District of Columbia, Michigan, and Ohio—all from the North, where it is popular to favor liberal pensions.

I now read and make a part of my remarks a list of casualties and applications for pensions for 8 other volunteer regiments, as follows:

Volunteer regiments in the war with Spain.

Regiments.	Strength.	Casualties.				Number of applications filed for pension.
		Killed in action.	Wounded.	Died.	Total.	
First Alabama Infantry	1,651	.....	.....	16	16	71
First Georgia Infantry	1,331	.....	.....	11	11	65
First Kentucky Infantry	1,334	.....	.....	28	28	122
First Mississippi Infantry	1,141	.....	.....	30	30	66
First South Carolina Infantry	1,359	.....	.....	18	18	110
First Tennessee Infantry	2,026	1	.....	25	26	174
Second Tennessee Infantry	1,419	.....	.....	15	15	93
First Texas Infantry	1,397	.....	.....	15	15	60
Total	.....	1	.....	158	159	761

It will be seen that the total number of deaths, killed, and wounded in these 8 regiments are 159; that the total number of pension applications by soldiers of these 8 regiments are 761, or, in round numbers, 4 applications for each death in these 8 regiments.

These last 8 regiments are from the States of Alabama, Georgia, Kentucky, Mississippi, South Carolina, Tennessee, and Texas, where the pension evil has not reached the horrid proportions it has in the Northern States, and where the people are still willing to make a living by honest toil and are not knocking at the doors of Congress day and night for the passage of legislation enabling them to appropriate the hard earnings of other people to their own use.

The extreme injustice of these tables and comparisons is apparent to the most casual observer. In the northern regiments no account is taken of deaths, except of those killed in battle. By counting only the killed and wounded in the northern regiments, he finds that there are 17 pension applications for each soldier killed and wounded. Had the gentleman followed the same method of comparison for the 8 southern regiments, he would have found that there are 761 pension applications for each soldier killed and wounded in those regiments. What glory can be gained by such a comparison is beyond my comprehension. If these soldiers had need of a champion to praise or defend them, they should pray to be saved from their friend from Tennessee.

But, Mr. Chairman, the attempt to institute a comparison between Northern and Southern soldiers is unjustifiable for any purpose or from any point of view. The courage, devotion, and patriotism of the American soldier, North or South, East or West, in the late war, or in any war, has been conceded by all, questioned by none, except so far as it is called in question by the remarks of the gentleman from Tennessee. The bravery of the Southern soldier in the late war, as in every war in which he has drawn his sword, has been and is conceded by the people of the North as freely as by the people of the South. No soldier in any age, in any country, or in any section exhibited unflinching courage in a higher degree than the soldiers who made, as well as the soldiers who repulsed, the immortal Pickett's charge on the fields of Gettysburg.

But why does the gentleman now raise this cry of sectionalism? What good purpose can be served? One of the most beneficial and glorious results of the late war was the welding together of the North and the South—a firmer union of one people, under one flag.

The attack of a foreign enemy, the insult to the flag, the destruction of American lives by a treacherous people, was miraculous in its effect upon our divided countrymen. It healed every wound of the civil war, brushed aside every cause for estrangement, and welded our divided country into a more perfect and lasting union. Sectional lines were obliterated. The bitterness that had lingered so long was effaced. Old hatreds were forgotten, and Confederate and Federal, the Blue and the Gray, the men who made and the men who repulsed Pickett's charge, united as one man, under one flag, in defense of one country. In the language of a distinguished Southern Senator, in an instant "there was no North, no South; one country and one flag."

I warn the gentleman from Tennessee that no patriotic citizen of the United States should attempt to destroy this union of sentiment and substitute the old-time bitter feelings of sectionalism.

But, Mr. Chairman, I did not rise so much to criticise the gentleman from Tennessee as to call attention to the record of a regiment he has failed to notice. I would not institute any odious comparisons with any other regiment. I would not attempt to distract one iota from the praise or fame or glory due to any other soldier. I simply want to call attention and give a just meed of praise to a regiment whose history is such a record of unflinching courage, undying devotion to the flag, danger defied, battles heroically fought, and victories won that the heart of every man, woman, and child in our own State thrills with pride at the mention of the Second Oregon. Let me place the record of this regiment side by side with those named by the gentleman from Tennessee.

Record of Second Oregon Infantry.

Killed	16
Wounded	74
Missing	3
Died	4
Total casualties	137
Number of pension applications	178

It will be seen that there are approximately one and one-fourth pension applications for each soldier, dead, wounded, and missing, and less than two pension applications for each soldier killed and wounded, as against 761 pension applications for each soldier killed and wounded in the eight regiments whose records were eulogized by the gentleman from Tennessee. But this by no means gives a complete record of the Second Oregon; its glory rests on much more solid foundation.

The Santiago campaign lasted from June 23 to July 17—in all, 25 days. The Second Oregon anchored at Manila Bay June 30, 1898, and embarked for the return journey June 14, 1899. It engaged in the first battle at Manila, February 5, 1899, and ended its fighting career by the capture of Aryat at 5 a. m. and Pasing at 9 a. m. May 22, 1899. In this fighting campaign of three months and seventeen days it marched 538 miles in rain and mud and

through unbroken country. It fought, and it is needless to say won, 42 battles, skirmishes, and engagements; it merited and received words of praise from every general who commanded it in the field—from Anderson, Wheaton, Merritt, and on three occasions from the bravest of the brave, the gallant, lamented Lawton.

The quality of the men who composed the Second Oregon was indicated by a brief order of General Wheaton at Melinto: "Orderly, overtake those Oregon greyhounds on the road to Polo and order them to Melinto. Go mounted, or you will never catch them." When, after the glorious victory at Malabon, General Wheaton was asked, "Where are your regulars?" he pointed to the Second Oregon, saying, "There are my regulars." A volume would not record the heroic deeds of those boys. At Malabon those brave young soldiers charged across the open rice fields, upon which they left many dead and wounded, in the face of a murderous fire from an entrenched foe and planted the Stars and Stripes upon the fortification of a defeated enemy. No veterans the world ever saw showed more cool, steady, and determined courage than the boys of the Second Oregon in that magnificent conflict.

The story of this regiment would be incomplete without some description of the men who composed it. People look to the West for brave, but rough, strength of character. Doubtless you are thinking that these soldier boys learned skill with the rifle, coolness in danger, and endurance in camp and on the march in the wild frontiers, hunting in the mountains, or herding on the plains of some imaginary "wild and woolly West." Let me undeceive you. These men were of the best "ye breed" in every sense. Out of the 1,190 enlisted men, there were 531 of these members of different church organizations; 114 were college graduates, 156 were students, 34 were merchants, 28 were teachers, 15 were lawyers, 15 were bookkeepers, 141 were clerks, 123 were farmers, 69 were skilled mechanics, and 175 were laborers.

When a railroad was captured, the Second Oregon furnished an engineer, who had left employment at $150 a month, to man the engine. When a town with waterworks out of repair was captured, the Second Oregon furnished the engineer to repair the waterworks and put them in running order. When the custom-house was organized, the Second Oregon furnished largely the clerical force, as it did for the quartermaster's department. When an educational system was instituted in Manila, a private from the Second Oregon became superintendent of public instruction.

It is the old story. The most remarkable courage is intelligent courage. The bully from the prize ring, when the real conflict comes, is a coward by the side of the more intelligent young man, who has left behind him a mother, wife, sister, or sweetheart, whose name he fears to tarnish even by the appearance of cowardice.

I present the record of these men as the tribute of the State of Oregon to flag and country. As citizens of that fair young Western State, where "rolls the Oregon," we are proud of them. We cherish the living, we honor the dead, and shall erect fitting monuments to their memory.

That other American soldiers under like conditions would have done nobly I doubt not. But it fell to the lot of the Second Oregon to be placed in a situation where supreme courage was the imperative need of the hour. Like true heroes they rose equal to their opportunities and the occasion; met every emergency, responded to every demand, discharged every duty, laughed at every danger, and left behind them a record of heroic achievements never excelled in any land or in any age. Not only the State of Oregon, not only their own country, but their race should be proud of such men. Their record proves what humanity can and will achieve, what it can and will suffer, when duty calls for great suffering or great achievement.

Mr. Chairman, if this Republic should be endangered, it will be through the negligence, not the wickedness, of its citizens.

The welfare and happiness of every man, woman, and child are dependent upon the honor of their country's flag, the quality of its laws, and the proper administration of every department of its Government. Our country preserves for us all that we have that makes life worth living. It protects property from the hands of violence, reputation from the tongue of slander, family honor from the invader of homes. The eloquence of Demosthenes, the music of Milton, the humanity of Shakespeare, the wisdom, devotion, and patriotism of Lincoln could not have flourished under the hand of tyranny.

But to properly preserve and administer every department of a great government wisely and well, to enact and enforce good laws, to give to each citizen as much freedom of action as is consistent with public safety and the welfare of others, requires thought, toil, intelligence, patriotic devotion to the country's welfare. It requires the faithful, conscientious performance of his public duties by every citizen of the entire country. A government like ours should be in fact, as well as in name, a government by the people and by all the people. The man who shirks, who fails to do his part, is recreant to a most sacred duty.

The man who receives the blessings and protection bestowed by a government like ours and does not in return perform faithfully and conscientiously his own public duties is taking something for nothing, something he has not earned, and is guilty of moral larceny. Yet there are men of wealth, the protection of whose persons and property occupies the time of our courts, the watchful care and attention of our officers, the thought and labor of our legislators, the courage and suffering and lives of our soldiers, who never in their lives gave a moment's thoughtful consideration to a single public duty.

There are men of culture, educated at schools supported by the public or by the endowment of patriotic men, who draw closely about them their robes of self-righteousness and shrink from public duties as something that might contaminate their immaculate purity or darken the whiteness of their hands. But even this is not all. Not content with neglecting their own public and political duties, they stimulate and encourage others to equal guilt with themselves. They point the finger of scorn at those whose public duties are well and faithfully done. They proclaim that politics are unclean, that public men are coarse, selfish politicians, that voters are corrupt. This is a vile, damnable slander upon many men who are infinitely their superiors in the discharge of public duties.

Against the example and conduct of such as these it is a pleasure to place the record of a band of men who have done their full public duties like heroes and patriots. They received little from the Commonweath, yet offered to lay down their lives for it. Of the average citizen their country requires little of his time or thought or labor, and this little is too often denied. These soldiers, young men on the threshold of their lives, took life and limb and happiness, all they have, or are, or hope be, and placed all on the altar of our common country, and some, alas, completed this great sacrifice. No wonder that when these boys returned to Oregon the woods and hills, the mountains and valleys rang with joyous welcome, and the very birds sang diviner and more inspiring songs in their honor.

A word for the heroic dead. They have performed the noblest and sublimest act it is given to humanity to achieve; they have given their lives for their country. Theirs were not lives nearing their close, worn out with dissipation, broken with toil, devoid of hope, their cup of happiness drained to the dregs, and nothing left worth living for. Theirs were lives at the beginning, unspent, everything to hope, everything to achieve, everything to live for. Before the prime of manhood had been reached their life's work had been done and well done. Their rest will be eternal, their fame secure. For those who returned, full of hope and full of honor, life holds many temptations and many dangers; the rest and happiness they crave may not be theirs.

Hope may turn to disappointment; the honors they have so proudly won may be sullied; we hope and pray not. The fame and honor of no man is safe this side of the grave. But the fame of these heroic men, "dead on the field of honor," is secure. Their honor will be forever unsullied, their memory will be like sweet perfume. They have received and are wearing their crown, and no power on earth or in heaven will pluck it from their brows.

On Fame's eternal camping ground
Their silent tents are spread,
And Glory guards with solemn round
The bivouac of the dead.

These men and their thousand comrades in a few months of war achieved more for their State, more for their country and its future advancement and future greatness; made more and grander history; have written their names higher and more legibly upon the scroll of fame than the 100,000 men who remained at home will in a lifetime of peaceful occupation.

The gratitude of their country will be theirs for all time; their memory will be cherished as long as youth loves life; their examples will be a treasure and an inheritance of inestimable value to generations yet unborn.

Through the late conflict our nation has received a new baptism of freedom; we have acquired new heroism and new heroes for future and higher inspirations. We have placed patriotism above business and valued liberty more than wealth. The hearts of poet and orator have been touched with a holier fire. We have learned diviner songs, instinct with national spirit, and that thrill and throb through every heart, East, West, North, and South.

Now, more than ever, we are one people, having one language and one law and under one flag. And among those who have contributed to this glorious result, in the first rank, second to none, stands the Second Oregon.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. PARKER of New Jersey having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the President of the United States, by Mr. PRUDEN, one of his

secretaries, announced that the President had approved and signed bills and joint resolution of the following titles:

On March 26, 1900:

H. R. 4686. An act for the relief of J. A. Ware;

H. R. 2956. An act to extend the time for the completion of the incline railway on West Mountain, Hot Springs Reservation; and

H. J. Res. 159. Joint resolution to amend joint resolution to furnish the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to members of the press, etc., approved February 17, 1897.

ARMY APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its sitting.

Mr. HULL. The time for debate has expired, and I ask the Clerk to read.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

COMMANDING GENERAL'S OFFICE.

To defray the contingent expenses of the Commanding General's Office, in his discretion, $1,750.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Before proceeding with my remarks I want to thank the gentleman who has just taken his seat for the complimentary way in which he referred to Pickett's division at Gettysburg. I believe, Mr. Chairman, that I am the only man on the floor of this House who was in that charge, and I am prouder of it than he possibly can be. [Loud applause.]

Mr. Chairman, it is not my intention to discuss fully the pending bill, but matters to which it relates. There is no one occupying a seat in this House that would withhold from our gallant soldiers a bountiful supply of everything that will make them as comfortable as soldiers can well be and in every way possible relieve their burdens and alleviate their sufferings; but when we pause and consider the vast sums of money appropriated by this bill alone, not considering the naval and other appropriations yet to be provided for, and further consider that these vast sums are being appropriated in a time of at least comparative peace, and, further, that our war with Spain has long since ceased and that the insurrection in the Philippine Islands has been pronounced as practically at an end for the past four months, I shall not wonder that the taxpayers of the country will ask, and that not without reason, Why the appropriation of these vast sums of money and the continuance of the burdensome and unnecessary war tax?

The appropriation made by this bill is largely for our army now in the Philippines.

By the results of the war with Spain, or rather, I may say, by what is called that peculiar, unaccountable, unexplainable "manifest destiny" that we hear talked about as having marked the march and progress of this great Republic on its course to grandeur and to glory, we are in the military possession and occupancy of portions of the Philippine Islands, which were by the treaty of Paris ceded to this Government; and for the title we received from Spain we paid $20,000,000, and thereby these islands are under the military control of this country, and it is seriously urged by some to be permanently held by us a part of the territory of our country.

The acquisition of foreign territory by this Government and its incorporation into and as a part of ours is such a radical departure from all the teachings of the founders of the Republic and all that is truly American and fraught with so much danger that we can not but contemplate such action with the gravest fears as to the result.

The problem is one of perplexity to all patriotic and true Americans, and demands at the hands of the Congress of the United States the most weighty consideration and the exercise of the profoundest wisdom.

Now, the question most naturally arises, When the insurrection in the Philippines has been fully and finally quelled, peace and order therein restored, and armed resistance to the military authority of the United States shall have ceased, what shall be done with the islands, or rather with their inhabitants?

Shall Congress legislate in regard thereto, and so legislate as to make the islands irrevocably a part of our great domain, placing them on the same footing as our other Territories and their inhabitants citizens of our Republic; or shall we let them go and tell their people that we began the war with Spain for the sake of humanity, and that we still stand by that declaration, and that we regard "forcible annexation as criminal aggression," and that as the fundamental principles of our Government forbid us attempting to govern a people without their consent, and that as they have evinced a disposition and determination not to be governed by us, therefore, if they will formulate their own government in their own way and make to us full reparation, that we will withdraw the military arm?

Mr. Chairman, we do not now, nor will we when peace and order is restored in these islands, own them or their inhabitants. If we should decide to retain them the most we could claim would be the right to govern the people; and what shall be the form and character of such Government? They are now without civil government, at least have only such as the military authorities of the United States now in the islands, acting by the authority of the President, may choose to furnish them. The people of these islands have no rights, except it be to live, breathe, be quiet and peaceful, provided always that they do not get in the way of or disturb the military establishment in their midst, and that they obey the same. And this state of affairs must substantially continue until the Executive of the United States shall choose to withdraw the military arm and substitute some other kind of government, or Congress shall legislate touching the status of government of the islands and their people.

But Congress, in its wisdom, may not choose to legislate in regard to the islands further than to declare that when peace and order shall have been restored the people shall be at liberty to formulate their own government and suit themselves as to its form.

If this be long delayed, other things may occur that may put it beyond the power of Congress to allow these people to go, and leave us with them on our hands.

The discussion in this House on the Puerto Rico tax measure developed that there has gotten into this question a great deal of, at least, apparent muddle and confusion—perhaps mostly muddle of brain—touching the acquisition by the United States of these islands and of the Territories of Louisiana and Florida. But the acquisitions of Louisiana and Florida should not, in my humble opinion, furnish any precedent for our action touching the Philippines. I can best illustrate our true position as to Louisiana and Florida at the time of their acquisition, and how our people regarded it, by relating a conversation I had some years ago with a Californian who was on a visit to my section of the country.

He said Virginia people were in some respects the most peculiar people with whom he had met; that they were constantly buying lands and farms, and when he asked them why they did this the invariable answer was, "Oh, because it joins us." So with the Territories of Louisiana, Florida, California, and Texas—"they joined us."

The people of Louisiana and Florida at the time of acquisition were to some extent, at least, dominated by American sentiment, by reason not only of contact with our people, but many of our people had settled in these Territories prior to their acquisition.

And, again, in a large measure, and by reason of this fact, the people of Louisiana and Florida were a homogeneous people and occupied adjacent territory to ours, while the Philippine people are a heterogeneous people and live in a far-away land, in another hemisphere, separated from our shores by a great physical barrier—an ocean 7,000 miles wide—and besides this they are not Anglo-Saxons, but Malays, red men, in fact, almost all colors save white. In religion, part Mohammedan and part Christian, and between their civilization and ours a great, if not an impassable, gulf exists, which will forever prevent their assimilation. They have no Anglo-Saxon instincts, and no connection whatever with our history. But I turn from this for the present to the discussion of another question.

It must not be supposed that the Democratic party is not for expansion, both of territory and trade. Nearly all the great Democratic leaders who have lived in this country or now live are expansionists, but there is a wide difference between what they pronounce true and proper expansion and what is termed imperialism, the assimilation of a homogeneous people and of adjacent territory and that of a heterogeneous people and foreign territory.

No party in this country that ever rose, reigned, or fell has advocated the acquisition of territory for colonial purposes or the owning by this country of colonial possessions until this doctrine has in this day found champions in the now Republican party of the country.

I am now, as I have always been, in favor of expansion of territory and trade, but as a patriotic American, true to the principles of the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution, I am utterly opposed to the newfangled doctrine of expansion as expounded by our friends of the Republican party; or, in other words, I am opposed to a colonial policy whereby part of the people of this Republic will be citizens and part subjects. To avoid this we must let go our hold upon the Philippines or make them a part of the territory of this country and their untold millions citizens of our Republic.

On the debate on the Puerto Rico tax bill I heard it argued and urged on the floor of this House by gentlemen on the other side of the Chamber that Congress, in dealing with the inhabitants of the islands acquired by us from Spain under the treaty of Paris, acts outside and beyond the pale of the Constitution; that the power of Congress in this regard is plenary, is supreme—omnipotent—and it takes an act of Congress to carry the Constitution to this newly acquired territory.

If Congress does not get its authority from the Constitution in dealing with these acquisitions, where does it get it?

The Congress "plenary" is a creature of the Constitution.

Can the creature get above the creator or go, be, or exist without the creator?

It can not be true, in the very nature of things, that Congress can do anything outside the Constitution.

To even assert, much less admit, that Congress, in dealing with the inhabitants of these islands, can act without and beyond the Constitution is the very rankest imperialism, and to admit such to be the authority of Congress is to state the fallacious proposition that under our Constitution we can in this country, at one and the same time, have two kinds of government in operation—one a Republic under the Constitution; the other an empire, by Congressional action, outside the Constitution.

If it be conceded that Congress can legislate for the inhabitants of these islands without being bound by the limitations, prohibitions, and restrictions of the Constitution, then it, or the legislatures of the Territories organized under its laws, can pass ex post facto laws or bills of attainder, abolish jury trial, suspend the writ of habeas corpus in time of peace, create titles of nobility, impose unequal taxation and that without representation—in a word, make the President of the United States or some military officer dictator or emperor. The statement of the proposition is its refutation.

How can an act of Congress carry the Constitution to our new acquisitions? Is not the very reverse true? Does not the Constitution carry Congress to these acquisitions, after our flag has been there planted and it has become our manifest intention to hold as part of our territory these acquisitions?

My examination of the decisions of the Supreme Court has satisfied me as to the status of territory and the inhabitants of territory acquired by the United States. I do not deem it necessary to repeat what has already been said in this House along this line.

Would it had been as Mr. Jefferson said, that the Constitution had been made so clear and plain that the people would have had no differences of opinion as to its meaning and only differed in policies of the Government.

Why should we make the Philippine Islands a part of this country and their inhabitants citizens of the United States? What do we want with them and what can we do with them? If we once incorporate them into and as a part of this country and make the inhabitants citizens of the Republic, and we shall hereafter discover we made a mistake, how shall we get rid of them?

It is asserted that we want their trade and the trade of the Chinese seas and the Orient, and by a distinguished Senator, that it is a land of great value in its productions and great in mineral wealth—a land of gold, and much gold; but it must be remembered that these are the maxims of covetousness, and not those of liberty and patriotism. We surely have not fallen so low as to be moved by such sordid considerations as those of greed and gain, and to barter our liberty and free institutions for "commercial assets."

I have already stated that we do not own the lands of these islands. They belong to the inhabitants, and we can not get the lands without paying for them, unless we are going to follow the example of William the Norman, and divide them out among our soldiers. We do not and can not own the inhabitants and can not force tribute from them, unless we are to become tyrants and freebooters and follow the example of England in South Africa, crushing as gallant, chivalrous, and brave a people as ever fought, bled, and died for liberty; and yet the American Congress, the grandest deliberative body on the earth, representing the most liberty-loving and enlightened people of the best and grandest Republic in the world, is not willing to even express sympathy with this people.

England is the enemy of free government. She is the enemy of this country and has tried to destroy us, and would be willing to undertake it now if she dared. She has been guilty of arson and murder. She is an old thief and robber, and is not only trying to rob the Boers of their gold and their diamonds but of their liberty. Away with your English alliance. Let those who will advocate it, but shame to any patriot who even thinks of entertaining such an idea.

Then there would seem to be only one principal thing we are after, and that is the privilege of trading with the people of these islands, and this privilege we can have without attempting to govern them.

It is said to retain the Philippines will furnish to us great opportunities for trade between America and the nations of the Orient; that we must look for markets, and that we must enter into actual competition for this trade; that we must recognize changed conditions, and that by holding the Philippines our trade in the Orient will continue to increase until we shall find a market for all our supplies and surplus products. I can not see the logic of this reasoning when there can be no reason why we can not find markets in the Orient for our surplus products without the Philippines as well as with them, and by letting them go we shall escape dangers to our liberty that are not now so clearly foreseen, but which will certainly come if we attempt to establish free institutions in the Eastern Hemisphere.

Again, the protective-tariff people, who have heretofore wanted to build a Chinese wall around this country to keep out the foreigner and make him pay the tax, and keep out foreign pauper labor, or goods made by foreign pauper labor, seem to have waked up to the realization of the fact that the country has outgrown Chinese walls at home and wants to go over and tear down the Chinese wall on the farther side of the seas, and to open broader markets for our surplus products, and are even willing to open up the country to pauper-made goods, and even to the paupers themselves.

They talk about opposition to free trade, and yet prate about reciprocity, which we all understand is nothing less than international free trade. Why not stand, as you will finally have to stand, on the true doctrine—tariff for revenue only? You are traveling rapidly in that direction and to that doctrine, and it will be no surprise that you should go beyond it. But are you preparing to exchange protectionism for imperialism? "It is better to bear the ills we have than to flee to those we know not of."

What is the trade of these islands worth to us? It has already been shown on this floor by the able speech made by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] on the 6th of last month, that the trade of these islands, as it now exists, if we could get it all, would not exceed $30,000,000 per year and that their productions, or at least many of them, are the same as our own. And, as shown by the speech referred to, the products of these islands are made by labor costing a mere trifle (a few cents per day to the laborer) and that these products would necessarily come into competition with our products, produced by our well-paid labor.

Will our laboring people submit to this or be willing to see this take place?

It would seem that every thoughtful American who loves liberty, his country, her opportunities and free institutions, and our glorious history and all that we hold sacred and dear does not wish to see the Philippine Islands incorporated into the Government of this country and its inhabitants become citizens of this Republic.

Some of the reasons that present themselves to my mind why I do not want to see this occur are:

First. These islands and their people are too far removed from our shores. Climatic and other conditions forbid our people from migrating and settling there. The situation of these people, their condition, and temperament would require too much governing, and of a kind and character not suited to republican institutions.

Certain it is that abuses in government and corruption in high as well as low places would follow, and we should be poorly able to correct these abuses, for we know by observation, if not by sad experiences, that it is difficult, if not next to impossible, to correct such abuses here at home. Are we willing to have corruption and robbery and disgraceful carpetbag rule, such as we had in the South in the days of reconstruction?

Second. The character, education, habits, manners, customs, and religions of these people forbid assimilation, and for us to attempt by force of government or otherwise to foist and fasten upon these islanders our civilization is death to them.

It is important that we do not lay too much stress upon the representations of those of our people who have lately come in contact with the Malay race, and are too ready upon mere superficial examination to declare how they are to be dealt with. If we are to take and govern the people of these islands, our duty is plain, and that is to govern them to the advancement of civilization, if we can—not necessarily our own complex system, totally different from theirs—and to the mutual advantage of both races.

The American is democratic and progressive; the Malay is aristocratic and conservative—characteristics inherited by them from scores of generations gone before—and as these are the results of slow accumulation from associations for hundreds of years, so they can not at once be eradicated, but they must be treated as chronic diseases of long standing are by the medical practitioner.

The foremost principle which should always be kept in view is that the civilization of any race is not a system that can be changed at will. Every civilization of any race is the growing product of a very complex set of conditions, depending on race and character, on climate, on the trade and minutiæ of circumstances. To attempt to alter such a system apart from its conditions is impossible. For instance, when a total change in government is made, it breaks down altogether.

When the English constitution was swept away, Cromwell or anarchy was the alternative. When the French constitution was overthrown, Napoleon was the only salvation from anarchy. And if this be the case when the externals of government alone are altered, how much more is it the case if we attempt to uproot the whole of a civilized and social life. We may despotically force a bald and senseless imitation of our way on another people, but we shall only destroy their life without planting any vitality in its place.

No changes are legitimate or beneficial to the character of a people except those which follow from conviction and the natural growth of mind.

The incorporation of these Philippine people into our body politic is a danger that threatens the very existence of the Republic. Imperial expansion—that is, the incorporation into our system of people that are incapable of receiving our civilization and becoming homogeneous with us, and therefore, being not of us, must of necessity be ruled as subjects, and can not become citizens.

And if this imposition of a foreign system is injurious, how destructive the imposition of such a system as ours, which is the most complex, unnatural, and artificial that has been known, a system developed in a relatively cold country, amid one of the hardest, least sympathetic, and most self-denying and calculating of all people in the world. Such a system, the product of such extreme conditions, we attempt to force on the least developed races, and expect from them an implicit subservience to our illogical law and our (to them) seeming inconsistent morality. The result is death. We make a deadhouse and call it civilization. Scarcely a single race can bear the contact and the burden.

Every attempt upon a low but perfect civilization will result in eradication in our efforts to improve. While the body of man remains *practically* the same for ages, the brain develops and changes, only by slow processes, as the race reaches a higher level.

We should divest ourselves of the idea that the history of the world began when we were born. A familiarity with the Old Testament and the classics, with oriental polyamy and Greek polytheism, should teach us not to ignore the painful and laborious efforts in social and political problems among nations other than our own, and to avoid the well-known failures of the past, and to let all the lights play fully around the subject, when that subject is the elevation and betterment of the Moslem, the Hindoo, and the Malay, and instead of throwing the arms of protection of our Government around the Sultan of Sulu, and winking at his polygamy, shall we not, by frowning upon his conduct, and by well-considered example, teach him, if we can, that his best policy and that of his people is to conform to our customs. No one solution of the problem of society, social life, and culture will fit every race.

And most surely our civilization is illy adapted to be all at once imposed upon the Filipino people when civilization so different from the Anglo-Saxon has been the growth of centuries. We must not, indeed can not afford to, force our civilization upon them, for, as I have already argued, it is death in the end to them and no profit to us, but eventual loss. If we can not elevate and Christianize them we are in danger of being carried down in the scale of civilization.

My third reason for stating that we do not want the Philippines is that to govern them will most likely require the constant presence of the military arm. Yes; a standing army of thousands of soldiers, and the expenditure of untold millions of money, which must be wrung from our already heavily burdened taxpayers, and, in addition, at the cost of the sacrifice of thousands of the best and bravest of our soldiers. It is stated on competent authority that we now have about 65,000 soldiers in these islands, at the cost of not less than $1,000 per annum for each man. How many lives have been lost in battle and by disease has not yet been, so far as I know, disclosed.

How many Filipinos have been killed we do not know, nor have we any account of how many Filipino prisoners have been taken, if any. Certain it is that our army is not burdened with prisoners.

Our attempt to retain the Philippines and to erect in the Eastern Hemisphere a republic is, first, an implied, if not an expressed, abandonment of the "Monroe doctrine;" and, secondly, is sure to excite the jealousy of and alarm the crowned heads of European and Asiatic countries and lead to friction, complications, entanglements, and collisions which must of necessity result in wars, frequent, bloody, relentless, and costly, and, flowing from this naturally, insubordination and insurrection in the islands.

To retain these islands as part of the domain of this Government is to bring their products, produced by the cheapest and most degraded labor, into competition with the products of this country, made and produced by the most intelligent and best paid labor on the earth, and thus bring down the price of our own products, and considerably reduce the price of our own labor, and with this will come discontent among our laboring people, resulting in strikes, if not wholesale strife. These islands will become the breeding ground of trusts and combines, entered into, organized, and intrenched in power for the purpose of controlling the trade of the Chinese seas and the Orient; and into the valleys and plains of Luzon will doubtless be transferred and transplanted many of our large manufacturing plants, with the very purpose and object of securing the cheap and degraded labor of these islands; the articles then manufactured will also go into the trusts and combines manufactured in this country, and come into competition with articles made by our well-paid labor.

We have not as yet discovered a legal method whereby can be controlled the monster trusts and combines in this country; then how shall we in the far-away land of the Philippines?

Already these gigantic anacondas, leeches, and bloodsuckers have so interwoven themselves in, through, and around avenues of trade as to practically crush out small traders—indeed, all formidable opposition or competition—and have almost completely destroyed or paralyzed individualism and individual effort, leaving to the poor but competent young business man, depending alone upon his own abor for a living, little, if anything, to encourage him. His hopes are blasted, his aspirations crushed and wrecked.

No doubt the acquisition, and more especially the permanent holding, of these islands will be made the excuse for the advocates of imperialism in this country to unite with those of England and other European powers for the further aggrandizement of empire by seizing the first opportunity for the dismemberment of China.

Mr. Chairman, shall the Republic live or shall it perish by our folly?

Our splendid Republic is as yet in the experimental state, with scarcely more than a century's existence.

The hardiest of vegetable and mineral growths are those of slowest development.

The history and the experience of nations show that those of longest duration in reaching their climax were slowest in dying.

It took Rome several hundred years to reach the zenith of her glory and then several hundred more to die—nearly fifteen hundred years from birth to death. Her downfall was the result of her insatiable greed for military glory, spoliation, and territorial aggrandizement. Shall we travel the same road and meet the same fate?

In my humble opinion the only sensible and reasonable solution of the Philippine problem is to restore to that unfortunate, unhappy people peace and order, and then let them establish their own government, stable and firm, of course, and let them become the architects of their own destiny, without involving ours, for it must be remembered that no civilized people ever struggled, fought and bled for liberty, and achieved it and founded free government but have ever had a fierce struggle to preserve and maintain it.

Every free people who have lost their liberty and wrecked their free institutions have usually done so by a forgetfulness of the cost thereof in blood and treasure, and in the attempt for territorial aggrandizememnt, urged on by success and the glittering prospects of empire, greed, and spoliation.

Mr. Chairman, liberty and the blessings of free government can only be preserved by frequent recurrence to fundamental principles.

Magna Charta was reaffirmed no less that two and thirty times by our English ancestors. The Declaration of Independence needs reaffirmation, and instead of reaching out for empire, shouting ourselves hoarse over the flag, it would be a good thing for us to have a real, genuine revival—a liberty revival—in which we might pause long enough to think over the blood and treasure and the sacrifices it cost our ancestors to establish free government, and, on the other hand, to consider what a crime we should commit against the Republic, our children, and our children's children if we suffer ourselves to pursue a policy which will be subversive of our liberties.

When the united Democracy shall assemble at Kansas City on the 4th day of July next to nominate the next President of the United States, we are going to have a regular old genuine liberty revival, and we shall again reaffim the declaration made by us in 1896 and the principles contained in the immortal Declaration of Independence.

Then we shall declare that this is a "government of the people, by the people, and for the people," and that we intend to preserve it in its constitutional integrity, free from all foreign entanglements, as handed down to us from our fathers, and transmit it as a sacred heritage to our children's children.

Mr. STEELE. Mr. Chairman, this paragraph makes an appropriation for the contingent expenses of the Commanding General of the Army. It was this distinguished soldier who took Puerto Rico. He did not go in exactly at the front door and meet the distinguished gentlemen in shirts and other uniforms who were on the wharves to receive him, but at the back door. He had trouble in getting the other people who met him out of the way. He did not understand where they wanted him to land. The correspondents who had horses were in the several villages and cities before he could arrive. And yet when he rounded up the population, it is said by our Democratic friends that he proposed to commit the Government of the United States to a policy for the United States.

No man has contended on that side, or will contend, that in attempting to do so he was guilty of anything less than presumption. It was nothing less. No man will contend that he had any

right, or authority, or law, or any order that would justify him in committing the United States Government to any demand that he made other than to demand and to accept the surrender of the Spanish army and to restore order on that island.

I can not understand how gentlemen who are disposed to be fair in business matters continually quote what this great soldier, it is said, attempted to do, or did do, in committing the Government. I do not know that he did. If he did not, I apologize to him.

Now, with reference to Puerto Rico. I have a letter here that I would like to have the Clerk read. I have only just received it. It is dated March 17. I ask the Clerk to read that part not crossed out; the other is personal.

The Clerk read as follows:

SAN JUAN, PUERTO RICO, *March 17, 1900.*

MY DEAR MAJOR:

* * * * * * *

We are watching with interest here the hurricane that the proposed 15 per cent tariff has raised and are wondering what it is all about. A 15 per cent tariff is not obnoxious to the people here; at any rate not to the planters and to the great body of the people, the only clamorers for out-and-out free trade being the men who have bought up most of the sugar and a good part of the tobacco.

I am creditably informed that the American Tobacco Company has absorbed the greater part of the tobacco interests of the island, and absolute free trade would mean that they stand to make a pocketful of money. This talk of the placing of the tariff at the behest of the trusts which control tobacco and sugar strikes us here as the most arrant rot, since these very interests are the ones that would profit most from absolute free trade. The people here take it that the United States is not going to appropriate money from the National Treasury for the purpose of running this island. Hence the money, about two and a half millions a year, must be raised either by a tariff or by direct taxation.

Under the present system there is not a cent of taxes collected on land or improved real estate. The insular revenues have come from the tariff and the municipal fund has come from taxes on the necessaries of life. Even under this system the planters have had to appeal for a suspension of process to save their lands from foreclosure, and the levy and collection at this time of a direct tax would practically mean the sale of the island under the hammer. Perhaps the holders of the mortgages have a voice in the clamor for the purpose of forcing the plantations into the hands of the sheriff.

The experience here has been that the removal of the tariff has not cheapened anything to the consumer. Acting under the demand for cheaper necessaries, the War Department removed the tariff from rice, bacon, beef, beans, and a number of other articles, but despite this removal of the tariff, not one of these articles sells any part of a cent cheaper in the stores to-day than they did with the tariff imposed, and whatever benefit has been derived from the abolition of those tariff dues has been divided between the wholesaler and the retailer.

* * * * * * *

I am glad to know, through a recent published interview of yours, that you have a pretty thorough understanding of conditions here, and hope you will fight it out on the tariff line. I am utterly at a loss to understand the attitude that some of the Republican papers have taken on this question, but am confident that the people will come to understand it.

Mr. STEELE. The Clerk need not read the signature.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Did I understand the gentleman to say that that letter was from Indiana?

Mr. STEELE. The heading at the beginning of the letter shows that it is from San Juan, Puerto Rico, from a gentleman of absolute integrity, who is a brother to a member of this House.

Mr. JAMES R. WILLIAMS. What is his name?

Mr. RICHARDSON. Is he from Indiana?

Mr. STEELE. He is from Indiana, where all good men come from. [Laughter.]

Mr. JAMES R. WILLIAMS. The gentleman is ashamed to put his name in the RECORD.

Mr. STEELE. I am ashamed to have the gentleman make that statement.

Mr. JAMES R. WILLIAMS. I move to strike out the gentleman's name, if it is in.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman moves to strike out the last two words.

Mr. STEELE. The gentleman says he wants to strike out the gentleman's name. Since it was not in, it does not matter.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. PARKER of New Jersey having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. BENNETT, its Secretary, announced that the Senate had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6627) making appropriations for the payment of invalid and other pensions of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1901, and for other purposes.

ARMY APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois moves to strike out the last two words; the pending amendment is to strike out the last word.

Mr. JAMES R. WILLIAMS. Now, Mr. Chairman, I did not intend to say anything on this bill or on this amendment. I am not particularly anxious to strike out the last word; but since the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. STEELE] has had read a letter before the committee as an argument in favor of a protective tariff to the people of Puerto Rico, in answer to that anonymous letter as far as the RECORD is concerned, I wish to say——

Mr. STEELE. I would like to show the gentleman the signature.

Mr. JAMES R. WILLIAMS. What is the objection to putting it into the RECORD?

Mr. STEELE. I do not object; his name is Walter K. Landis.

Mr. JAMES R. WILLIAMS. Well, let "Walter K. Landis" go in the RECORD, then. [Laughter.] I would like to ask the gentleman what position he holds?

Mr. STEELE. He holds the position of a gentleman, and attends to his own business. [Laughter.]

Mr. COX. What else?

Mr. JAMES R. WILLIAMS. I understand he is a postmaster. Not only that, but he shows a great deal of sympathy for his friends in Indiana, who need sympathy at this particular time. [Laughter on the Democratic side.]

Mr. STEELE. Will the gentleman yield until I have something read from a newspaper in Indiana?

Mr. JAMES R. WILLIAMS. Yes, I will yield to anything from Indiana. [Laughter.]

Mr. STEELE. This is from a newspaper in my own county.

Mr. JAMES R. WILLIAMS. It is not from the Indiana Senator's speech delivered on free trade for Puerto Rico?

Mr. STEELE. No; it is not.

The Clerk read as follows:

The people of late have had a practical demonstration to the effect that metropolitan papers do not always reflect general public sentiment. The Puerto Rican tariff bill is an instance. Several well-known and influential newspapers jumped at the conclusion that the people were "dead against" the bill.

Just what inspired this conclusion is a mystery. They are now beginning to find out differently. The people approve of the course of President McKinley and his advisers. We have seemed to detect an overweening desire on the part of some newspapers to magnify the importance of this measure. These newspapers should put away their bogy men and cultivate a closer acquaintance with public sentiment.

It is a mistake to assume that the people are vociferously indignant and clamorously dissatisfied with the Puerto Rican tariff bill, and the attempt of several metropolitan papers to make it so appear is misleading, to say the least. While the people do not generally approve of a tariff rate between this country and Puerto Rico, they recognize that the measure is only intended as a temporary expedient in the interest of the poor people of the island, who receive direct and immediate relief.

These metropolitan papers reflect more their own opinions than the true sentiment of the Republican masses. In fact, some of these metropolitan newspapers that appear to be so deeply concerned for the dear people are about as far from a correct knowledge of the sentiments and desires of the common people as New York's codfish aristocratic four hundred.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. JAMES R. WILLIAMS. One moment; I did not understand the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. STEELE] to give us the name of the paper.

Mr. STEELE. It is from the Fairmount News, published in Grant County, Ind.

Mr. JAMES R. WILLIAMS. A county paper?

Mr. STEELE. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker. I notice that the article says that the people are in favor of the course of the President and his advisers. The inquiry I wish to propound to the Chair is, which course is that? [Laughter on the Democratic side.]

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Mississippi propose that as a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. STEELE. It is the humane course.

Mr. JAMES R. WILLIAMS. I yielded to an interruption by my friend from Indiana, but I hope his newspaper article will be put in as a part of his remarks and not mine. [Laughter.]

Mr. STEELE. I think that is fair. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, that will be done.

Mr. JAMES R. WILLIAMS. This only shows, Mr. Chairman, the desperation to which these gentlemen are being driven. I understand this man Landis, a brother of Congressman LANDIS, of Indiana—and if I am not correct I am willing to be corrected—holds a position down there, under the Administation, probably a postmaster or something similar to that, and of course he is anxious to relieve his friends in Indiana and the representatives from that State, who are in such great distress at this particular time.

Now, as against the county paper which the gentleman has found in his State in favor of one or the other policies of the President, I cite him to the Chicago Inter-Ocean, the Indianapolis Journal, and a great many other Western papers that have an immense circulation and which take a great deal of pains to ascertain the sentiment of the people. I think myself that that county paper will have a very difficult task even to convince the gentleman himself that he is not standing upon sinking sod in Indiana if he undertakes to vote for a tariff on Puerto Rico again.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. JAMES R. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I ask for two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks for two minutes more. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. JAMES R. WILLIAMS. I noticed in the papers a few days ago where the distinguished gentleman from Indiana, Mr. CRUMPACKER, received a great reception in one of the cities in Indiana from the people of all classes because he had the courage of his convictions to vote against the tariff on the people of Puerto Rico. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I notice some very different receptions that gentlemen have received in Indiana who voted for a tariff on the people of Puerto Rico. But, coming to the point I intended to make, and that is this: Against this letter of a Republican postmaster endeavoring to help out the distressed Representative from Indiana I set the unanimous voice of every delegate who has come before the Committee on Insular Affairs from the island of Puerto Rico, representing all classes of industries—agricultural, mercantile, manufacturing, and everything else—who declare with one voice that they are in favor of free trade and want that and nothing else. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The CHAIRMAN. If there is no objection, the informal amendments will be withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The Clerk, proceeding with the reading of the bill, read as follows:

Contingencies of the Army: For all contingent expenses of the Army not provided for by other estimates, and embracing all branches of the military service, to be expended under the immediate orders of the Secretary of War, $200,000.

Mr. STEELE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. If anyone has any idea that I am in any distress on account of my vote on the Puerto Rican tariff bill, I would have him possess his soul in peace. I voted for the bill; I helped to frame it, and I never have tried to dodge a single bit of responsibility. On the contrary, I believed when the bill was completed that it was a humane measure. I believe it yet, and I do not hear gentlemen on the other side of the House propose anything better.

We have been charged, on this side of the House, with working in the interest of the trusts; and yet no man has pointed out, nor can he point out, how in any way the trusts can be benefited by the legislation that we propose. On the other hand, it would be *a very great* advantage to the people over there who have sugar and tobacco if they were to have a reduction of three-quarters of the duty on what they have to export.

We give them a reduction of 85 per cent, and Mr. Finney, consul from Great Britain, and a very few other gentlemen who own or control these articles, who were sitting in the gallery during the time the gentleman from Maine [Mr. LITTLEFIELD] was making his speech, and who led in the applause when he said something favorable to free trade, would be much benefited, and could afford to pay many dollars into the Democratic campaign fund, if you shall succeed in securing free trade for them.

As I said before, I have no apologies to make; and when the gentleman says his committee has heard from all classes of people, I would like to ask him whether it has heard from the man who can not read, who has never worn a pair of shoes in his life, whose only uniform is a shirt? Ninety per cent of the population of that island are people of that class. How is free trade going to benefit that class of people? It is not going to put bread into their mouths.

Every dollar collected in the United States upon importations from Puerto Rico and every dollar collected in Puerto Rico upon importations from the United States and other countries is, by the bill, to be placed in the hands of the President to help those poor people, those without shoes, without shirts, without education—absolutely destitute people on account of the privations of four hundred years of Spanish domination and misrule, and on account of a hurricane which swept the island last August.

Mr. RIDGELY. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. STEELE. I would like to know what it is. [Laughter.]

Mr. RIDGELY. Does the gentleman think that the 15 per cent taxation contemplated by the bill which passed this House would help to clothe those people?

Mr. STEELE. Well, it would give them each one shirt, would it not?

Mr. RIDGELY. I think not.

Mr. STEELE. Why, a gentleman on your side has said that $750,000 would be collected, and a shirt of the kind those people wear would cost about 15 cents. Whatever the amount may be, it goes to feed and clothe those poor people and give them a start to become American citizens, with all that the words imply.

Mr. RIDGELY. If the gentleman is willing to give up 85 per cent of the tax collections, why not give up the other 15 per cent?

Mr. STEELE. Did the gentleman vote for the $2,000,000 proposition? I did.

Mr. RIDGELY. I voted against it on the final passage.

Mr. STEELE. Oh, you did. A great many gentlemen on your side voted the other way. They were more humane than you.

Mr. RIDGELY. You levy a tax on the Puerto Ricans and then ask us to vote it back.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. JAMES R. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I had not expected to participate in this discussion; in fact, I do not like to discuss a question that is not before the committee or the House. But some things have been said by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. STEELE] that certainly deserve some attention. He has stated here to-day that one reason why the Republicans have changed their position against free trade and in favor of a tariff upon the people of Puerto Rico is on account of the interest which one Mr. Finley would have in case those goods were admitted free.

Mr. STEELE. The vice-consul.

Mr. JAMES R. WILLIAMS. The gentleman had better understand what he speaks about when he does speak. I have never seen Mr. Finley to speak to him or hear him speak except when he was before the committee. His statement was that he has been in business in that island for over thirty-five years, acting a part of the time as British consul or vice-consul. Now, I want to call the gentleman's attention to this fact: That the President of the United States had had his officers all over that island investigating its condition for weeks and months before Congress convened, and he knew just as well on the day Congress met the necessity for revenue in that island and the needs of those people as he did after Mr. Oxnard had come before our committee and opposed free trade for Puerto Rico.

Now, the gentleman talks about this money buying shirts and food for the people of Puerto Rico. He knows better than to contend for one moment that these duties, collected as a tariff, are to be used to buy clothing for the people of Puerto Rico. I am surprised that a gentleman of experience in this House, a Representative here, should undertake to make any such contention as that. In the first place, this money will go to conduct the government of that island, if the people have a government; and according to the report of your own governor-general it will exhaust about all the money you can collect under that bill—yes, all of it, and more—to conduct the government and pay its expenses. All this talk about buying clothing and books and building schoolhouses is the merest "rot;" and gentlemen ought to understand it.

It is said that no other policy has been proposed than that embodied in the Puerto Rican bill passed by this House. Sir, another policy has been proposed; and if gentlemen will read the debates they will ascertain what it is. The policy that the people of Puerto Rico want is a good local government which will give them the power to raise their revenue by taxing property, instead of poverty, in the island of Puerto Rico. [Applause.] That is what they want, and if you will give them that they will be able to take care of themselves. If you undertake to feed them out of the contribution box you may expect to continue it as long as they are a part of the United States, in the language of a Democrat.

The Clerk read as follows:

For contingent expenses at the headquarters of the several military departments, including the staff corps serving thereat, except the department judge-advocates, being for the purchase of the necessary articles of office, toilet, and desk furniture, binding, maps, books of reference, professional newspapers and periodicals, and police utensils, $6,000, to be allotted by the Secretary of War, and to be expended in the discretion of the several military department commanders.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

I was somewhat amazed to hear a distinguished Republican member of this House, and an ex-soldier, no doubt a gallant one, attack the Commanding General of the United States Army for having dared to offer terms to the people of Puerto Rico, who welcomed him in a friendly way when he arrived upon that island. Although I was merely a boy of 11 years of age, I remember that when Lee surrendered to Grant at Appomattox, and Grant made the magnanimous terms which he did, a thrill of generous pride went through the hearts of all Southern people, depressed though they were at that time.

Grant, I presume, had no authority to make any sort of terms as to the ultimate disposition of Lee and his army; but what sort of a government would it have been which would have repudiated the pledges of the victorious general under such conditions as that? And what sort of a government is it, Mr. Chairman, which would repudiate the generous promise of its commanding officer when he had gone to an island and tendered the protection of his government to those people and they had accepted it in a free and friendly spirit?

Mr. Chairman, I read in a paper to-day a quotation from a speech delivered by the President of the United States last fall in which he stated that in his judgment Puerto Rico was as much a part of the United States as the District of Columbia or Arizona or New Mexico. From that time to this I have seen nothing

coming from him which indicated any change of heart or judgment upon his part. And if the gentleman has any evidence that the President now does not believe that Puerto Rico ought by right to enjoy all of the privileges of the District of Columbia or Arizona or New Mexico, I should like to have it produced.

Mr. DOLLIVER. What speech of the President does the gentleman allude to?

Mr. SLAYDEN. It was delivered, I think, in Peoria. I speak merely from memory, but I think that was the place.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I have no recollection of it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. It was somewhere out on that electioneering trip.

Mr. SLAYDEN. It was on that electioneering tour; yes, and I will look it up this evening and print it in the RECORD, so that the gentleman from Iowa may see what the President's views were last fall.

On his campaigning tour of the West and Northwest, at Waukegan, Ill., on October 17, 1899, Mr. McKinley, speaking of the Philippine Archipelago, called it "a territory as much our own as Alaska or the District of Columbia or any Territory of the United States." That means Puerto Rico also.

Mr. McRAE. Mr. Chairman, I wish to offer a substantial amendment. I move to strike out "six" and insert "three." Three thousand dollars is the amount usually carried by this item.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 9, strike out the word "six" and insert in lieu thereof the word "three;" so that it will read: "three thousand dollars."

Mr. McRAE. That is the amount usually carried by this item, and unless there is some special reason for doubling it I do not see why we should do so.

Mr. HULL. If the gentleman will permit me, I will state that for the current fiscal year the estimates submitted were $6,000. The first appropriation last year was $3,000. Afterwards we passed a supplemental appropriation, giving them $3,000 more. The War Department reports that the increased amount is necessary on account of the largely extended field of operation. We have a great many more departments than we had before the war began. At that time the departments were all in the United States proper, and so were the department headquarters. We have now headquarters in Cuba, in Puerto Rico, in the Philippines, as well as those that we formerly had in the United States.

Mr. McRAE. You have mentioned no place yet which is outside of the United States.

Mr. HULL. Well, under the five-minute rule the gentleman can not get up any argument with me as to that. I am telling the gentleman where the departments are. They have been largely increased over what they were, and if we give this $6,000 now, I will say to my friend from Arkansas we are simply giving what we ultimately gave, as I remember, during the last fiscal year.

Mr. McRAE. During the last fiscal year, of course, you perhaps had a great deal more necessary expense than you will have in the next fiscal year. I hope that is true, at least. But let me ask if these departments have been increased 100 per cent.

Mr. HULL. In a note to the estimate for this item the War Department says:

The increased amount estimated for is made necessary on account of the establishment of new departments, namely, Cuba, Habana, Santiago and Puerto Principe, Matanzas, and Santa Clara, province of Habana and Pinar del Rio, the Pacific, Puerto Rico, and Texas.

In view of that statement, I do not think it would be just and fair to strike out the amount. It is a small amount anyway, and the Committee on Military Affairs was unanimously in favor of the item.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Arkansas withdraw his amendment?

Mr. McRAE. Mr. Chairman, I do not know enough about it to insist upon my amendment, and so far as I am personally concerned the explanation of the chairman of the Military Committee is satisfactory. Therefore I withdraw the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be considered as withdrawn, and the informal amendment also will be considered as withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, some time ago the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LACEY], chairman of the Committee on the Public Lands, filed a minority report in reference to a bill granting some of the public lands of Alabama to school purposes. One of the schools was a negro school and the other was a white school. In his minority report he states that he does not think the bill ought to pass, because Alabama has not properly cared for the education of the children of the State.

The gentleman from Iowa is my friend, and I am sure that he made the statement without any intention of doing an injustice to the people of Alabama; but I think the statement should not rest without a proper correction being made.

Alabama, like many of the Southern States, has labored under a great many misfortunes in the last thirty years. A comparison is made by the gentleman from Iowa between the amount of school tax in Iowa and the amount of school tax in Alabama.

There is no question that the State of Iowa has magnificiently taken care of the school children of that State; but I wish to call the attention of the gentleman and the attention of the country to the fact that in the State of Alabama 54 per cent of the people pay 95 per cent of the taxes, and that the result of the civil war placed upon the white people of the State of Alabama the education of a race of people who up to that time were uneducated and without property or means to educate themselves. The white people of the State have taken up this burden without complaint; and out of the public treasury, out of the taxes collected from themselves, have given equally, in proportion to population, to the colored children and to the white children of the State. I think it unjust to our people, when we have had these burdens to sustain, that we should be criticised because we have not been able to give as great educational advantages as some of our sister States have who have not had these burdens to carry.

I want to call attention to the fact that in the State of Alabama for the year 1898, the last one for which I could get the authentic figures, the total taxes raised and disbursed by the State were $2,242,894. The amount distributed for educational purposes was $1,018,086, which was an increase over the previous year of $191,000, the amount being 45 per cent of the total disbursements of the State. In other words, of the total moneys collected by taxation in the State 45 per cent has been paid for educational purposes and nearly half that amount has been paid out to the negro race in the State for their education, when they do not pay 5 per cent of the taxes.

Now, why has Alabama suffered? Why have we been unable to pay the same amount for our schools that the more fortunate States in the North have been able to pay? At the close of the civil war the public debt of the State of Alabama was $5,939,000. It remained that until the State was compelled to pass through the reconstruction period. When we came out of the reconstruction period and the white people of the State were once more placed at the helm of government, we came out with a bonded indebtedness placed on the backs of the people of that State of $38,381,000, and the bonded indebtedness of Iowa is only $245,000.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I ask my friend to let me put in the fact that these bonds have been paid, and we have over a million dollars in the treasury.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi (to Mr. UNDERWOOD). That makes your argument a fortiori.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I congratulate the gentleman and congratulate the great State of Iowa; but I intended to show from these figures, that I take from the census of 1890, that the amount of indebtedness of Iowa was only 2 per cent of the debt of Alabama. Now, we are not at fault, the people who pay the taxes in Alabama are not in fault, for this indebtedness; the people who own the property, the people who control the State government, are not in fault for this indebtedness. We did not create it. It was placed as a burden on our backs without our consent and against our protest by the reconstruction government; but it was a debt created, and a debt we were bound to recognize and to pay. In Alabama out of 325,782 school children, 122,889 are negroes; in Iowa out of 538,576 school children, only 1,286 are negroes. That is a part of the burden that we are carrying and being taxed for it, and it is but proper that our people should try to make them good citizens and give them education.

It is not for their benefit, but for the benefit of our State, and I am not protesting against the fact that we are being compelled to take up these burdens and carry them, but where we do protest is that in our efforts to do so we are being criticised for not doing what the more fortunate States in the Union have done. Now, besides the fact that our indebtedness was increased 546 per cent in the State of Alabama during reconstruction days, the assessed value of real and personal property increased from $312 per capita in 1850 to $448 per capita in 1860. But in 1880, after the State had gone through the reconstruction period, we find that the per capita assessed value of real and personal property in Alabama had fallen to $97 per capita, and in 1890 it had only increased to $171 per capita, while in the State of Iowa in 1850 the per capita value of the property was $112, and in 1890 it had increased to $271.

In other words, under the reconstruction government in the State of Alabama, we were not only burdened with a tremendous bonded indebtedness, but it destroyed the value of the property in the State, and thereby decreased our ability to raise revenue for school purposes. The amount of debt was increased 546 per cent, and the assessed value of property was decreased 66 per cent.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. May I interrupt the gentleman?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Certainly.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. The gentleman was quoted in a newspaper the other day as saying upon his return from Alabama that an account of the present prosperity of the State would

read like a fairy tale. I would like to ask the gentleman if he substantially did say that?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I would say, Mr. Chairman, that I do not think in the history of the South there has been any greater prosperity at any time than now exists in the district I represent. [Loud applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. I am glad to hear it.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. But that does not extend to the entire State. I represent a manufacturing district, and we all know that the manufacturing interests of this country are exceedingly prosperous to-day. A large portion of the State of Alabama is agricultural, and that portion of the State is not prosperous. The white taxpayers of the State did not create the present bonded indebtedness that we have to pay.

The granting of the unlimited right of suffrage to an ignorant class of people who were not qualified at that time to receive it or to properly exercise it was the instrument that brought about this condition. We have had to assume the burden as we found it; and I say, that being the condition, that the people of the United States, the people of this Government who were responsible for bringing about that condition in the Southern States, placing these people on our hands to educate and to take care of, should not criticise us for the amount of money expended for school purposes, but ought to be willing to do exactly what we have asked in the bill that my friend from Iowa [Mr. LACEY] reports adversely on. They ought to be willing to give these public mineral lands for the education of these people.

The lands that the Government is asked to donate for school purposes under these bills are mineral lands, are not open to homestead settlement, and the masses of the people are deprived of their use under the general laws. It is not just to the State that they should be withdrawn from sale for any longer period and the development of the mineral resources of the State thereby retarded. The Government must dispose of them. If you put them up for public sale a few speculators, who know what is valuable land and what is not, will make all the profits, and but very little will go to the General Government. On the other hand, if you give them to the schools of the State the whole people will receive the benefit.

Mr. LACEY. Will the gentleman yield to me for a question?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Certainly.

Mr. LACEY. How much of the $38,000,000 of indebtedness does the State of Alabama now recognize as a valid indebtedness?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. It recognizes all that it has not paid, all excepting certain fraudulent bonds.

Mr. LACEY. I am speaking of those conceded to be genuine and that the State did not repudiate?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Alabama has repudiated none of its indebtedness.

Mr. LACEY. I do not mean in the offensive sense.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Alabama has not repudiated any of its indebtedness.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I ask one moment to answer the gentleman's question. The amount of indebtedness as it now exists, to give the accurate figures, is $12,413,196; but the gentleman must remember for the last thirty years we have been bearing this great burden. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

[Mr. SPARKMAN addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. LACEY. Mr. Chairman, I did not hear all the remarks of my friend from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], but by the aid of the reporter I think I have gathered the full scope of them. I want in advance to disclaim any feeling against Alabama.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I acquitted the gentleman of that.

Mr. LACEY. I think my friend from Alabama ought to have sided with me and taken this report and have talked plain talk to the people of Alabama. My Congressional district, with 175,000 people, in 1897-98 paid as much school taxes as the whole State of Alabama. I only give this to illustrate the difficulties under which the school system of Alabama labors.

In 1875, smarting under reconstruction and goaded to desperation, perhaps, by the evils that they complained of, they adopted a constitution forbidding themselves practically to support the public schools. That was not the intention, that was not the purpose in view, but that was its effect. They provided in their constitution that they should levy for all school and State purposes not to exceed three-quarters of 1 per cent. What is the result? In the State of Alabama in the year 1897-98 the entire sum raised for public schools was only a shade over $800,000, only 46 cents per capita to the population, and each child that was sent to school only cost $3.59.

Let us take the State of South Dakota. She spent that same year $23.45 for every child in the public schools. She levied taxes on the people per capita of $3.15 for the support of the public schools, while the State of Alabama only levied 46 cents. It is not the fault, perhaps, of the people now; they are doing all they can under the constitution; but they have made it illegal to do for themselves that which they ought to do, namely, support their public schools.

But I want to say to the credit of the people of the city of Birmingham, in which the gentleman from Alabama lives, that they have disregarded the State constitution and have made an arrangement by which they levy, in spite of the constitution, money for the public schools. But it is a big city, and public opinion is strong, and they are enabled to override the narrow limits of the constitution. But the constitution is submitted to in the other towns, and the result is that while, with a negro population of nearly one-half, it is necessary to raise money to support two systems of schools, and they do not have but three-quarters of 1 per cent tax for the support of the State government and entire school system.

Now, that ought to be remedied. Four years ago the State of Alabama appealed to the Committee on the Public Lands for relief. We said, "Why don't you levy a school tax?" They said, "Our constitution won't let us." We inquired, "Why don't you amend the constitution?" They answered, "Oh, we can not." And there they sit holding their hands for twenty-five years with a provision that limits them to three-quarters of 1 per cent for a levy to support the schools of that State, a sum entirely inadequate for the purpose and well known to be insufficient.

There are public-spirited people there, but when an evil grows hoary-headed with age it becomes sacred, and the constitution being twenty-five years old, they have gotten used to this system and they do not realize the mistake that they made in thus binding themselves hand and foot. They hardly realize how badly they are off. They know the rate of illiteracy is high, but they fail to recognize the cause of it. It will remain so until they provide for local taxation for their schools, and to do this the State constitution should be amended. Congress can not help them. They must help themselves.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. What is the rate of taxation for school purposes in the gentleman's district?

Mr. LACEY. My tax was about $3.60, more than 3½ per cent school tax alone in the city of my home, while the entire tax for schools and State expenses was only three-quarters of 1 per cent in the State of Alabama. Of course the expenses of the State must be paid and the schools must take the second place.

Mr. BERRY. Does the gentleman say that his tax was $3.50 on a hundred dollars?

Mr. LACEY. It is.

Mr. BERRY. The gentleman means 35 cents on a hundred dollars.

Mr. LACEY. No; the assessment is not on a full valuation; the tax was for the various school purposes, but was as I have stated. In the country districts the levy is lower, but the rate that I speak of is by no means unusual. When I explained to these gentlemen that a single district in Iowa paid more school taxes than the whole State of Alabama, they looked at me with amazement.

The same policy prevails in all the different States of the Northwest. And, sir, I have made this minority report in the kindest spirit, with the idea of calling the attention of the people of Alabama to the fact that they ought to take measures to procure a constitutional convention to amend their constitution, so that the different localities there can take care of their own affairs instead of asking Congress for relief. I am glad that my esteemed friend from Alabama has called attention to the matter. A little agitation may do some good.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. If the gentleman will allow me to interrupt him a moment, I wish to state that on two occasions during the last five years we have attempted that. Last year various gentlemen, along with myself—and I think every single member of Congress on this floor from our State—stood out in favor of a constitutional amendment.

Mr. LACEY. There is no doubt of that.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. We went to the legislature to procure the calling of a convention, so that we could remedy this trouble.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. LACEY. I ask unanimous consent for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair hears no objection.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. And we were finally overcome in our efforts by the very people that we were seeking to benefit. We were defeated by Republicans in that legislature, elected by the negro vote of the State—representatives of negro constituencies that we were attempting to benefit. With some Democratic votes, they finally defeated our effort to have a convention. I agree with the gentleman from Iowa. He is right; and we will still attempt to accomplish what he says we ought to do.

Mr. LACEY. I can scarcely express my surprise at the intimation of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], who is blaming this trouble on the Republican party of Alabama.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Not at all.

Mr. LACEY. That party has not been the controlling party in Alabama in recent years.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I am not blaming the national Republican party, but I am blaming the local organization. The men who control the government there now want to give educational facilities and are asking to be allowed to do so; but the men who are to be benefited are refusing to let the thing be accomplished.

Mr. LACEY. My friend from Alabama and myself desire to accomplish the same thing in his State. Does he not think that the State of Alabama ought to adopt an amendment to its constitution so as to enable the localities to tax themselves to conduct their public schools?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. We have been asking to do that, many of us.

Mr. LACEY. That is the point to which I wish to call attention—that for twenty-five years leading men of Alabama have been appealing to Congress for relief in this manner, instead of applying the medicine to the spot where the disease is located—in their State constitution, which in effect prohibits them from taking care of their own schools. Mississippi spends nearly twice as much in proportion to her population for public schools as does the State of Alabama. I say this to the credit of my friend from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] who I see is now rising to interrupt me.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I want to call the gentleman's attention to the statement he made a moment ago; and I wish to ask him whether I understood him correctly. I understood him to say that Iowa levies for school purposes a tax of 3½ per cent. Did he not mean three and a half mills per hundred? He said three and a half dollars on the hundred.

Mr. LACEY. Certainly; that is what I meant to say; and the fact that the gentleman expresses surprise at the statement shows that he does not appreciate what we are doing in our State for education. These sums are not levied by the State. They are voted in the school districts by the people themselves.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Does the gentleman mean to say that if a man in Iowa has a 5 per cent investment three and a half of that 5 per cent goes to the school fund?

Mr. LACEY. Certainly. Are you surprised at that? My own home school taxes for years were about 3.6 per cent. What do you think of that?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Was property assessed at its real value?

Mr. LACEY. Our assessment usually has been about 40 per cent of the real value. Under a recent law it has been reduced to 25 per cent of cash value.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Oh!

Mr. LACEY. And in Alabama property is not assessed at more than 40 or 50 per cent of its real value.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. In our State each man's property is assessed at what he swears he would take for it if he sold it—not what it would bring upon a foreclosure.

Mr. LACEY. In Illinois, Alabama, and other States the assessment is considerably less than the cash value of the property. In most of the States whilst ostensibly the valuation is assumed to be at full cash value, in actual practice it is assessed at much less and much personal property escapes altogether.

Mr. RICHARDSON. In your State do you tax personal property?

Mr. LACEY. Yes; everything.

Mr. RICHARDSON. And is not personal property assessed at its true value?

Mr. LACEY. That was formerly the case theoretically; but as a matter of fact the valuation has been only about 40 per cent until the present law has made it uniform at 25 per cent.

I do not claim any special virtue for Iowa; I am simply showing that when a locality is permitted to levy a tax on itself to support its schools it does not regard it as a tax any more than it regards a board bill or a wash bill as a tax. It is regarded as one of the ordinary and necessary expenses of the families that we should have public schools. We vote it upon ourselves in our municipalities; and in different localities there are different rates. I have given the rate in my own town. The aggregate taxation there for all school purposes is commonly over 3.6 per cent.

Mr. RICHARDSON. What is the aggregate amount of taxation?

Mr. LACEY. In my own city, a little over 6 per cent.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Sixty dollars on a thousand?

Mr. LACEY. A little over that. We do not expect to have educational advantages for nothing. The trouble with some of our friends is that they want to have all these things and not pay for them themselves, but instead, make their appeals to Congress. If a State desires to take any rank in these matters, it must bear the expense, and it is well worth the cost. If you will let the people of Alabama school districts tax themselves for their schools, they will soon make a different record.

Mr. PAYNE. Does the gentleman mean to say that the people of Alabama come here to Congress asking us to give away land and money to support their schools?

Mr. LACEY. No; they asked us to give lands.

Mr. PAYNE. To give lands in order to sell them to support their school system.

Mr. LACEY. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Oh, no; this was for certain special colleges.

Mr. LACEY. Not generally. This was for certain institutions which were specified. There is another bill pending to give the remainder of the land for the common schools.

Mr. PAYNE. Do they not put themselves in the same position that they think we are trying to put the people of Puerto Rico in, when we give money out of the Treasury to build schools down there?

Mr. LACEY. Let us not get onto the Puerto Rico question, because this is a serious matter.

Mr. PAYNE. I should like to know the difference between the two propositions.

Mr. BERRY. I want to ask the gentleman, what is the tax duplicate of the whole State of Iowa? How much is the whole property that is returned to the State for taxation?

Mr. LACEY. I have not attempted to give that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LACEY] has expired.

Mr. LACEY. I should like five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that his time be extended five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BERRY. I want to know what the tax duplicate of the State of Iowa is?

Mr. LACEY. I can not give it from memory.

Mr. BERRY. Can you approximate it? It is about $1,200,000,000, is it not?

Mr. LACEY. During the same year when Alabama spent $800,000 for school purposes, Iowa spent $8,451,000.

Mr. BERRY. Therefore the gentleman is mistaken in his statement as to the rate of taxation. The total must be ten or twelve hundred million dollars, and $36 on the thousand would give about $36,000,000 for the total; so the gentleman has made a mistake.

Mr. LACEY. Oh, no. I pay my taxes every year, and I know what the receipts are, and it is nothing unusual. The fact that I pay 36 mills for school purposes is not a remarkable thing in Iowa, although it seems so to some of the gentlemen here.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. You said 36 cents.

Mr. LACEY. No; three and six-tenths cents—three and six-tenths of a cent.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Oh, well, that is different. That was the question I asked you. I wanted to know the figures.

Mr. LACEY. I told the gentleman that the entire tax of my city was over 6 per cent, of which over 3½ was for school purposes, and this has been the rate for many years. If our tax levy should be cut down so that our State and school tax in Iowa cities and towns would not exceed three-fourths of 1 per cent we would think that the public-school system had disappeared, and, in fact, the schools would close. If, as in Alabama, our school taxes only amounted to 46 cents per capita it would only pay about one-tenth of the expense of our school system.

Mr. BERRY. I was speaking about the total tax rate.

Mr. LACEY. It is over 6 per cent in my town.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Six mills?

Mr. LACEY. No; 6 cents on the dollar.

Mr. BERRY. Sixty cents on the hundred?

Mr. LACEY. No; $6 on the hundred. Six mills would not go very far toward sustaining a good common-school system.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. The gentleman said the school tax was $3.60 on the hundred. I think he is mistaken about that.

Mr. LACEY. Oh, no; not at all. My taxes last year in the city in which I live were a little over 60 mills, a little over 6 per cent on the valuation. Of that 6 per cent and some odd mills, 36 mills, or 3.6 per cent, were voted by the people of my town, or my school district, for school purposes—to support the public schools.

That is not remarkable in Iowa. That is not at all astonishing there. We regard it as a matter of course. All of the Iowa members here pay about the same amount of taxes in their towns in Iowa. Now, here comes my friend from Alabama, with his town bound hand and foot, so that it can not levy more than three-fourths of 1 per cent for school purposes and State purposes both. He thinks that it is a very remarkable thing that anybody should vote to tax themselves 3.6 per cent for school purposes. We pay over 6 per cent, including the other taxes, as I have several times explained to these gentlemen.

Mr. BERRY. You mean $6 on the hundred?

Mr. LACEY. Certainly, $6 on the hundred—6 per cent.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. And $3.60 on the hundred for schools?

Mr. LACEY. Yes. Now, we do not complain of that. I did not expect to make any point on that. We simply vote this on ourselves; but here are towns of the same size as the one in which I live, towns in Alabama that under the constitution of Alabama have no power to vote one cent upon themselves for school purposes, and what is the result? The consequence is that they only levy an average in the whole State of 46 cents per capita, while the State of Mississippi levies 81 cents per capita—nearly twice as much per capita. And though in the State of Mississippi they spend $5.21 for every child in school, in Alabama they spend $3.59, and in the State of Iowa we spend $22.79 for every child in school.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. If the gentleman will allow me, in the statement that I made I gave some later figures than those which the gentleman quoted. Last year the amount collected was 81 cents per capita, instead of 46 cents.

Mr. LACEY. My friend has some later reports than those which I was able to obtain. I have taken the last report from the Commissioner of Education, and I am glad to know that the amount is increased; but the fact remains that it can never be made anywhere near adequate so long as local taxes for school purposes can not be lawfully levied in that State.

I will print in my remarks the minority report which has caused this discussion. I commend the facts contained in it to the careful attention of the people of Alabama.

VIEWS OF THE MINORITY.

The undersigned can not agree with the views of the majority report on this bill.

Alabama is in very great need of educational facilities. The percentage of illiteracy is large, and no one can doubt the necessity for adequate provisions being made for the educational purposes in this State. The State has been applying to Congress for many years for national aid for its various educational institutions. The attention of the gentlemen seeking this aid has repeatedly been called to what appears to be the main difficulty in educational matters in Alabama.

Alabama is a fertile State with a delightful and healthful climate, abundance of timber, coal, and iron, with adequate rainfall and a prolific soil. The population of the State at the present time is probably near 1,800,000 souls. The State has been making great industrial progress, and the city of Birmingham has become the rival of Pittsburg herself. There is one great drawback to the State of Alabama which casts a cloud over her future, but which is an essential one for her people to remove. She has no adequate system of public schools, nor any method of providing sufficient revenue to support them. Nothing can supply this want but the action of her own people.

Under her constitution it is provided, "Separate schools for each race shall always be maintained by the school authorities." This policy of maintaining separate schools for the white and the black children is the policy of many of the former slave States, if not all of them. On this subject the people of those States are the best judges. They know best what is for the interest of both races, and no one outside the State has a right to criticise the plan adopted. This statement is not made in criticism, but only in order to call attention to the fact.

The population is nearly equally divided between the white and the black races, and as two complete systems of schools must be maintained it is evident that it costs the State necessarily much more, if not doubly as much, to conduct its schools as it does in States where no such distinction is made. In view of the fact that this method has been adopted in this State, it is evident that the allowance for schools should be greater than in those States where but one system is provided for both white and black together. But, on the contrary, not a sufficient allowance is made for the schools of one color alone.

The State does not seem to have sufficiently recognized the difficulties surrounding the subject of education, for in 1875 it adopted a constitution which has been in force for a quarter of a century and under which the State has bound herself hand and foot in the matter of providing funds with which to carry on a system of public schools. The following pages contain all the provisions of the constitution of the State of Alabama relating to this subject:

"ARTICLE II.—*Taxation.*

"SEC. 1. All taxes levied on the property in this State shall be assessed in exact proportion to the value of such property: *Provided, however*, The general assembly may levy a poll tax, not to exceed $1.50 on each poll, which shall be applied exclusively in aid of the school fund in the county paying the same.

"SEC. 2. No power to levy taxes shall be delegated to individuals or private corporations.

"SEC. 3. After the ratification of this constitution no new debt shall be created against or incurred by this State or its authority, except to repel invasion or suppress insurrection, and then only by the concurrence of two-thirds of the members of each house of the general assembly, and the vote shall be taken by the yeas and nays and entered on the journals; and any act creating or incurring any new debt against this State, except as herein provided for, shall be absolutely void: *Provided*, The governor may be authorized to negotiate temporary loans, never to exceed $100,000, to meet deficiencies in the treasury; and until the same is paid no new loan shall be negotiated: *Provided further*, That this section shall not be construed so as to prevent the issuance of bonds in adjustment of the existing State indebtedness.

"SEC. 4. The general assembly shall not have the power to levy in any one year a greater rate of taxation than three-fourths of 1 per cent on the value of the taxable property within the State.

"SEC. 5. No county in this State shall be authorized to levy a larger rate of taxation, in any one year, on the value of the taxable property therein, than one-half of 1 per cent: *Provided*, That to pay debts existing at the ratification of this constitution an additional rate of one-fourth of 1 per cent may be levied and collected, which shall be exclusively appropriated to the payment of such debts, or the interest thereon: *Provided further*, That to pay any debt or liability now existing against any county, incurred for the erection of the necessary public buildings or other ordinary county purposes, or that may hereafter be created for the erection of necessary public buildings or bridges, any county may levy and collect such special taxes as may have been or may be hereafter authorized by law, which taxes so levied and collected shall be applied exclusively to the purposes for which the same shall have been levied and collected.

"SEC. 6. The property of private corporations, associations, and individuals of this State shall forever be taxed at the same rate.

"SEC. 7. No city, town, or other municipal corporation, other than provided for in this article, shall levy or collect a larger rate of taxation, in any one year, on the property thereof, than one-half of 1 per cent of the value of such property, as assessed for State taxation during the preceding year: *Provided*, That for debts existing at the time of the ratification of this constitution, and the interest thereon, an additional rate of 1 per cent may be collected, to be applied exclusively to such indebtedness: *And provided*, This section shall not apply to the city of Mobile, which city may, until the 1st of January, 1879, levy a tax not to exceed the rate of 1 per cent and from and after that time a tax not to exceed the rate of three-fourths of 1 per cent, to pay the expenses of the city government, and may also, until the 1st day of January, 1879, levy a tax not to exceed the rate of three-fourths of 1 per cent, to pay the existing indebtedness of said city and the interest thereon.

"SEC. 8. At the first session of the general assembly after the ratification of this constitution the salaries of the following officers shall be reduced at least 25 per cent, viz, governor, secretary of state, State auditor, State treasurer, attorney-general, superintendent of education, judges of supreme and circuit courts, and chancellors; and after said reduction the general assembly shall not have power to increase the same except by a vote of the majority of all the members elected to each house, taken by yeas and nays, and entered on the journals: *Provided*, This section shall not apply to any of said officers now in office.

"SEC. 9. The general assembly shall not have power to require the counties or other municipal corporations to pay any charges which are now payable out of the State treasury."

"ARTICLE XIII.—*Education.*

"SEC. 1. The general assembly shall organize, establish, and maintain a system of public schools throughout the State, for the equal benefit of the children thereof between the ages of 7 and 21 years; but separate schools shall be provided for the children of citizens of African descent.

"SEC. 2. The principal of all funds arising from the sale of lands or other disposition of lands or other property which has been or may hereafter be granted or intrusted to this State or given by the United States for educational purposes shall be preserved inviolate and undiminished, and the income arising therefrom shall be faithfully applied to the specific objects of the original grants or appropriations.

"SEC. 3. All lands or other property given by individuals or appropriated by the State for educational purposes, and all estates of deceased persons who die without leaving a will or heir, shall be faithfully applied to the maintenance of the public schools.

"SEC. 4. The general assembly shall also provide for the levying and collection of an annual poll tax, not to exceed $1.50 on each poll, which shall be applied to the support of the public schools in the counties in which it is levied and collected.

"SEC. 5. The income arising from the sixteenth section trust fund, until it is called for by the United States Government, and the funds enumerated in sections 3 and 4 of this article, with such other moneys, to be not less than $100,000 per annum, as the general assembly shall provide by taxation or otherwise, shall be applied to the support and maintenance of the public schools; and it shall be the duty of the general assembly to increase, from time to time, the public-school fund as the condition of the treasury and the resources of the State will admit.

"SEC. 6. Not more than 4 per cent of all the moneys raised or which may be hereafter appropriated for the support of the public schools shall be used or expended otherwise than for the payment of teachers employed in such schools: *Provided*, That the general assembly may, by a vote of two-thirds of each house, suspend the operation of this section.

"SEC. 7. The supervision of the public schools shall be vested in a superintendent of education, whose powers, duties, compensation, and term of office shall be fixed by law. The superintendent of education shall be elected by the qualified voters of the State in such a manner and at such times as shall be provided by law.

"SEC. 8. No money raised for the support of the public schools of the State shall be appropriated to or used for the support of any sectarian or denominational school.

"SEC. 9. The State University and the Agricultural and Mechanical College shall each be under the management and control of a board of trustees. The board for the university shall consist of two members from the Congressional district in which the university is located, and one from each of the other Congressional districts in the State. The board of the Agricultural and Mechanical College shall consist of two members from the Congressional district in which the college is located, and one from each of the other Congressional districts of the State. Said trustees shall be appointed by the governor, by and with the advice and consent of the senate, and shall hold office for the term of six years and until their successors shall be appointed and qualified.

"After the first appointment, each board shall be divided into three classes as nearly equal as may be. The seats of the first class shall be vacated at the expiration of two years, and those of the second class in four years, and those of the third class in six years, from the date of appointment, so that one-third may be chosen biennially. No trustee shall receive any pay or emolument other than his actual expenses incurred in the discharge of his duties as such. The governor shall be ex officio president, and the superintendent of education ex officio a member of each of the said boards of trustees.

"SEC. 10. The general assembly shall have no power to change the location of the State University or the Agricultural and Mechanical College as now established by law, except upon a vote of two-thirds of the members of the general assembly, taken by yeas and nays and entered upon the journals.

"SEC. 11. The provisions of this article and any act of the general assembly passed in pursuance thereof to establish, organize, and maintain a system of public schools throughout the State shall apply to Mobile County only so far as to authorize and require the authorities designated by law to draw the portion of the funds to which the said county shall be entitled for school purposes and to make reports to the superintendent of education as may be prescribed by law. And all special incomes and powers of taxation as now authorized by law for the benefit of public schools in said county shall remain undisturbed until otherwise provided by the general assembly: *Provided*, That separate schools for each race shall always be maintained by said school authorities."

Instead of permitting school districts and local authorities to tax themselves for the support of the public schools in the districts, the methods of raising money have been thus limited by the constitution. It will be observed that the total State levy for all purposes is only three-fourths of 1 per cent. (Const., Art. II, sec. 4.) Also a poll tax of $1.50 is provided, which, no doubt, like poll taxes generally in all the other States of the Union, is found very difficult to collect.

Out of this three-fourths of 1 per cent, the maximum tax levy, and the poll tax, together with a license tax in some counties, the public schools must be supported, subject, however, to some additions from other sources, such as the proceeds of sales of school lands, the interest on the surplus at 4 per cent deposited with the State by the United States in 1836, rents of a portion of the lands given by the United States or private individuals for the support of schools, and also escheats.

The meager allowance for the support of schools has been acquiesced in for a quarter of a century by the people of Alabama. Instead of endeavoring to amend the constitution so as to raise adequate funds by local taxation

the National Government has been appealed to. The only wonder is that Alabama shows as good a record as she does in her school system with the very inadequate means which her constitution permits her to raise for that purpose.

The most useful system of public schools is that which does not attempt to take the children away from home and their parents to some distant place, but brings the schoolhouse close to the child where he can remain at home and continue to be a support to the family, having opportunities for education at a day school in the neighborhood. The child thus continues to be a producer and the family relation is kept up.

At night the children take home their books and writing materials, and the family residence becomes a night school for both old and young. Upon this system of education so much depends that no State is justified in neglecting it. So long as Alabama is under bondage by her constitution not to levy more than three-fourths of 1 per cent tax for all State purposes, first paying the expenses of the State and then applying the residue to school purposes, just so long will she be under the necessity of calling on Congress for aid and of appealing to individuals outside the State for assistance in carrying on her educational system. Until the limitation which prevents the State from furnishing adequate means for educational purposes shall have been removed, Congress can not be consistently asked to furnish that which the State, under its own constitution, forbids itself to supply.

The means for amending the constitution are ample, and the necessity for some amendment seems to be imperative. In fact, all the gentlemen who have been urging Congress to furnish this relief have recognized the fact that the necessity for a change is imperative in the organic law of the State in that respect. No mere outsider has a right to criticise or comment on the laws or constitution of any one of the States of the Union in which he has no personal concern; but when a State applies to Congress for relief on the grounds that it is so hampered by its own constitution as to be prevented from performing a great duty pertaining to the Commonwealth, it is no more than right and just that the difficulty should be pointed out, and in doing so it is with the friendliest spirit and with the greatest desire to see Alabama assume a progressive attitude in relation to the education of both white and black.

Congress, by aiding the State, by either appropriations of land or money, would be injuring rather than benefiting her people, because, in looking to Congress for assistance, they would be led to ignore the simplest of all propositions, viz, that of permitting themselves to levy local taxes for educating all the children of each community.

The minority discussed with the gentlemen present a like bill, years ago when the same proposition was presented for the first time, the necessity of the State making suitable provision for its schools, but nothing seems to have been done in that direction, though the propriety of the suggestion was admitted. The proposed land grant would probably only further delay the action of the State in making suitable arrangements for the support of its school system.

The people of Alabama evidently do not realize the position in educational matters which is enforced by the constitutional limitation referred to.

In appearing before the Committee on the Public Lands from time to time in the last four years, the delegations from that State asking for national aid have often manifested surprise at the suggestion that the State is not sufficiently helping herself in these matters.

A review of what is being done in a few of the other States in relation to common schools will render it obvious that the real need of Alabama is a method of raising sufficient revenues for the common schools of the State within the State.

The statistics of a few States North and South will show how the common-school system of the State of Alabama is suffering from limitations created twenty-five years ago and still retained in the constitution.

The expenditure per capita of population for all the public schools in the following States for the year 1897-98 was:

South Dakota	$3.15
North Dakota	3.66
Nebraska	3.18
Iowa	4.02
Kansas	3.00
North Carolina	.53
Arkansas	.94
West Virginia	2.36
Georgia	.84
Tennessee	.90
Louisiana	.71
Mississippi	.81
Alabama	.46

The actual expenditures of the following States for common schools in the year 1897-98 were:

South Dakota	$1,280,663
North Dakota	1,288,031
Nebraska	3,712,017
Iowa	8,451,504
Kansas	3,991,477
North Carolina	931,143
Arkansas	1,220,362
West Virginia	2,046,623
Georgia	1,758,106
Tennessee	1,690,750
Louisiana	956,888
Mississippi	1,165,840
Alabama	800,273

Average cost per capita per pupil of children in the public schools in the following States for the whole school year for all purposes.

South Dakota	$23.45
North Dakota	31.30
Nebraska	21.34
Iowa	22.79
Kansas	15.54
North Carolina	4.34
Arkansas	6.38
West Virginia	12.81
Georgia	6.31
Tennessee	5.00
Louisiana	7.25
Mississippi	5.21
Alabama	3.59

The above figures give a striking illustration of the results in Alabama of the constitutional prohibition of adequate support to the common schools.

South Dakota expended 50 per cent more for her common schools than Alabama, and yet Alabama has three times the population of South Dakota.

Mississippi has a majority of black population, and has less wealth and population than Alabama, and yet Mississippi expended 50 per cent more for school purposes than Alabama.

For each person living in Mississippi the tax for the common schools was 81 cents; in South Dakota, $3.15; but in Alabama, only 46 cents.

The actual average annual cost of each pupil for all school purposes in Alabama was only $3.59. In Mississippi it was $5.21; in South Dakota it was $23.45.

For these reasons we think the bill should not pass.

JOHN F. LACEY.
F. M. EDDY.

In addition to the foregoing reasons, I think all public lands subject to homestead entry should be reserved for those purposes.

F. M. EDDY.

Mr. SIMS. I want to ask the gentleman a question for information.

Mr. LACEY. I will yield to my friend.

Mr. SIMS. If a bond or note bearing 6 per cent——

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

Mr. LACEY. I do not know but what we could use this time to good advantage.

Mr. HULL. Gentlemen have permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. SIMS. But we can not extend our questions.

Mr. HULL. The question under discussion between Alabama and Iowa having been settled, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SHERMAN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 8582) making appropriations for the support of the Regular and Volunteer Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1901, and had come to no resolution thereon.

LEAVE TO PRINT.

Mr. LENTZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for three days more in which to prepare for the RECORD my speech on the Loud bill. I have had some difficulty with my eyes, and in consequence have not been able to complete it within the five days allowed.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio states that he has had difficulty with his eyes for some days, and in consequence of that fact asks unanimous consent for three days in which to extend his remarks on the Loud bill, the time for leave to print on that bill expiring to-night. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, Senate bills and joint resolutions of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and referred to their appropriate committees, as indicated below:

S. 1246. An act granting a pension to Charles A. Perkins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 1245. An act granting a pension to Oliver Domon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 2290. An act granting a pension to James Richardson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 2753. An act granting an increase of pension to David H. Morey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 1601. An act granting an increase of pension to John Thornton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 1603. An act granting an increase of pension to John W. Kaump—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 2539. An act granting an increase of pension to Capt. Milton H. Daniels—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 258. An act granting a pension to Coryden Bevans—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 3380. An act granting an increase of pension to Hamilton K. Williams—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 2335. An act granting an increase of pension to Maj. John W. Blake—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 2900. An act granting a pension to Hannah G. Huff—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 351. An act to increase the pension of Samuel S. White—to the Committee on Pensions.

S. 1400. An act granting a pension to William Lyman Chittenden—to the Committee on Pensions.

S. 2764. An act granting an increase of pension to William Murphy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 3200. An act granting an increase of pension to Luke H. Monson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 2483. An act granting an increase of pension to Lewis C. Beard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 2215. An act granting an increase of pension to Robert J. Koonce—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 2276. An act granting an increase of pension to George W. Ragland—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 2296. An act granting an increase of pension to John J. Sears—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 316. An act granting an increase of pension to Louann A. Perry, of Wallace, Kans.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 3215. An act granting an increase of pension to Andrew F. Dinsmore—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 1890. An act granting a pension to Sarah E. Tradewell—to the Committee on Pensions.

S. 1966. An act revoking and annulling the subdivision of Pencote Heights, in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 2926. An act to prevent dangers to navigation from rafts on the Pacific Ocean—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 2870. An act concerning disbursing officers of the Subsistence Department of the Army—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 3270. An act for the relief of Nathan S. Jarvis—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 3249. An act to remove the charge of desertion from the naval record of Charles C. Lee—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 3060. An act for the relief of James C. Drake—to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1596. An act to equalize and regulate the duties of the judges of the district courts of the United States of Alabama—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Senate concurrent resolution:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the statue of Oliver P. Morton, presented by the State of Indiana, to be placed in Statuary Hall, is accepted in the name of the United States, and that the thanks of Congress be tendered the State for the contribution of the statue of one of the most eminent citizens and illustrious statesmen of the Republic.

Second. That a copy of these resolutions, suitably engrossed and duly authenticated, be transmitted to the governor of the State of Indiana—

to the Committee on the Library.

S. 1612. An act providing for the purchase of metal and the coinage of minor coins and the distribution and redemption of said coins—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

S. 3380. An act granting an increase of pension to Hamilton K. Williams—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 1939. An act authorizing the President of the United States to appoint a commission to study and make full report upon the commercial and industrial conditions of China and Japan, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 3352. An act granting a pension to Sarah Kersey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. R. 72. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States to appoint David Bagley as an additional cadet at the Naval Academy, Annapolis, Md.—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the following titles:

S. 3129. An act granting an increase of pension to Henry McMillen;

S. 265. An act granting an increase of pension to Jane McMahon;

S. 1592. An act granting a pension to Jane E. Augur;

S. 1254. An act granting a pension to Catherine E. O'Brien;

S. 1713. An act granting an increase of pension to Alice S. Jordon;

S. 495. An act granting a pension to Ambrose J. Vanarsdel;

S. 343. An act granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Freeman;

S. 195. An act for the relief of Louis Miller;

S. 39. An act granting an increase of pension to Caroline V. English;

S. 1752. An act granting a pension to James J. Wheeler;

S. 2346. An act granting an increase of pension to Alfred Bigelow;

S. 2368. An act granting a pension to Mary A. Randall; and

S. 2882. An act to authorize the Cambridge Bridge Commission to construct a drawless bridge across the Charles River, in the State of Massachusetts.

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

H. R. 99. An act to establish a military post at or near Des Moines, Iowa; and

H. R. 9497. An act to amend an act providing for the construction of a light-ship to be located near Cape Elizabeth, Me.

OPEN DOOR IN CHINA.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President:

To the House of Representatives:

In response to the resolution of the House of Representatives of March 24, 1900, reading as follows:

"Whereas the commercial community of the United States is deeply interested in ascertaining the conditions which are to govern trade in such parts of the Chinese Empire as are claimed by various foreign powers to be within their 'areas of interest;' and

"Whereas bills are now pending before both Houses of Congress for the dispatch of a mission to China to study its economic condition: Therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the President of the United States be requested to transmit to the House of Representatives, if not incompatible with the public service, such correspondence as may have passed between the Department of State and various foreign governments concerning the maintenance of the 'open door' policy in China."

I transmit herewith a report from the Secretary of State, with accompanying papers.

WILLIAM MCKINLEY.

EXECUTIVE MANSION,
Washington, March 27, 1900.

The message, with the accompanying documents, was ordered to be printed, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

And then, on motion of Mr. HULL (at 5 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

A letter from the Clerk of the House of Representatives, transmitting a communication from the file clerk of the House relating to the necessity of additional space to accommodate the files of the House, etc.—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers in relation to disallowances in the accounts of Maj. H. M. Adams—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a copy of a communication relating to the necessity of an appropriation for protecting the Fort Caswell Military Reservation from storm tides—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Secretary of War submitting an estimate of appropriation for filling in land at Fort Point, Galveston, Tex.—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Secretary of War submitting an estimate of appropriation for Army depot buildings at Philadelphia—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Director of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing submitting an estimate of appropriation for certain persons erroneously classified—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Supervising Architect submitting a form of bill relating to the old court-house building at Baltimore, Md.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Supervising Architect submitting an estimate of appropriation for lookouts in the temporary post-office building in Chicago—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of John R. Henderson, administrator of estate of Michael C. Henderson, against the United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of Martha Noggle, administratrix of estate of Jacob Noggle, against the United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of Jacob A. Miller against the United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

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

Mr. HULL, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the joint resolution of the House (H. J. Res. 216) for appointment of members of Board of Managers of the National

Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers, reported the same, accompanied by a report (No. 777); which said joint resolution and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. KNOX, from the Committee on the Territories, to which was referred the joint resolution of the Senate (S. R. 76) withdrawing certain lands on the island of Oahu, Hawaii, from the public domain, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 778); which said joint resolution and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. EDDY, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 6440) to amend the act of Congress approved May 14, 1880, entitled "An act for the relief of settlers on the public lands, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 779); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HAUGEN, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 2799) to carry into effect the stipulations of article 7 of the treaty between the United States and Spain concluded on the 10th day of December, 1898, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 780); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MAHON, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 2384) to reimburse certain persons who expended moneys and furnished services and supplies in repelling invasions and suppressing Indian hostilities within the Territorial limits of the present State of Nevada, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 782); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. EDDY, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 2977) to amend "An act to provide for the allotment of lands in severalty to Indians on the various reservations and to extend the protection of the laws of the United States and the Territories over the Indians, and for other purposes," approved February 8, 1887, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 791); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. FLETCHER, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 7945) to amend an act entitled "An act permitting the building of a dam across Rainy Lake River," reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 792); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BARHAM, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 7840) for the establishment of a light-house and fog signal at Point No Point, in Chesapeake Bay, between Cove Point and Smiths Point, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 793); 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 Senate (S. 2630) for the relief of the legal representatives of Merrick, Merrick & Cope, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 781); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SIMS, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 2268) to carry into effect a finding of the Court of Claims in favor of Pamella B. Finney, administratrix of T. C. Finney, deceased, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 783); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MAHON, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 4693) for the relief of Sarah E. E. Perine, widow and administratrix of William Perine, deceased, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 784); 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. 5091) for the relief of the legal representatives of John Roach, deceased, of the Etna Works, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 785); 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. 8282) for the relief of the Allaire Works, of New York, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 786); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HENRY of Mississippi, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 4522) for the relief of Dr. Asa Wall, of Virginia, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 787); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MAHON, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 2724) for the relief of William B. Reaney, surviving partner of the firm of Reaney, Son & Archbold, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 788); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. WEAVER, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 4061) for the relief of Hannah E. Boardman, administratrix of William Boardman, deceased, surviving partner of the firm of Boardman, Holbrook & Co., of the Neptune Works, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 789); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 2650) granting an increase of pension to Katharine Taylor Dodge, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 790); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. GRAFF, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 1017) for the relief of John M. Guyton, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 794); 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. HOWELL: A bill (H. R. 10036) for the erection of a public building in the city of Perth Amboy, N. J.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HEATWOLE: A bill (H. R. 10037) regulating the issue of stamped envelopes by the Government—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. DAYTON: A bill (H. R. 10038) to promote the circulation of reading matter among the blind—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. BROWNLOW: A bill (H. R. 10039) to authorize the Secretary of War to set aside a part of national cemetery at Arlington, Va., for the burial of deceased enlisted men and their wives—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BINGHAM: A bill (H. R. 10040) to amend Title LXV of the Revised Statutes of the United States, relating to telegraph companies—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. MUDD: A bill (H. R. 10041) to regulate the pay and hours of service of attendants at the Government Hospital for the Insane, in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BANKHEAD: A bill (H. R. 10042) to authorize the acquisition of square No. 229, in the city of Washington, D. C., and providing for a hall of records, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. CURTIS: A bill (H. R. 10043) to establish and maintain, in connection with the Department of Justice of the United States, a division to be known as the Bureau of Criminal Information, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HULL, from the Committee on Military Affairs: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 216) for appointment of members of Board of Managers of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers—to the House Calendar.

By Mr. BABCOCK: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 217) providing for the printing of the Messages and Papers of the Presidents—to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. LORIMER: A resolution (H. Res. 199) providing for the printing of hearings before the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads—to the Committee on Printing.

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. ALDRICH: A bill (H. R. 10044) for the relief of Mrs. S. F. Prestridge, of Selma, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CURTIS: A bill (H. R. 10045) for the relief of Patrick Larkin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10046) to pension Rosa Cox—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10047) granting a pension to Paul Berg—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10048) granting an increase of pension to James B. Haslet—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10049) for the relief of Elijah T. Hunt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DAYTON: A bill (H. R. 10050) granting an increase of pension to Edward Madden—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10051) granting a pension to George W. Harrison, late a captain and assistant quartermaster and brevet lieutenant-colonel of volunteers in the Army of the United States—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10052) to reimburse the estate of Samuel Caldwell, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10053) granting an increase of pension to J. E. Wallace, of Rowlesburg, W. Va.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10054) granting an increase of pension to Bryson Dunn, of Reedsville, W. Va.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DAVIS: A bill (H. R. 10055) granting an increase of pension to Frederick G. McDowell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DOUGHERTY: A bill (H. R. 10056) granting a pension to David P. Watts—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BROWNLOW: A bill (H. R. 10057) for the relief of Mary A. Shufeldt—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BARTLETT: A bill (H. R. 10058) granting a pension to George A. Alexander and John S. Alexander, the minor children of George A. Alexander, deceased—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10059) granting a pension to Mrs. Elizabeth Folds, of Butts County, Ga.—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10060) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. Winfred M. Goins, of Barnesville, Ga.—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10061) for the relief of Henry C. Mix, of Macon, Ga.—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 10062) granting an increase of pension to Harriet Crotsenburg, widow of Lieut. Nick Crotsenburg, late second lieutenant of Company F, Thirteenth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DOUGHERTY: A bill (H. R. 10063) granting a pension to Samuel P. Cox—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CUSHMAN: A bill (H. R. 10064) for the relief of Alfred S. Ruth—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GASTON: A bill (H. R. 10065) granting a pension to Mary J. White—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GILBERT: A bill (H. R. 10066) granting a pension to James Morris—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10067) for the benefit of the Harrodsburg Presbyterian Church—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10068) for the relief of H. Manwaring—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10069) granting a pension to Sarah T. Brewer—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10070) granting a pension to W. E. Grubbs—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 10071) granting an increase of pension to Mary W. Clark—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HEATWOLE: A bill (H. R. 10072) to reimburse Hubert Nyssen—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KNOX: A bill (H. R. 10073) for the relief of Angus McVigor—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KERR: A bill (H. R. 10074) granting an increase of pension to George Logsoon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LORIMER: A bill (H. R. 10075) for the relief of John Mullin—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10076) to increase pension of Susan C. Gilbreath, widow of Maj. E. C. Gilbreath, Eleventh United States Infantry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MORGAN: A bill (H. R. 10077) for the relief of Peter Scott—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10078) granting a pension to Charles C. Jones, of Jackson, Ohio—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McALEER: A bill (H. R. 10079) for the relief of the personal representatives of John McCabe and Patrick McCabe, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. O'GRADY: A bill (H. R. 10080) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Judson Knickerbocker—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10081) granting a pension to Anthony Coleman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10082) granting an increase of pension to Lewis Oliver—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10083) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Hugh McGuckin—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PEARRE: A bill (H. R. 10084) for the relief of Nathan Shaw—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10085) for the relief of Isaac R. Maus—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10086) for the relief of John L. Benson—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10087) for the relief of William Akerman—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RUPPERT: A bill (H. R. 10088) granting a pension to Oscar Dunlap—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SULLOWAY: A bill (H. R. 10089) granting an increase of pension to Charles Forbes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. VAN VOORHIS: A bill (H. R. 10090) granting a pension to Willard Harrop—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WACHTER: A bill (H. R. 10091) granting a pension to Mary L. Tweddle—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10092) for the relief of Patrick H. Philbin—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. YOUNG: A bill (H. R. 10093) granting a pension to Mary P. Mitchell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10094) granting a pension to Louisa S. Hoepfner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PEARRE: A bill (H. R. 10095) to increase the pension of Mrs. Annie Gibson Yates, widow of Capt. George W. Yates, Seventh United States Cavalry—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HEMENWAY: A bill (H. R. 10096) for the relief of George Kelly—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SCUDDER: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 218) for the relief of Annie Birdsall, administratrix of the estate of John Birdsall, deceased—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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 the SPEAKER: Petition of A. W. Decker and 22 citizens of Janesville, Iowa; Dr. C. A. Waterbury and 22 citizens of Blackhawk County, Iowa, in favor of the Grout oleomargarine bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of E. C. Buckner Post, of Eldora, Iowa, Grand Army of the Republic, favoring the establishment of a Branch Soldiers' Home for disabled soldiers at Johnson City, Tenn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BARTLETT: Petition of the Chicago Federation of Labor, protesting against the passage of House bills placing a tax on process butter and otherwise regulating its manufacture and sale—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BOREING: Petitions of Grand Army of the Republic posts of Pineville and Tompkinsville, Ky., in favor of a bill locating a Branch Soldiers' Home near Johnson City, Tenn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BOWERSOCK: Protest of the Merchants' Association of Illinois, against the passage of the Grout, Tawney, or other bills to increase the tax on butterine—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of citizens of Ottawa, Kans., in favor of Senate bill No. 1439, relating to an act to regulate commerce—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, report of the Commercial Club of Topeka, Kans., favoring cession of arid lands to the States—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. BRENNER: Petition of Frank Foot and others, of Trenton and vicinity, Ohio, to amend the present law in relation to the sale of oleomargarine—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BURKETT: Remonstrance of the Business Men's Association of Kearney, Nebr., against a parcel-post system—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, resolutions of the Chicago Federation of Labor, against sundry bills taxing oleomargarine and butterine—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURLEIGH: Petition of citizens of Freedom, Me., in favor of the Grout bill taxing oleomargarine—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BUTLER: Sundry petitions of citizens of the Sixth Congressional district of Pennsylvania, in favor of the Grout bill taxing oleomargarine—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of West Chester, Pa., to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors in Army canteens, etc.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Brandywine Post, No. 54, Grand Army of the Republic, of Coatesville, Pa., favoring the passage of a bill to establish a Branch Soldiers' Home near Johnson City, Tenn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CHANLER: Resolution of the New York Board of Trade and Transportation, relative to the policy of the United States

toward the island of Puerto Rico—to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CRUMPACKER: Resolutions of eight posts, Grand Army of the Republic, of the Tenth Congressional district of Indiana, in favor of House bill No. 7094, to establish a Branch Soldiers' Home at Johnson City, Tenn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CURTIS: Petition of Lincoln Post, No. 1, Grand Army of the Republic, of Topeka, Kans., favoring the passage of House bill No. 7094—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STANLEY W. DAVENPORT: Petition of Conyngham Post, No. 97, of Wilkesbarre, Pa., Grand Army of the Republic, in favor of House bill No. 7094, to establish a Branch Soldiers' Home at Johnson City, Tenn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DAYTON: Papers and evidence to accompany House bill relating to the claim of Samuel Caldwell's heirs—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of the estate of Elizabeth D. Gibson, deceased, late of Jefferson County, W. Va., praying reference of war claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of the estate of Barney Ott, deceased, late of Jefferson County, W. Va., praying reference of war claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. DOUGHERTY: Papers to accompany House bill to increase the pension of Samuel P. Cox—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill granting a pension to David P. Watts—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ESCH: Petition of John E. Perkins Post, No. 95, Grand Army of the Republic, of Department of Wisconsin, in favor of House bill No. 7094, to establish a Branch Soldiers' Home at Johnson City, Tenn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts: Petition of selectmen of the town of Orleans, Mass., asking for a survey of Nausett Beach and vicinity for the purpose of making Pleasant Bay, in the towns of Orleans, Harwich, and Chatham, a harbor of refuge for coastwise trade—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of J. C. Freeman Post, No. 55, Department of Massachusetts, Grand Army of the Republic, in favor of the establishment of a Branch Soldiers' Home near Johnson City, Tenn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, resolutions of the Boston Retail Grocers' Association, favoring the passage of a pure-food bill—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, papers to accompany House bill No. 7835, to change the characteristic of Cape Cod light, Massachusetts—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GROUT: Resolutions of the Federal Labor Union No. 7130, of St. Johnsbury, Vt., favoring the Federal ownership of Government lands and the building of storage reservoirs by the Government—to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

Also, petition of the New York Zoological Society, urging the passage of the Lacey bill for the protection of wild birds and game—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Vermont Pharmaceutical Association, for the repeal of the tax on medicines, perfumery, and cosmetics—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of P. Houston and 40 citizens of Hamden, N. Y., in favor of the Grout bill taxing oleomargarine—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, resolution of the Trades League of Philadelphia, Pa., approving the Senate amendments to the legislative bill respecting the Hydrographic Office, Navy Department—to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, resolution of the Philadelphia Board of Trade, praying for legislation to build up the merchant marine of the United States—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, resolution of the American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, protesting against the passage of bill extending the limit of time for holding live stock in transit from twenty-four to forty hours—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HEMENWAY: Petition of Fred A. Elikofer and others, of Evansville, Ind., favoring the passage of joint resolution No. 33, relating to enlisted men in the service of the United States engaging in business or employment when the same shall interfere with local civilians—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of George W. Bohn and other citizens of Evansville, Ind., for the repeal of the tax on medicines, perfumery, and cosmetics—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolutions of Grand Army of the Republic post of Petersburg, Ind., in favor of House bill No. 7094, to establish a Branch Soldiers' Home at Johnson City, Tenn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HILL: Petition of Upton Post, No. 14, of New Milford, Conn., Grand Army of the Republic, in favor of the establishment of a Branch Soldiers' Home near Johnson City, Tenn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HITT: Petition of Company D and Company G, Sixth Infantry, Illinois National Guard, in favor of House bill No. 7936, making an increase in the appropriation for arming and equipping the militia of the States and Territories—to the Committee on Militia.

By Mr. HOPKINS: Petitions of citizens of Dekalb, McHenry, and Sycamore, Ill., in favor of the Grout bill, taxing oleomargarine—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. JACK: Petition of F. M. Brown Post, No. 266, Grand Army of the Republic, of Rochester Mills, Pa., favoring the passage of a bill to establish a Branch Soldiers' Home near Johnson City, Tenn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McDOWELL: Resolution of Post No. 394 and Post No. 676, Department of Ohio, Grand Army of the Republic, in support of House bill No. 7094, to establish a Branch Soldiers' Home at Johnson City, Tenn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Anna M. Sheridan and 4 others, of the Newark (Ohio) post-office, for the passage of House bill No. 4351—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of the City Board of Trade of Newark, Ohio, for the passage of a bill for the equalization of the salaries of letter carriers—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of Price Russell and other druggists of Creston, Ohio, for the repeal of the stamp tax on medicines, perfumery, and cosmetics—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MEEKISON: Resolutions of W. H. Doering Post, No. 247, and W. A. Slaughter Post, No. 568, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Ohio, in favor of House bill No. 7094, for the establishment of a Branch Soldiers' Home at Johnson City, Tenn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MIERS of Indiana: Papers to accompany House bill No. 9072, granting a pension to William F. Browning—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NEVILLE: Petition of F. S. Rembe and others, of Chadron, Nebr., to amend the present law in relation to the sale of oleomargarine—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. O'GRADY: Papers to accompany House bill for the relief of Judson Knickerbocker—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, papers to accompany House bill granting increase of pension to Lewis Oliver—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill granting a pension to Hugh McGuckin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PEARRE: Paper to accompany House bill for the relief of William Ackerman—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Hancock Post, No. 57, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Maryland, indorsing the bill to establish a Branch Home for Disabled Soldiers at Johnson City, Tenn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. POWERS: Petitions of Mrs. S. J. Crittenden, Clyde R. Sumner, and others of Rutland and New Haven, Conn., against the Loud bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of E. H. Shipper and others of Ira, Vt., favoring the Grout bill relating to oleomargarine—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of the Vermont Pharmaceutical Association, for the repeal of the stamp tax on medicines, perfumery, and cosmetics—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCUDDER (by request): Petition of A. J. Verkonteren, of New York City, expressing sympathy for the Boer Republic in its present war—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Florence W. Patten and other clerks of Jamaica (N. Y.) post-office, in favor of House bill No. 4351—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. SPERRY: Resolutions of the Methodist Episcopal Church of South Meriden, Conn., protesting against the sale of liquor in our new possessions—to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

Also, resolutions of the Young People's Society of Christian Endeavor of the First Baptist Church of Meriden; of the Baptist Church and the Methodist Episcopal Church at Yalesville, Conn.; and Young People's Society of Christian Endeavor of the First Methodist Episcopal Church of Meriden, Conn., favoring the anti-canteen bill—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. VAN VOORHIS: Papers to accompany House bill for the relief of Willard Harrop—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WRIGHT: Petition of Ingham Post, No. 9, Department of Pennsylvania, Grand Army of the Republic, in favor of House bill No. 7094, to establish a Branch Soldiers' Home at Johnson City, Tenn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. YOUNG: Papers to accompany House bill No. 6232, granting a pension to Eliza J. Noble—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, evidence in support of House bill No. 9340, granting a pension to Charles Moyer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill granting a pension to Mary P. Mitchell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ZENOR: Resolutions of Russell Post, No. 354, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Indiana, in support of House bill No. 7094, to establish a Branch Soldiers' Home at Johnson City, Tenn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, *March 28, 1900.*

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. DAVIS, and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Journal, without objection, will stand approved.

WIND RIVER INDIAN RESERVATION LANDS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 10th instant, a report from the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, together with a lease for prospecting for coal within defined limits in Wind River Indian Reservation, in the State of Wyoming, and for mining such discoveries thereof, etc.; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

VAULTS, SAFES, AND LOCKS FOR PUBLIC BUILDINGS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a letter from the Supervising Architect submitting an additional estimate of deficiency in the appropriation for vaults, safes, and locks for public buildings for the fiscal year 1900, $2,500, which it is desired to have added to the amount of $7,500, thereby increasing the sum to $10,000; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

COMMITTEE SERVICE.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I ask leave to resign my place upon the Committee on Indian Affairs. It meets on the same day the Committee on Commerce holds its sessions.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Minnesota asks to be excused from further service upon the Committee on Indian Affairs. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. It is so ordered.

Mr. PERKINS. I ask that the Chair appoint my colleague [Mr. BARD] to fill the vacancy.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no objection, the Chair will appoint the junior Senator from California [Mr. BARD] to the vacancy caused by the resignation of the Senator from Minnesota.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills; and they were thereupon signed by the President pro tempore:

A bill (S. 39) granting an increase of pension to Caroline V. English;

A bill (S. 195) for the relief of Louis Miller;

A bill (S. 265) granting an increase of pension to Jane McMahon;

A bill (S. 343) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Freeman;

A bill (S. 495) granting a pension to Ambrose J. Vanarsdel;

A bill (S. 1254) granting a pension to Catherine O'Brien;

A bill (S. 1592) granting a pension to Jane E. Augur;

A bill (S. 1713) granting an increase of pension to Alice S. Jordon;

A bill (S. 1752) granting a pension to James J. Wheeler;

A bill (S. 2346) granting an increase of pension to Alfred Bigelow;

A bill (S. 2368) granting a pension to Mary A. Randall;

A bill (S. 2882) to authorize the Cambridge Bridge Commission to construct a drawless bridge across the Charles River, in the State of Massachusetts;

A bill (S. 3129) granting an increase of pension to Henry McMillen;

A bill (H. R. 99) to establish a military post at or near Des Moines, Iowa; and

A bill (H. R. 9497) to amend an act providing for the construction of a light-ship to be located near Cape Elizabeth, Me.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. BATE presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Memphis, Tenn., praying for the construction of five or more Marsh movable jetties for the improvement of navigation in the Mississippi River during the season of low water; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the congregations of sundry churches of Maryville, Tenn., praying for the appointment of a chaplain to each regiment in the Army, and also to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors in Army canteens; which war referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. QUARLES presented the petition of Andrew Tate and J. H. Hellweg & Son, of Bayfield, Wis., praying for the repeal of the stamp tax upon proprietary medicines, perfumeries, and cosmetics; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. NELSON presented a petition of the Board of Trade of Mankato, Minn., and a petition of the Red River Millers' Club, of northwestern Minnesota, praying for the adoption of certain amendments to the interstate-commerce law; which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of St. Paul, Minn., praying for the reclassification of post-office clerks; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented a petition of the Retail Grocers' Association of St. Paul, Minn., and a petition of the Retail Grocers and General Merchants' Association of North Dakota, praying for the enactment of legislation to prevent the manufacture and use of trade checks; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a memorial of the Commercial Club of St. Paul, Minn., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to prevent the manufacture and use of trade checks; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of Battery A, National State Guard of Minnesota, praying for the enactment of legislation to improve the armament of the militia; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented memorials of the Farm Implement Publishing Company, of Minneapolis; the Graplin Sentinel, of Lake City; the Conference Examiner, of St. Paul; the Professional Barber, of St. Paul; Nya Tiden, of Minneapolis; the Northwestern Guardsmen, of Minneapolis; Der Wanderer, of St. Paul; the Messenger, of Stillwater; the News Gleaner, of Plainview, and the Broderbaaudet, of Kenyon, all in the State of Minnesota, remonstrating against the passage of the so-called Loud bill, relating to second-class mail matter; which were referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. FORAKER presented the petition of H. D. Robison and 19 other citizens of Cleveland, Ohio, praying for the establishment of an Army veterinary corps; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a petition of the Sunday school of the Congregational Church of Norwalk, Ohio, and a petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Peru, Ohio, praying for the enactment of legislation to limit absolute divorce in the District of Columbia and the Territories; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the congregation of the Second Congregational Church of Oberlin, Ohio, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the importation, manufacture, and sale of intoxicating liquors and opium in Hawaii; which was referred to the Committee on Pacific Islands and Puerto Rico.

He also presented a petition of the Sunday school of the Congregational Church of Norwalk, Ohio, and a petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Peru, Ohio, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the transmission of pictures and descriptions of prize fights; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the Sunday school of the Congregational Church of Norwalk, Ohio, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution regulating polygamy, marriage, and divorce, etc., and granting the right of suffrage in the new possessions; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. ALLEN presented a petition of sundry citizens of Tekamah, Nebr., praying for the establishment of an Army veterinary corps; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. FRYE presented a petition of Company D, First Regiment Infantry National State Guard of Maine, praying for the enactment of legislation to improve the armament of the militia; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a petition of the Young People's Christian Endeavor Society of Kenduskeag, Me., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors in Army canteens; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. HALE, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 3743) for the relief of certain enlisted men of the Navy, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. ALLEN, from the Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (S. 3339) for the relief of Leonard Wilson, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.