League of America, for a law to reform the consular service—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Dr. Edw. F. Janeway and 25 others, for a pure-food law—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FLETCHER: Petition of the Western Fruit Jobbers' Association, relative to the interstate-commerce bill—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FLOYD: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Henry Albert Crandell—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of N. W. Plymate—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of Smith Brothers & Sparks, of the National Stock Yards, for an amendment to the law governing the time stock may be kept in cars—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of citizens of Alaska, relative to legislation for that Territory—to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, petition of the General Synod of the Reformed Church in America, against recognition of persons affiliated with the Mormon Church—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILBERT: Petition of citizens of South McAlester and Indian Territory, for union of statehood of Indian Territory and Oklahoma—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. GRANGER: Petition of Summit Grange, No. 15, Patrons of Husbandry, for passage of bill H. R. 345—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance Unions of Manton and Mount Pleasant, and the Methodist Episcopal Church of Phenix, R. I., against liquor traffic in Indian Territory and Oklahoma as States—to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, petition of Union Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Washington, R. I., against liquor traffic in Indian Territory—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. HARDWICK: Paper to accompany bill (H. R. 12897) for relief of Robert B. Malone—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAY: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Mary C. Spangler—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HENRY of Connecticut: Petition of Monitor Council, No. 61, Order United American Mechanics, of Glastenbury, Conn., favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. HINSHAW: Petition of the Farmers' Institute of Western, relative to railway freight rates—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Farmers' Institute of Western, favoring power for the President to adjust the tariff with foreign nations by reciprocal measures when the interests of the people demand—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOWELL: Paper to accompany bill for relief of William C. Butler—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KETCHAM: Petition of Mount Hope Grange, No. 902, for repeal of revenue tax on denaturized alcohol—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of A. T. Johnson and 35 others, of Catskill, N. Y., for an investigation of the Kongo Free State—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KNAPP: Petitions of Barnes Corners, Star, and St. Lawrence granges, Patrons of Husbandry, for repeal of revenue tax on denaturized alcohol—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LAFEAN: Petition of 16 citizens of New York and vicinity, for relief of heirs of victims of the *General Slocum* disaster—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LEVER: Paper to accompany bill for relief of James D. Blanding—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MAHON: Petition of Grange No. 1282, of Altenwold, Pa., for repeal of revenue tax on denaturized alcohol—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MARTIN: Petition of Hall of Order of Railway Conductors, for bills H. R. 239 and S. 1657—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Hall of Order of Railway Conductors, for bill H. R. 9328—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER: Paper to accompany bill for relief of William N. Hughes—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. OLMSTED: Petition of Samuel E. Light, against any bill for free denaturized alcohol—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Elizabethville (Pa.) Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. RYAN: Paper to accompany bill for relief of James W. Jones—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SAMUEL: Petition of Master Grange, No. 88, of Benton, Pa., for repeal of revenue tax on denaturized alcohol—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of Maryland: Papers to accompany bill to equalize rank and pay of certain retired officers of the Marine Corps—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Worthington Goldsboro—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Pennsylvania: Petition of New Maysville Council, No. 395, Order United American Mechanics, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. SPIGHT: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Abner W. Lanier—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Patti Rodgers Crawford—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of A. C. Marr—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of estate of Mrs. Harriett W. Flemming—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Mark M. Harwell—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Francis S. Jones—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of W. M. McKie—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Joseph Henry Martin—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of W. B. Johnson—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of William Winans—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Bayles E. Cobb—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Milton R. Dungan—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of William Cook—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of J. W. McQuire—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. STERLING: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Thomas Pinneo—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Olden Myers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THOMAS of Ohio: Petition of 16 citizens of New York and vicinity, for relief for heirs of victims of *General Slocum* disaster—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WEISSE: Petition of the Commercial Law League of America, against commercial spoliation of Niagara Falls—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, *January 25, 1906.*

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. EDWARD E. HALE.

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

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Journal stands approved.

Mr. TILLMAN. Have we reached the order of petitions and memorials?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair will first lay before the Senate an executive communication.

Mr. TILLMAN. Very well.

ANNUAL REPORT OF COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the annual report of the Commissioner of Patents for the year ended December 31, 1905; which was referred to the Committee on Patents, and ordered to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 5289) to provide for the selection of grand and petit jurors for the district courts in the Territory of Oklahoma; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the enrolled joint resolution (H. J. Res. 87) to authorize the use of the transport *Sumner* to convey members of the Santiago Battlefield Commission and others to Cuba and return, and it was thereupon signed by the Vice-President.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

OVERCAPITALIZATION OF RAILROADS.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President, we have had some discussion during the week on the subject of railway-rate regulation. There has been some presentation of views by different Senators on one of the most important phases of it—overcapitalization. In order to contribute in a feeble way to the subject I have here a very important paper, a letter from Prof. William D. Marks, a very distinguished engineer, publicist, and statistician, which I ask to have read.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from South Carolina asks that the communication sent by him to the desk shall be read. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Secretary will read it.

The Secretary read as follows:

DECEMBER 11, 1905.

Hon. WHARTON BARKER, *Philadelphia, Pa.*

DEAR SIR: Referring to our verbal interviews regarding the overcapitalization of the steam railway corporations of this United States, and more particularly in reply to your query of the 5th current, "Let me know what you think a fair capitalization of the railroads or capitalization the public should pay for," I would say that in my experience of late years as a consulting engineer I have been struck by the deplorable and almost universal "watering" of securities in railway corporations practiced by our promoters of these enterprises.

Not only are our railways often wastefully built wholly upon the proceeds of the sale of bonds at figures far below par, but the promoters frequently add to the burden of the earnings of their enterprises by issuing as a bonus (to go with the bonds or appropriated by themselves) an equal or greater amount of stock, representing a speculative profit in the future.

So invariably have I found this to be the case that I felt justified, after numerous individual experiences, in saying to you that more than one-half of the railway securities issued represented no real property or investment of cash.

Besides the "water" injected into securities by the original builders of a new railway, other and often larger percentages of it are poured in by financiers who have found their profit in combining a number of individual railways into a "system" by means of a holding and operating corporation.

As a result we frequently find stratum of securities piled upon stratum of securities until a chart of the securities of a system of some railway systems very closely resembles a geological section.

There can (if my statement is correct) be but one of two results of these manipulations.

Either the public is robbed by overcharging to render these watered securities valuable to their owners or innocent purchasers of them lose all or a portion of their investments, if they have been led to believe that their securities represent real property.

Tersely, either the traveler and shipper are robbed or the purchaser of securities is swindled if he buys believing them to have been honestly issued.

The purchaser of "water" securities is either helping thieves to rob the public or is himself the victim of thieves.

But probably my general experience and feeling in these matters will not serve to convince you or others, and I will ask your careful attention to an analysis of the Massachusetts railroad commissioner's report, 1904:

Returns of year ending June 30, 1903.

	Miles owned.
Massachusetts railways, total length of lines	3,794
Massachusetts railways, total length of single track	7,601

The cost of construction of these lines, excluding equipment, land, and buildings, securities of other companies, cash, and miscellaneous assets, is given as $293,236,332; in round figures, $73,800 per mile of roadbed; $38,600 per mile of single track.

This single-track valuation is the important item, for it includes every foot of track, wherever or however used.

Omitting long bridges, tunnels, heavy rock cuts, extraordinary excavations, allowing 10,000 cubic yards excavation per mile, the cash cost of the average standard-gauge railway to the top of the rail head is, from many instances, about as follows, when prudently constructed:

Preliminary legal papers and rights of way	$700
Civil engineering construction to top of rail	11,000
Architects, stations, shops, and houses	1,500
Total	13,200

Of course, we have excepted long bridges (say over 60-foot span) and other unusual features, but throughout Massachusetts and the United States there are very few railways requiring 10,000 cubic yards excavation ($3,500) per mile.

There are notable individual instances of costly and unavoidable engineering expense, but these will be balanced by the average savings from $13,200 allowance per mile for construction.

We see that the average book cost, $38,600, of construction is nearly three times the necessary cost, $13,200, of steam railways to the rail top.

The cost of equipment of the Massachusetts railways is given as $32,957,122. By this is principally meant the rolling stock. For the purpose of this comparison I will place very high figures upon it, though much of it is old and largely depreciated in value.

Locomotives, 2,277, at $10,000 each	$22,770,000
Passenger cars, 3,338, at $5,000 each	16,690,000
Baggage and mail cars, 650, at $3,000 each	1,950,000
Freight cars, 34,825, at $500 each	17,412,500
Gravel and construction cars, 1,865, at $400 each	746,000
Total	59,568,500

Many of these locomotives and cars are leased, but for the purpose of our discussion they should be valued, and so we had better fix their total cost at, say, $76,000,000 instead of $33,000,000—book value given.

There are 7,601 miles of single track owned, and with sufficient accuracy for our purposes we can put the first cost of equipment with rolling stock at $10,000 per mile, a very liberal estimate for the Massachusetts railways, which serve a denser population than exists in any other portions of this United States, and which, being a manufacturing community, must use its railways largely.

We have omitted occasional extraordinary expenditures, say, for the tunnels and long bridges over rivers and also for rock cuts and deep excavations.

We are perfectly safe, however, in allowing an average of $2,000 per mile of track, or $15,202,000, to cover the cash cost of these extras.

Recapitulating for the average honest cash cost of Massachusetts railways, we have for each mile of single track owned:

Preliminary legal papers and right of way	$700
Civil engineering construction to top of rail	11,000
Minor stations, machine shops, and houses	1,500
Equipment of locomotives and cars	10,000
Extraordinary expenditures	2,000
Estimated cost of construction and equipment per mile	25,200

Massachusetts has been selected because its railroad commissioners have largely reduced the usual amount of corporate dishonesty by their most careful examinations and enforced publicity of corporate accounts.

Its dense population requires a larger equipment than the average of the rest of the United States. Its costs of construction are increased by reason of its rocky soil and hilly topography far above the average of many other sections.

I have increased the stated book value of equipment from $33,000,000 to $76,000,000; I have added $15,000,000 to well-known standard average costs of construction; I have allowed $11,400,000 for architectural work, and as a result I have obtained an average cash cost per mile of $25,200, which I have no doubt substantially exceeds the true costs of railways.

In education, frugality, industry, and honesty Massachusetts's population stands in the first rank of these United States, and yet we have the following capitalization of the Massachusetts railways:

Funded debt	$133,435,355
Mortgages, etc. (?)	25,007,318
Capital stock	235,834,466
Total capitalization	394,277,139

Dividing this by 7,601 miles of single track, we obtain about $52,000 capitalization per mile—51½ per cent of water, probably more.

Referring to gross assets of companies given on page 9, Massachusetts railroad commission report, June 30, 1903, we find as book accounts, but probably not the practical truth:

Construction	$293,236,332
Equipment	32,957,122
Land and buildings	1,497,218
Cash	40,880,067
Total	368,570,739
Stocks, bonds, and other property	64,210,110
Gross assets	432,780,849

The item of $64,000,000 probably represents "strategic purchases," having no proper relation to expenditures required to operate the roads for the convenience of the public and the profit of the stockholders.

The Interstate Commerce Commission, June 30, 1903, reports total miles of single track 283,821.52. (This is not the length of road bed, which is less; it is the total length of all the tracks wherever placed.) Outside of Massachusetts, with a few exceptions in the Eastern and Middle States, the equipment rarely costs as much as $5,000 per mile, and we are liberal in putting the cash cost of construction and equipment of all at an average of $20,000 per mile, or $5,676,420,000. The total railway capital June 30, 1903, was (Interstate Commerce Commission report) $12,599,990,258, or about $7,000,000,000 watered securities and $5,600,000,000 actual value.

Experienced engineers (I mean those who have been through the mill) will tell you the same as I do as to actual costs of constructions and equipment, if not (as in most cases) prevented by personal fear of consequences from disclosing the truth.

You may and probably will have many instances of extraordinary cost of construction brought to prove to you the higher cost of our railways. Many of these instances are both unwise and unnecessary expenditures.

Do not forget that for every such case there are hundreds of miles of railway which honestly have not cost $17,500 per mile to construct and equip; on the contrary, very much less.

The fairest index of the proper cost of a railway is not to its length of roadbed, but its length of single track.

Twenty thousand dollars per mile is an overestimate of the average cost of most railways crossing the vast prairies of the West.

You will note that I have not brought forward the many individual instances which hav come to my notice upon which I based my former statements to you, b t have delayed long enough to enable me to verify them, generally by a consideration of all the railways of Massachusetts.

For thirty-four years, beginning on the Delaware, Lackawanna and Western road, as a civil engineer, in the days of the crimes of Fisk & Gould, of the Erie, I have watched the growth of this criminal method called "watering" securities, and to-day we find that their success had led to the perpetration by their imitators of a colossal fraud reaching $7,000,000,000 upon the citizens of this United States.

I wish you godspeed in trying to put a stop to it. If you succeed you will earn the gratitude of every honest man.

I return to you the bill, which could be much improved, and I also hand you Engineering News, November 2, 1905, containing a brief article of mine on railway rates for an electric railway, and the following papers: "What are the facts?" by Slason Thompson; "Facts about railroad rates," by H. T. Newcomb; "Solution transportation problem," by P. S. Grosscup; Massachusetts Railroad Commissioners' Report, June 30, 1903.

After you have read my article in the Engineering News I wish you would refer to Census Bulletins Nos. 3 and 21, just to see how carefully they have avoided giving the required data enabling the fixing of the cost of construction, equipment, and operation of the railways they pretend to deal with.

To the engineer's lot it falls to deal with the concrete and tangible, and when he seeks help from these expensive publications by our Government he finds that because no one compiling the data in them appears to have power to demand replies on practical experience and grasp that all our Government statisticians have fallen victims to the conspiracy of secrecy among railway promoters and operators who, above all things, fear honest publicity for their deeds.

Very truly, yours,

WM. D. MARKS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair will refer the letter just read to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. TILLMAN. I should like to have it printed as a document.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from South Carolina requests that the communication be printed as a Senate document. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT presented a petition of Post Q, Indiana Division, Travelers' Protective Association, of New Albany, Ind., praying for the enactment of legislation providing that letter postage should be reduced to 1 cent before the passage of the so-called "parcels-post bill;" which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. GALLINGER presented a petition of Burnside Council, No. 25, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Chester, N. H., praying for the enactment of legislation to restrict immigration; which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a petition of the Oklahoma Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Cushing, Okla., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors in Oklahoma Territory when admitted to statehood; which was referred to the Committee on Territories.

Mr. MILLARD presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Nebraska, remonstrating against the passage of the so-called "parcels-post bill;" which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Nebraska, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. BURNHAM presented the petition of Ward R. Clarke, of Dover, N. H., praying for an investigation of existing conditions in the Kongo Free State; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented the petition of Mary S. Fuller-Smith, of Hampstead, N. H., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the postal laws relative to fraud orders; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented a petition of the New England Section of the Society of Chemical Industry, of Boston, Mass., praying for the enactment of legislation to remove the internal-revenue tax on denaturized grain alcohol; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented petitions of Mount Pleasant Council, No. 10, of Plymouth; of Liberty Council, No. 37, of East Tilton; of John P. Hate Council, No. 9, of Barrington, and of Burnside Council, No. 26, of Chester, all of the Junior Order United American Mechanics, in the State of New Hampshire, praying for the enactment of legislation to restrict immigration; which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. CARTER presented petitions of sundry citizens of Choteau, Dupuyer, Conrad, Great Falls, Saypo, Cut Bank, and Cascade County, all in the State of Montana, praying for the enactment of legislation opening to settlement and disposal, under the land laws of the United States, the Blackfeet Indian Reservation in that State; which were referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

He also presented memorials of the Conrad Investment Company and sundry other citizens of Great Falls, Mont., remonstrating against any proceeding on the part of the Government to abate the dam of the Conrad Investment Company or to prevent the diversion of the waters of Birch Creek into its canal, and praying that the Blackfeet Indian Reservation be opened to settlement; which were referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. NELSON presented a petition of Winona Lodge, No. 510, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, of Winona, Minn., praying for the passage of the so-called "anti-injunction bill;" which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of Winona Lodge, No. 510, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, of Winona, Minn., praying for the passage of the so-called "employers' liability bill;" which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the Goodhue County Farmers' Association, of Kenyon, Minn., praying for the enactment of legislation to remove the duty on denaturized alcohol; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of the Minnesota National Guard Association, of St. Paul, Minn., praying for the enactment of legislation to increase the efficiency of the militia and promote rifle practice; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Northfield, Minn., praying for the enactment of legislation to investigate the existing conditions in the Kongo Free State; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a memorial of the Tanana Miners' Association, of Seattle, Wash., remonstrating against the action taken by the Seattle convention of delegates relative to the mining interests of Alaska; which was referred to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

Mr. GAMBLE presented a petition of Local Division No. 258, Order of Railway Conductors, of Aberdeen, S. Dak., praying for the passage of the so-called "employers' liability bill;" which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of Local Division No. 258, Order of Railway Conductors, of Aberdeen, S. Dak., praying for the passage of the so-called "anti-injunction bill;" which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. WARNER presented an affidavit to accompany the bill (S. 3453) granting an increase of pension to John F. Cluley; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. TELLER presented a petition of Printing Pressmen's Union No. 40, American Federation of Labor, of Denver, Colo., praying for the enactment of legislation to secure official recognition of the position of foreman of presswork in the Government Printing Office; which was referred to the Committee on Printing.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Denver, Colo., remonstrating against the ratification of the Isle of Pines treaty; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of the El Paso County Horticultural Society, of Colorado Springs, Colo., praying for the enactment of legislation to prevent the impending destruction of Niagara Falls on the American side by the diversion of the waters for manufacturing purposes; which was referred to the Committee on Forest Reservations and the Protection of Game.

He also presented a petition of the State Teachers' Association of Denver, Colo., and a petition of the Colorado Society of the Archæological Institute of America, of Denver, Colo., praying for the enactment of legislation to establish the Mesa Verde National Park in that State; which were referred to the Committee on Forest Reservations and the Protection of Game.

He also presented a petition of Local Division No. 186, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, of Denver, Colo., and of Lincoln Council, No. 9, Junior Order of United American Mechanics, of Pueblo, Colo., praying for the enactment of legislation to restrict immigration; which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a petition of W. E. McGraw Lodge, No. 680, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, of Denver, Colo., praying for the passage of the so-called "anti-injunction bill;" which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Buena Vista, Colo., praying that an appropriation be made to enable the Geological Survey to make further examination of black sands for gold and platinum in that State; which was referred to the Committee on the Geological Survey.

He also presented a petition of Local Union No. 306, Cigar Makers' International Union, of Pueblo, Colo., and a petition of Local Union No. 129, Cigar Makers' International Union, of Denver, Colo., remonstrating against a reduction of the duty on cigars and tobacco imported from the Philippine Islands; which were referred to the Committee on the Philippines.

He also presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Colorado Springs, Colo., praying for the enactment of legislation to reorganize the consular service; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the People's Sunday Alliance of Denver, Colo., praying for the enactment of legislation to reduce the Congressional representation of those States that have disfranchised colored citizens; which was referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Baca County, Colo., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for a resurvey of the boundary lines of that county; which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also presented a memorial of the Wholesale Grocers' Club of Colorado Springs, Colo., remonstrating against any increase of the duty on tea and coffee; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of the congregation of the First Methodist Episcopal Church of Central City, Colo., and a petition of the Denver Christian Citizenship Union, of Colorado, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors in all Government buildings and grounds;

which were referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also presented a petition of the Colorado Woman's Christian Temperance Union, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors in the Indian Territory when admitted to statehood; which was referred to the Committee on Territories.

He also presented a memorial of the Board of Trade of Durango, Colo., relative to the tariff on beet sugar manufactured in that State; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of the city council of Durango, Colo., praying for the enactment of legislation to enlarge the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of W. E. McGraw Lodge, No. 680, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, of Denver, Colo., and a petition of Pikes Peak Lodge, No. 218, Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen, of Colorado City, Colo., praying for the passage of the so-called "employers' liability bill;" which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. CLARK of Montana presented a petition of the Commercial Club of Great Falls, Mont., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the opening of the Blackfoot Indian Reservation in that State to settlement, except such a portion as would be set aside for allotment to the Indians; which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. HEMENWAY presented a petition of Jefferson Council, No. 13, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Upland, Ind., praying for the enactment of legislation to restrict immigration; which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a petition of the Manufacturers' Association of Indianapolis, Ind., praying for the enactment of legislation to permit the industrial use of alcohol; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. WARREN, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to whom was referred the letter from the Secretary of the Department of Commerce and Labor submitting a draft of a bill "authorizing the Secretary of Commerce and Labor to lease for a term of years a suitable building for the Department of Commerce and Labor," asked to be discharged from its further consideration, and that it be referred to the Committee on Appropriations; which was agreed to.

Mr. FRYE, from the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the joint resolution (S. R. 23) providing for an extension of time for completing the highway bridge and approaches across the Potomac River at Washington, D. C., reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 3416) to prohibit any vessel from anchoring in such manner as to obstruct or interfere with the range lights established in any navigable waters of the United States by the United States Light-House Board, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. FRYE. I am directed by the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (S. 31) to amend certain sections of title 52 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, entitled "Regulation of steam vessels," and acts amendatory thereto, and for other purposes, to report it adversely, the purposes of the bill having been accomplished in other legislation. I move that the bill be indefinitely postponed.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. CRANE, from the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (S. 3409) for the construction of an able seagoing tug for the Revenue-Cutter Service for New Bedford, Mass., reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. PILES, from the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 11045) to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize Washington and Westmoreland counties, in the State of Pennsylvania, to construct and maintain a bridge across the Monongahela River, in the State of Pennsylvania," approved February 21, 1903, reported it without amendment.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 11263) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the navigable waters of St. Andrews Bay, reported it without amendment.

Mr. HOPKINS, from the Committee on Fisheries, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1462) to establish one or more fish-cultural stations on Puget Sound, State of Washington, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (S. 3263) to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a port of delivery at Salt Lake City, Utah," reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. PERKINS, from the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2274) to establish a fog signal on one of the jetties at the entrance to the harbor at Humboldt Bay, California, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 3318) to allow the entry and clearance of vessels at Port Harford and Monterey, Cal., reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. MALLORY (for Mr. FOSTER), from the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 7085) authorizing the Pea River Power Company to erect a dam in Coffee County, Ala., reported it without amendment.

Mr. MALLORY. I am directed by the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 297) to authorize the construction of dams and power stations on the Tennessee River at Muscle Shoals, Alabama, to report it without amendment.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will be placed on the Calendar.

Mr. MALLORY. I move that Order of Business No. 120, being Senate bill 2354, to authorize the construction of dams and power stations on the Tennessee River at Muscle Shoals, Alabama, be indefinitely postponed, and that House bill No. 297, just reported by me, take its place upon the Calendar.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. FORAKER, from the Committee on Pacific Islands and Porto Rico, to whom was referred the amendment submitted by Mr. McCUMBER on the 22d instant, intended to be proposed to the urgent deficiency appropriation bill, proposing to appropriate $35,000 for filling in the United States quarantine station at Honolulu, Hawaii, reported it with an amendment, submitted a report thereon, and moved that it be referred to the Committee on Appropriations and printed; which was agreed to.

Mr. BLACKBURN, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 368) to correct the military record of Shadrack F. Brown, submitted an adverse report thereon, which was agreed to; and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

Mr. HANSBROUGH, from the Committee on the Library, to whom was referred the bill (S. 3292) to incorporate the Great Council of the United States of the Improved Order of Red Men, asked to be discharged from its further consideration, and that it be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary; which was agreed to.

STATUE OF COUNT DE ROCHAMBEAU.

Mr. PLATT, from the Committee on Printing, to whom was referred the concurrent resolution submitted by Mr. WETMORE December 13, 1905, reported it without amendment, and it was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the concurrent resolution passed February 2, 1904, providing for the publication of the proceedings on the occasion of the unveiling of the Rochambeau statue is hereby continued in force and excepted from the limitation of one year as provided in section 80 of the act of January 12, 1895, providing for the public printing and binding and the distribution of public documents.

FRENCH COMBATANTS IN AMERICAN REVOLUTION.

Mr. PLATT, from the Committee on Printing, to whom was referred the concurrent resolution submitted by Mr. LODGE on the 16th instant, reported it without amendment, and it was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed 3,000 copies of Senate Document No. 77, Fifty-eighth Congress, second session, "Les Combattants Françaises de la Guerre Américaine, 1778–1783," of which 500 shall be for the use of the Senate, 2,000 for the use of the House of Representatives, and 500 for the use of the National Society of the Sons of the American Revolution, to be distributed under the direction of A. Howard Clark, registrar.

REPORT OF SUPERINTENDENT OF INDIAN SCHOOLS.

Mr. PLATT, from the Committee on Printing, reported the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to:

Resolved by the Senate, That the Public Printer be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to print from the stereotype plates 1,500 copies of the Report of the Superintendent of Indian Schools for 1905, for the use of the Department of the Interior.

REPORT OF RECLAMATION SERVICE.

Mr. PLATT. I am directed by the Committee on Printing, to whom was referred the joint resolution (S. R. 17) to print the Fourth Annual Report of the United States Reclamation Service, to report it without amendment, and I ask for its present consideration.

The Secretary read the joint resolution; and by unanimous consent the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration. It provides for printing 9,000 copies of the Fourth Annual Report of the Reclamation Service, of which

1,000 are to be bound in form similar to the preceding reports of the Service; and of that entire edition 1,500 shall be for the use of the Senate, 2,500 for the use of the House of Representatives, and 5,000 for distribution by the Director of the Geological Survey.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

REPORT ON THE REFORMATORY SYSTEM.

Mr. PLATT, from the Committee on Printing, reported the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That there be printed and bound in cloth, for the use of the Department of State, 1,000 copies of the report on "The Reformatory System in the United States," House Document No. 459, Fifty-sixth Congress, first session.

HARBOR OF REFUGE AT POINT JUDITH, R. I.

Mr. GALLINGER, from the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the concurrent resolution submitted by Mr. ALDRICH on the 22d instant, reported it without amendment; and it was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to inform the Senate whether changed conditions necessitate a change of project for the main breakwater of the harbor of refuge at Point Judith, R. I., and if so, to submit plans and estimates for such revised project.

PUBLIC BUILDING AT AUBURN, ME.

Mr. SCOTT. I am directed by the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to whom was referred the bill (S. 25) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a building thereon at Auburn, in the State of Maine, to report it with amendments. I call the attention of the Senator from Maine [Mr. FRYE] to the bill.

Mr. FRYE. As that is practically my own city, there being simply between mine and it a narrow frith, I hope the Senate will indulge me in allowing it to be considered now.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will be read for the information of the Senate.

The Secretary read the bill; and, there being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration. It directs the Secretary of the Treasury to acquire, by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, a site and cause to be erected thereon a suitable building, including fireproof vaults, heating and ventilating apparatus, and approaches, for the use and accommodation of the United States post-office and other Government offices in the city of Auburn, Me., the cost of the site and building, including the vaults, heating and ventilating apparatus, and approaches, complete, not to exceed $50,000.

The first amendment of the committee was to strike out section 4 in the following words:

SEC. 4. That if, upon consideration of said report and accompanying papers, the Secretary of the Treasury shall deem further investigation necessary, he may appoint a commission of not more than three persons, one of whom shall be an officer of the Treasury Department, which commission shall also examine the said proposed sites, and such others as the Secretary of the Treasury may designate, and grant such hearings in relation thereto as they shall deem necessary; and said commission shall, within thirty days after said examination, make to the Secretary of the Treasury written report of their conclusion in the premises, accompanied by all maps, statements, plats, or documents taken by or submitted to them, in like manner as hereinbefore provided in regard to the proceedings of said agent of the Treasury Department; and the Secretary of the Treasury shall thereupon finally determine the location of the building to be erected.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was to strike out section 5 in the following words:

SEC. 5. That the compensation of said commissioners shall be fixed by the Secretary of the Treasury, but the same shall not exceed $6 per day and actual traveling expenses: *Provided, however*, That the member of said commission appointed from the Treasury Department shall be paid only his actual traveling expenses.

SEC. 6. That the building shall be unexposed to danger from fire by an open space of at least 40 feet on each side, including streets and alleys.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

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

PUBLIC BUILDING AT FAYETTEVILLE, N. C.

Mr. SIMMONS. I am directed by the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to whom was referred the bill (S.1277) authorizing a public building at Fayetteville, N. C., to report it favorably without amendment, and I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The Secretary read the bill; and there being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration. It directs the Secretary of the Treasury to purchase, or otherwise acquire, a suitable site at Fayetteville, N. C., and cause to be erected thereon a suitable public building to accommodate the needs of the United States post-office at that place, and for other public purposes, at a total cost not to exceed $75,000.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. GALLINGER introduced a bill (S. 3679) to amend the Code of Law for the District of Columbia, relating to incorporations; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. McCUMBER introduced a bill (S. 3680) to provide for the admission of the State of Sequoyah into the Union, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Territories.

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

A bill (S. 3681) granting a pension to Sanford H. Moats; and

A bill (S. 3682) granting an increase of pension to Reuben M. Harlow (with an accompanying paper).

Mr. FORAKER introduced a bill (S. 3683) for the relief of James W. Jones; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. MILLARD introduced a bill (S. 3684) granting an increase of pension to George W. Hyde; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. CARTER introduced a bill (S. 3685) to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to examine and report upon the nature, quality, and condition of seed and grain; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. LODGE introduced a bill (S. 3686) for the relief of Robert G. Carter, United States Army (retired); which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. HANSBROUGH introduced a bill (S. 3687) providing for the segregation of $1,000,000 from the reclamation fund created by the act of June 17, 1902, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands.

Mr. GAMBLE introduced a bill (S. 3688) directing the Court of Claims to hear and determine the question of the restoration of the unpaid annuities of the Sisseton and Wahpeton bands of Sioux Indians; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. WARREN introduced a bill (S. 3689) to create a new land district in the State of Wyoming; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also introduced a bill (S. 3690) to provide for the purchase of certain coal lands in the Philippine Islands, and to authorize the lease of same and of the Batan Military Reservation for the purpose of securing a local coal supply to the United States Government in the Philippine Islands; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Philippines.

Mr. FULTON introduced a bill (S. 3691) granting a pension to Rollin S. Belknap; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

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

A bill (S. 3692) for the relief of the estate of Raphael Cohen;

A bill (S. 3693) for the relief of the estate of Calvin Read, deceased (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 3694) for the relief of the estate of Cyprian T. Jenkins, deceased (with accompanying papers).

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

A bill (S. 3695) granting an increase of pension to Alexander McCormick;

A bill (S. 3696) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Ward; and

A bill (S. 3697) granting an increase of pension to Sarah A. Petherbridge.

Mr. RAYNER introduced a bill (S. 3698) for the relief of the heirs of Michael Carling, assignee of Joseph R. Shannon, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 3699) for the relief of James Hooper; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 3700) to place Worthington Goldsborough upon the retired list of the Navy; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. WARNER introduced a bill (S. 3701) granting a pension to Mollie A. Jones; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. BURKETT introduced a bill (S. 3702) for the relief of the Gurley Memorial Presbyterian Church, of the District of Columbia; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. DICK introduced a bill (S. 3703) to amend section 918 of the Revised Statutes of the United States; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also (by request) introduced a bill (S. 3704) to regulate the practice of dentistry or dental surgery in the Indian Territory; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

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

A bill (S. 3705) to amend the act of June 27, 1890, as amended by the act of May 9, 1900;

A bill (S. 3706) granting a pension to Joseph Farrell;

A bill (S. 3707) granting an increase of pension to Eugenia J. Hunt; and

A bill (S. 3708) granting an increase of pension to John McArthur.

Mr. HOPKINS introduced a bill (S. 3709) to correct the military record of Bernhard Franz; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. PETTUS (for Mr. MORGAN) introduced a bill (S. 3710) for the relief of the estate of Thomas V. Provence, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. PETTUS introduced a bill (S. 3711) for the relief of Dan Walden; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

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

A bill (S. 3712) granting an increase of pension to Davis S. Loudon;

A bill (S. 3713) granting an increase of pension to David W. Farington; and

A bill (S. 3714) granting an increase of pension to James Ruth.

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

A bill (S. 3715) granting an increase of pension to Samuel S. Watson;

A bill (S. 3716) granting an increase of pension to Isaac G. Cisnea; and

A bill (S. 3717) granting an increase of pension to Paul L. Bahr.

Mr. NEWLANDS introduced a bill (S. 3718) declaring the purpose of the United States regarding the future government of the Philippine Islands, providing for a Philippine agricultural bank, for the issue and guaranty of Philippine bonds for public and railroad construction, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Philippines.

Mr. FULTON introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 25) authorizing the Secretary of War to negotiate with John T. Dolan, of Portland, Oreg., for purchase of original manuscript copy of "Order Book of General Arthur Saint Clair;" which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

AMENDMENT TO DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. NELSON submitted an amendment proposing to strike out the words "Amsterdam, Netherlands," where they occur in Class IV, Schedule B, and insert the same words in Class III of said schedule, intended to be proposed by him to the diplomatic and consular appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed.

INVESTIGATIONS AT TESTING PLANTS AT ST. LOUIS.

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

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he hereby is, directed to transmit to the Senate a summary of the results obtained in the investigations, under the Director of the Geological Survey, of fuels and structural materials at the testing plants at St. Louis, and a statement of his opinion, with the reasons therefor, whether or not it is desirable for the Government to continue the investigations, together with an estimate of the amount of money which will be necessary to carry on the investigations in a satisfactory manner, during the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1906.

GEORGIA RAILROAD AND BANKING COMPANY.

Mr. BACON submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Claims:

Resolved by the Senate of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the claim of the Georgia Railroad and Banking Company (Senate bill 819) be, and the same is hereby, referred to the Court of Claims under the provisions of the act of Congress approved March 3, 1887, commonly known as the "Tucker Act."

ESTATE OF J. P. LAMAR.

Mr. BACON submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Claims:

Resolved by the Senate of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the claim of the legal representatives of J. P. Lamar, deceased (Senate bill 818), be, and the same is hereby, referred to the Court of Claims under the provisions of the act of Congress approved March 3, 1887, commonly known as the "Tucker Act."

HOUSE BILL REFERRED.

H. R. 5289. An act to provide for the selection of grand and petit jurors for the district courts, in the Territory of Oklahoma, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CHINESE BOYCOTT OF AMERICAN MANUFACTURES.

Mr. TILLMAN. I submit a resolution, which I send to the desk, for which I should like immediate consideration.

The Secretary read the resolution, as follows:

Whereas the boycott of American manufactured products by the people of China is a matter of very serious and deep concern to the capitalists and laborers interested in those industries; and

Whereas it is understood that the former United States minister, Wu Ting Fang, is a leader of this movement among his countrymen, assigning as a reason therefor the outrages and indignities put upon Chinese travelers and students under our immigration laws, and through the unwise and drastic methods which have been followed in executing these laws; and

Whereas the policy thus stigmatized by the Chinese is not such as should be followed by one great nation in dealing with another; and

Whereas it is in the interest of our commercial expansion and growth that the just complaints of the Chinese people should be carefully investigated and the whole subject presented to Congress for its guidance and information: Therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate, That the Committee on Immigration shall consider and, after thorough investigation, report to the Senate the facts in the case and suggest any remedies that may be deemed advisable.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. ALDRICH. Let the resolution go over, Mr. President.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Under objection, the resolution will go over.

FUNERAL EXPENSES OF THE LATE SENATOR MITCHELL.

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

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to pay the expenses incident to the sickness and death of the Hon. JOHN H. MITCHELL, late a Senator from the State of Oregon, from the miscellaneous items of the contingent fund of the Senate, amounting to $547.75.

MEDICAL DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there further morning business? If not, that order is closed.

Mr. WARREN. I ask unanimous consent for the consideration at this time of the bill (S. 1539) to increase the efficiency of the Medical Department of the United States Army.

Mr. MONEY. Mr. President, I wish to ask if the morning business is concluded?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The morning business has been concluded and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN] has been recognized. He has asked unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill named by him. Is there objection?

Mr. MONEY. I was going to remark, Mr. President, that I gave notice yesterday that I would take the floor at this hour, but I will yield to the Senator from Wyoming if the bill for which he asks consideration is one which will require no discussion. If it is a bill which will require discussion, I shall have to object to its present consideration.

Mr. WARREN. I shall not insist upon its consideration if it shall lead to debate.

Mr. MONEY. Let the bill be read.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will be read for the information of the Senate.

The Secretary read the bill.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I now understand that the

bill is liable to lead to some discussion, and as I do not wish to occupy the time of the Senator from Mississippi I will ask that the bill may go over, retaining its space on the Calendar.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will go over, retaining its place on the Calendar.

MOROCCAN CONFERENCE AND RELATIONS WITH SANTO DOMINGO.

Mr. MONEY. Mr. President, in the discussion which has engaged the attention of the Senate for several meetings the dominant note has been the authority of the President of the United States or his impolicy, if he has the authority and the inexpediency of action in regard to our foreign relations in some particulars.

In that debate almost everything has been brought in. The affairs of Santo Domingo have been discussed from every possible point of view, constitutionally, historically, commercially, the Monroe doctrine, considerations of humanity, of propinquity, of national obligation; also the affair now in process at Algeciras, to which we have sent delegates by invitation of Morocco, has been considered with reference to the President's power and, if he had the power, whether it was wholly advisable, or at all advisable, under the conditions prevalent there that we should be represented, with the inferential consequences and obligations that might be imposed on account of our community in the consideration of the questions presented.

It has been stated here, Mr. President, that the questions considered there would be of a purely political character, in which the interests of the United States were in no measure whatever involved; that we had notice, as did the other powers there represented, that matters of commercial import were not to be considered, or perhaps, to state it more exactly, that no commercial interests of any party invited would be disturbed by the result of that conference; which meant, of course, that they were not to be considered, for no man could guarantee that they would not be disturbed if they were matters of conference and consideration. So it resolved itself into a question of European politics—"European," it is called, but really European and African, for Morocco embraces a district of country lying along the South Mediterranean of 200,000 square miles, containing 10,000,000 people of the Mohammedan faith—a country which was once the most beautiful section of the globe, once the seat of mighty empires, that succeeded each other one after another through several thousands of years; a country now capable of enormous possibilities if the energies of its people could be concentrated and used in some wise way.

The political condition prevalent there is unsatisfactory to the observer, if he be a civilized man, wherever he may be, as a student of history and of civilization. There is a great movement of a philosophical character, at least of changes of government, and even in the character of the people; but the question is whether the United States of America as a Government, whether this great people as a nation, has any concern whatever in questions that are now at an acute crisis in the deliberations at Algeciras, if we may credit the morning newspapers.

Right at this point I may be permitted to indulge in a compliment to my friend the Senator from Georgia [Mr. BACON], who, with a very clear prognosis, said the very things which have come to pass were likely to come to pass, and also to pay my small tribute of admiration to the independent Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE], who, in the speech which he made the other day, full of pith and moment, in the most independent manner criticised this whole affair, except that he made a failure in predicting that the representatives of the United States would be immediately withdrawn if the crisis should be reached which was reached yesterday. I could not agree with the Senator when he announced that proposition, because the President of the United States is not a man who marches his men up the hill and then marches them down again. He is too positive a character for that. When he sent representatives to that general conference of European powers interested in the Moroccan question, it was not his intention that they should withdraw at the critical moment, but that at the critical moment they should be there, so that the United States, to use his favorite expression, should be felt as a world power.

Now, there is the whole question; whether the United States should be there as a great world power or in any other capacity; whether, in other words, his love of the Monroe doctrine is entirely one-sided; in other words, like the fish trap that caught all the fish going one way and let none go the other. It was said by Thomas Jefferson, the father of the Monroe doctrine, some twenty years before it was promulgated by Mr. Monroe, that he would draw a line through the middle of the Atlantic and the middle of the Pacific, and that he would have no interest of America beyond and no interest of Europe to hither side.

Mr. President, whether or not any good will come to the United States from the conference at Algeciras is not a debatable question. That we will be respected any more because we put our hand in the kettle of the European combination I can not admit. Whether the President had the authority under the Constitution to send anybody to Algeciras, is a question which I do not think is disputable. I believe the President of the United States has the right to send, when invited, delegates to any conference with any other power in the world, but the question of its wisdom and policy is one that can fairly be debated here. I say it can be fairly debated here, because, as was so lucidly and clearly and briefly and tersely stated the other day by the senior Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE], in the original the question of making treaties was intended for the Senate. You are all, I presume, more or less familiar with that contention in the convention, and while much more could be said, yet the Senator from Maine stated all that was necessary to be stated in the brief time allowed here for debate when he said the intention was first on the part of some members of the convention who made the Constitution of the United States that the Senate should originate treaties; then it should be a joint production; and then, yielding the love of independence and of power which they wished should reside in the States as sovereigns represented in this Chamber, to the practice of the whole world, which had given the Chief Executive the initiative power in making treaties, they made the present combination of power.

You will notice, as I showed the other day in a brief interruption, that the language of the Constitution is this, "that the President of the United States, by and with the consent of the Senate, shall make treaties," and so on; and in the same paragraph follows "and he shall nominate, and by and with the advice of the Senate, shall appoint" so and so. In other words, taking the two sections of the paragraph together, taking the intention of the framers of this instrument as we know it to be the contemporary literature, by the reports of the convention, we must come to the conclusion it was intended originally that the Senate should be consulted at every stage of the proceeding, not only in the confirmation or ratification, but also in the negotiation of a treaty.

And with that impression upon the minds of George Washington and the other early Presidents, it was quite common for them, as was stated here yesterday by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER] very clearly, to consult the Senate to see whether it would be advisable—not constitutional, but advisable and politic—to open negotiations with certain nations upon certain subjects. That fell into disuse, and according to the text of the Constitution and the practice, I am not disposed to dispute the power of the President—that is, his authority under the Constitution—to make treaties. Whether they are wise or unwise must be determined by the Senate.

But, Mr. President, there is a grave question about the policy and advisability of mixing up in the political affairs of another hemisphere from which there can come no good to this people, and where we may incur obligations such as we did incur once and which we freely repudiated, not perhaps to our honor, but from an overwhelming public necessity, and in the days of George Washington.

Now, Mr. President, what may be the effect of the conference at Algeciras no man here can say. There is a condition there familiar, I presume, to almost every member of the Senate; of course more so to some, who are students, than to others who are more active in the routine business of the Senate. But the fact remains patent to everybody that the Moroccan question is likely to be a bone of contention that will probably involve the whole of Europe in war. We know that the French have established their sphere of influence in Morocco after years of active diplomatic and commercial intercourse; and as Japan and Russia went to war—one for her predominance in Manchuria and the other in a contention for the sphere of influence in Korea—so to-day we have imminent a war between Germany and France, which may draw in Great Britain on the one side and Italy on the other, and we know not what other power. It is not desired, I presume, by the President of the United States or his advisers, or anybody else, that we should see another war.

Now, wars sometimes do act beneficially, like burning out a bad chimney; but, altogether, we are a people of peace. We want quiet and business, and it is a singular thing that everybody else wants business. All the wars, except the religious wars, have been about commerce, money-making, money getting; and some of the most nefarious crimes which have been committed by some of the greatest nations in the world were for the sake of money—to compel countries to receive goods which in the highest degree were deleterious to their people.

Now, in case there shall be a war as a result of this conference, a bad feeling, are we to take our share of it? How shall

our representatives vote? They will not retire when the time comes for casting the vote of the United States. I do not apprehend the President of the United States will send them any such cablegram as to retire while the balloting is going on. He intends them to be there as a potent factor in this conference and in its decision, and on whichever side we cast the deciding ballot or any ballot, we have at once incurred the dislike of those against whom that vote has been cast.

To-day we are on good terms with the whole of Europe, so far as I know. There is nothing I know of to break that good feeling, and certainly the condition of the American foreign trade, which amounts to $2,480,000,000, does not justify the business interests of this country in upholding any policy that invites dissension with foreign nations who are our customers and friends.

However, so far as our business with Morocco is concerned, it amounts to nothing. We have never tried to get it. The whole coast of Africa has been surrendered to a few manufacturers at Marseilles and Lisbon, and although it is true, as I have been informed by American manufacturers, that the Americans could introduce American manufactures along the twenty-six hundred miles of the Mediterranean cheaper than the manufacturers of Lisbon, we have not invaded that field at all. Why? For lack of enterprise? For lack of drummers who can speak two languages? No. Simply because the American manufacturer has relied upon a protective tariff to take care of him and has not put himself on his wit to compete with his compeers in all the nations of the world for the cheapest goods in the cheapest market. That is the only reason. You can not find a drummer of an American house who speaks any language but English. The employers do not demand it of them. Nor do our manufacturers trouble themselves to prepare and ship the goods in the way in which the foreign customers want them prepared and shipped. That, however, is not important in this consideration.

The question is whether the President has acted wisely in sending the conferees there, and no one has shown in this debate, unless it was when I was absent from the Chamber, that we are to be in any manner the beneficiaries of this deliberation. That our political interests are not concerned in one single particular, I believe will be conceded by every gentleman on both sides of the Chamber. I can not conceive how they can be concerned; and if that is true, then how much better it would be to cling to the advice of Washington and Jefferson and the other early statesmen of the Republic to have no intercourse, except strictly commercial, with the people of the Old World.

It has been said by my very learned and distinguished friend the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] that there was a strong disposition on this side to preserve the principles of Washington's Farewell Address. I did not look at it in that way. Perhaps he was taking a Pickwickian view of it. The attempt on this side is to honestly maintain the wisdom of taking the advice of George Washington and Thomas Jefferson and of confining our political troubles to this hemisphere as much as we are able to do. What relation we have had, as cited by the learned Senator from Massachusetts, with the Barbary coast, has not been to the honor, but to the everlasting disgrace of the American nation, as it was simply paying a tribute to a nest of pirates. We are too strong now to do that. But that, Mr. President, is one of the matters I shall not dwell upon. I only brought it in because it has been so freely discussed on both sides, with such a variance of opinion.

I wish to speak particularly about Santo Domingo. The President has made utterance in his message, and his friend and fidus Achates has spoken here. The frankness of the President is not to be disputed by anybody. Nobody has ever said that he cultivated diplomatic phrases to conceal his meaning. There is an openness and frankness about his communications, whether official or otherwise, that leaves nobody in doubt about his meaning, and he has stated his reasons for interfering in the affair in Santo Domingo, and that affair, in my opinion, concerns us a great deal more than does the conference at Algeciras. The President of the United States has said that in a wise development or evolution of the Monroe doctrine we were to take care of the people in the island of Santo Domingo—that is, that part of it comprising the Dominican Republic—for the reason that it was near us, as stated by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. SPOONER]; for the reason stated by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], in the same way; and for the further reason, produced by both of those gentlemen and by the President, that they are a helpless people, utterly unable to take care of themselves, and that he is justified in interference in behalf of a helpless people, among whom anarchy is a permanent condition, in order to do what? To collect their dues and pay their debts, and relieve them from what? From the threat of occupation of some of their ports by foreign powers.

I do not see that the Monroe doctrine is a doctrine of evolution, wise or otherwise. As the Senator from Massachusetts very correctly stated yesterday, it was a pretty dead doctrine as long as the Clayton-Bulwer treaty was extant, for that was a complete check of the Monroe doctrine, both as to the first, second, and third parts of it. It was only after the abolition of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty that we had a recrudescence of ideas here, which could not be called the Monroe doctrine, but more properly the great American doctrine that there should be no interference in purely American questions by the nations of Europe.

I do not wish to take up the time of the Senate or to fatigue myself, but it is impossible for me to discuss the President's position in regard to the Monroe doctrine and that of his champion here on the floor, who has sustained him with great ability and great clearness, without going to the genesis of this business to show what the Monroe doctrine is, for there has been yet, in my hearing, no clear definition of the Monroe doctrine—in fact, no correct statement of what the Monroe doctrine is nor the reason why it ever existed at all.

We recollect that in the general revolt of the Spanish colonies in America the Holy Alliance was formed. There had been a tremendous cataclysm in France, and the Jacquerie had arisen against the governing and richer classes, and there had been a sort of revolution which seemed to satiate itself with nothing else than human blood. In a spasm of "liberty, equality, and fraternity" those people had seemed to send all over Europe the mighty influence of love of liberty, and there were uprisings in Spain, in the Piedmont country, and all over Europe, and the flames, crossing the Atlantic, illumined the Spanish colonies, and they, too, raised the standard of revolt a little later on. The result was to throw off the yoke of Spain after various circumstances of warfare, which culminated in the victory on a field, the name of which I have forgotten, by General San Martin, which virtually, as has been said, closed the war for independence in South America.

At this time the Holy Alliance assembled in congress in Paris and declared through the persons of the monarchs themselves—for no less personage was permitted at that conference—that they ruled by divine right; that no reform in government could possibly originate among the people and go upward, but they must all go down, and that in obedience to the God-given right to reign over other people there was an obligation to the Divinity at the cost of whatever liberty and life might be necessary to establish order on the royal idea of order.

In obedience to that, they sent a hundred thousand troops into Spain, overthrew a constitutional Cortes, restored Ferdinand VII to power, and then overran the Piedmont country and soon suppressed every feeling that seemed to be capable of being incited to rebellion anywhere in Europe. There were conferences at Labach, Trappau, Vienna, Paris, and at one or two other places. The King of England could not be there personally, although he sympathized with them. He could not attend simply because, according to the British constitution, the British sovereign can do nothing. He can only act through a responsible ministry. He had his ambassador at the conference, and the ambassador reported with great satisfaction the progress being made in the scheme of the Holy Alliance. The prime minister was Lord Castlereagh, and then a great man took his place—George Canning. Canning loved liberty, but was also devoted to the commercial interests of Great Britain—a double cause of action. He saw that the return of the Spanish colonies to the sovereignty of Spain would, under Spanish law, deny to Great Britain any share of the commerce of the colonies, and when it was reported by the British ambassador at the last conference that it was contemplated by the Holy Alliance to send a united fleet to South America to restore the sovereignty of Spain, he called into conference Mr. Rush, the American minister near the Court of St. James, and he gave him the plan and sounded him, to use his own expression, to see how he would take the suggestion he was about to offer, saying in a letter to a friend that the American minister not only took it well, but he took the bait, hook, line, sinker, and all, and ran away with the proposition.

He said this is the time for the United States to assert itself against what? The Holy Alliance; against its scheme of government, which denied the right of peoples to govern themselves and affirmed the divine appointment of kings. A declaration by the United States that any attempt of the Holy Alliance upon the liberty of the Spanish-American colonies will be viewed as an unfriendly act by the United States, and will not be tolerated by them; and if events required action by the United States, he assured Mr. Rush that Great Britain could be relied upon to furnish the support of her fleets.

Mr. Rush communicated this very promptly to our Government. Mr. John Quincy Adams, an exceedingly able and ener-

getic man, was Secretary of State. The Secretary drew up in part what is now called the "Monroe doctrine," under the direction of Mr. Monroe. It was submitted to Mr. Jefferson, who retained it about six weeks, and then, without any authority from anybody that I can find, communicated it to Madison, who gave it much milder support than Mr. Jefferson. Then came a conference in the Cabinet. Mr. Monroe, with all his great abilities, was a somewhat timid man—there is no doubt of that, and was perhaps a negative character—and when the debate came in the Cabinet over this document prepared by Mr. John Quincy Adams, Mr. Monroe was a little bit startled by the decision and firmness of the tone of the document. The contest was whether the President should have his phraseology or the Secretary of State should have his; and there is no doubt that the wish of the President would have prevailed but for the fact that a stronger man than either was Secretary of War—John C. Calhoun—who took the part of Mr. John Quincy Adams, and together they drove that thing through the Cabinet.

At the last meeting upon that question, Mr. Adams submitted the last paragraph, which concerned the colonization in this country by foreign nations. That was never considered by the Cabinet. Mr. Calhoun made that statement in the old Senate Chamber on two occasions, once in 1848, on the military occupation of Yucatan, a measure proposed by the Polk Administration, and again in one of his several speeches on the Oregon question, under the Polk Administration; and, by the way, Mr. Polk was an exceedingly aggressive and energetic President. Mr. Adams was present and heard one of these declarations that the Cabinet had not considered the colonization feature, for which Mr. Adams alone was responsible, and did not deny it. On the contrary, you will find in his works that he claimed the credit of having himself written and put through that part concerning colonization.

That part of it was conceived in this way. It was intended to affect in fact only two nations—one was Russia and the other was Great Britain. An American ship captain named Gray, on a little trading ship, had gone up the Columbia River, and as discoverer claimed the whole country in the name of the United States. Fur traders had claimed the whole country in the name of Great Britain, by occupation and in the prosecution of their trade. Russia had extended her forts down to Monterey, in California, claiming the whole northwest coast, and that condition existed when the so-called "doctrine of Monroe" was proclaimed in 1821.

Immediately Great Britain and Russia notified us that no attention would be paid to that clause of the document. The matter was simplified, so far as Russia was concerned, by a treaty which she made with the Republic of Mexico, in which she agreed to retire from all fortifications and occupations, and did retire as far as Alaska. The other was in a condition that required a modus vivendi, and in that condition Mr. Polk declared he was going to the fifty-six forty line or fight, and that became the slogan of his particular followers—"Fifty-six forty or fight." But the matter was arranged by a joint commission upon a division which did not meet the views of Mr. Polk, but it established the present line. A later commission established the main channel of Puget Sound and San Juan de Fuca Straits, which gave the island of Vancouver to Great Britain. And that part of the doctrine has been as dead ever since as the bulrushes that surrounded little Moses on the banks of the Nile. It has been said it was revived in the case of Venezuela. I, for one, did not agree with Mr. Cleveland in his message on the Venezuelan question.

Now, Mr. President, look further and see how far the Monroe doctrine has operated in the other feature of it. The best way to find out what was meant by the doctrine as it was enunciated by Mr. Monroe is to take a contemporary view of it and the action subsequent to that time. My friend the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. SPOONER], and I am sorry he is absent to-day, because I like his interruptions very much, as they always spur me up when I am a little flagging, stated that he was for the Monroe doctrine as it was in the beginning and in all the intermediate stages up to date and in all its evolutions and everything else. As a matter of fact, the Monroe doctrine is best interpreted by the man who wrote it—John Quincy Adams—I mean that part of it which is political and concerning the interference of Europeans upon the Western Hemisphere.

Three years after the date of that proclamation, the same gentleman who was then Secretary of State had become President of the United States, and Henry Clay, of Kentucky, had become the Secretary of State, after that notorious quadrangular fight that raised the cry of "Bargain and corruption!" when Jackson, who got the majority of votes, was beaten by the combination. As to whether there was bribery and corruption, of course nobody now thinks there was, but it was the cry then.

On account of this promulgation of the Monroe doctrine, the southern confederacies or republics of America and Central America and Mexico had conceived the idea of a pan-American congress, and they called it to meet at Panama as a central point. The Republics of Mexico and Colombia invited the United States to send delegates to that convention. To that convention, if I am not mistaken, was delegated a man named Andersen, of Kentucky, who was then minister at Bogota. In those days there were no facilities for travel in that country, and he had to hunt for one of the courts of those little republics in the mountains the best way he could, and get away from there the best way he could. The other delegate was Mr. Sargeant, of Pennsylvania. One of these died. The other never went there at all, and because neither of them did appear the Congress at Panama adjourned to meet at Tacubaya, in Mexico. But that meeting was never held.

The most interesting fact, if you wish to know what was the meaning of the Monroe doctrine in regard to the political or other influences on this hemisphere of European powers, is contained in the instructions which the Secretary of State, Mr. Clay, wrote for his chief, John Quincy Adams, the author, in the instructions to Andersen and Sargeant, and also to our ministers near the courts of other nations, particularly Mr. Poinsett, who was then our representative at the city of Mexico. In these instructions this author of the Monroe doctrine, which distinctly stated that any attempt on the part of European governments to invade the rights or use an influence to the detriment of any of these American republics would be considered by the United States as a distinctly unfriendly act to them—they were instructed to say to the Panama Congress that when that utterance was made it did not in any manner whatever commit the United States to interfere, by arms or otherwise, except good offices, if there should be an attempt made by any foreign country to occupy or seize her territory or empire or impair their rights as a sovereign; that it was a declaration of opinion and a policy that each one of these sovereign states should make for themselves, and having made it, maintain it. They distinctly disclaimed the fact that any of the southern nations could call upon the United States in any contingency whatever, and they took occasion to say also, which was true, that as the Holy Alliance had dissolved, as any man could see it must, for when so many people had divine rights they must clash somewhere, owing to this disintegration, the first declaration of these principles, of course, faded because of no importance; because the cause that produced them had disappeared. Mr. Adams, through his Secretary, declared that, the cause of this declaration having passed away, there was no longer any reason for insisting upon the declaration he had made.

Now, that declaration was not against monarchy. This was the first nation in the world to recognize the Emperor of Brazil when, after the insurrection in Portugal, the imperial family moved its court to Rio. And we were the first to recognize Iturbide, Emperor of Mexico. It was not intended or aimed at the system of monarchy in Europe or elsewhere, but the Holy Alliance system, which declared in its fundamental doctrines as a truth that power came only from God to kings, and could not exist inherently among the people governed; otherwise that government was not by the censent of the governed, but by will of the governor. So he said the occasion or the cause having passed away, there was no longer any necessity for considering this doctrine at all.

Then we had the Clayton-Bulwer treaty, which involved us in all sorts of difficulties. There is another singular fact which I will call to the attention of the Senate. There never has been, at least not until lately, any legislative approval of the Monroe doctrine. There were attempts made to approve it, but they all failed. There were resolutions in both Houses of Congress supporting President Monroe in his declaration of that doctrine. Not one of them ever passed. As a matter of fact, the authors never had tried to call them up for consideration.

But I will tell you what did pass. A resolution written by James Buchanan, of Pennsylvania, then a Member of the House, repudiating the whole thing. It did pass, by a very decided majority, the House of Representatives. So the only legislative action taken was a distinct and emphatic repudiation of the doctrine of Mr. Monroe as declared in his message of December 2, 1821.

As the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] said yesterday, the Clayton-Bulwer treaty seemed to hold us to the fence, and we were not willing even to properly interpret the Clayton-Bulwer treaty on account of the consequences that would flow from it. When we failed to agree with Great Britain upon the main meaning of that treaty our negotiator, the Secretary, Mr. Clayton, wrote a note, as did Sir Henry Bulwer Lytton, in which

they agreed that the British meaning was the right meaning and that our meaning was wrong, and immediately the Senate, with General Cass leading, and supported by Stephen A. Douglas, declared in the Senate that they would never have voted for the Clayton-Bulwer treaty if they had understood it as having that meaning.

I may be allowed to bring in a little episode also to show that the denunciation of Mr. Clayton was violent on the part of Mr. Cass and Mr. Douglas and others. He resigned his seat as Secretary and came here as a Senator in order to meet Mr. Cass. Mr. Cass, with a discretion much greater than his valor, found it convenient to be absent that winter in Detroit. Mr. Clayton, who was a distinguished debater and a very fierce one, finding nobody else to talk with, after fuming and fretting with his manuscript here for two or three months said that as the man he was after was gone he would have to take up his lieutenant; and so he proceeded to castigate Stephen A. Douglas, with the result that when he concluded Stephen A. Douglas rose, and when he got through there was not anything left of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty or of Clayton either.

Now, having differed in the construction of that instrument and suspended the Monroe doctrine, Great Britain proposed first that we should arbitrate. The Senate declined to do it. Then there was another proposition that we should abolish the treaty. That was also declined. Then there was another proposition that we should remake the treaty, and that was declined by the Senate. Why? Because then Great Britain had sent Sir William Gore Ouseley to Central America and was negotiating treaties with them extending, as we feared, the sphere of British influence, and it was the fear of those treaties which made the American Senate insist upon the maintenance of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty, of which they did not like a line, for fear that greater advantage might accrue to Great Britain from the treaties about to be negotiated. As a matter of fact, it turned out that Sir William Gore Ouseley surrendered every point of contention between the United States and Great Britain, and he made treaties with those little Republics—Nicaragua, Guatemala, Honduras, and so on.

Then, Mr. President and Senators, we have no Monroe doctrine down to the point that it was disengaged from the incubus of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty. It sprang into sudden popularity because it struck a responsive chord in the bosom of the average American citizen; that is, a desire for military glory and for conquest and for self-assertion. It is one of the curious facts of history that perhaps where men are supposed to govern themselves they are fonder of military glory than the people in monarchies, where, it is declared by Montesquieu in his Spirit of Laws, honor is the motive of action. But that is a fact, if history does not belie itself.

So that martial spirit that is dominant all the time in the American breast has come spontaneously forward to support any measures of aggression, whether wise or unwise, to support any policy, whether just or unjust. I do not mean to say that I am reflecting upon what I consider the greatest people who have ever in all the tide of time essayed the great experiment of self-government; but it is simply a part and parcel of that blood that forces itself through the average American citizen to take all he can; in other words, to adopt—

* * * the good old rule,
* * * the simple plan,
That they should take who have the power,
And they should keep who can.

That is not to become the supreme law in this country if we could govern ourselves, but we do maintain it as to other people.

Now, then, the doctrine grew in favor again, not the Monroe doctrine, which had long, long since died and been buried by its authors, but the new American doctrine, that we would not permit in this hemisphere the intrusion of a foreign influence; that the United States, by virtue of its power, by virtue of its political institutions, which are best adapted to secure the rights of men, should have the hegemony of all the American States and should hold itself as a bulwark to protect the weak. That doctrine does not belong to Mr. Monroe or his advisers. It is the feeling of the American people, and it is the dominant policy to-day.

Now, to get down to Santo Domingo, having stated this much by way of introduction, and on account of what the President says, that under the signification of the Monroe doctrine, as it has wisely been evolved, the duty is incumbent upon the American people to protect the people who are in danger of intrusion from some foreign power to compel the payment of debts. As a matter of international law I suppose everyone will admit that the right of a nation to enforce a contractual obligation by arms is conceded. It has always been conceded. It has always been the practice of nations. If you go farther backward, to the history of the Greeks or any other people who have a history, you will find that everywhere they enforced the obligations made to their own people by another power or the citizens of another power.

So we set ourselves up, then, according to the President's idea, to protect these people from seizure—at least in their custom-houses or ports, coming down to the real matter in controversy—by first undertaking to take charge of their whole affairs and guaranteeing their territorial and political integrity, to collect their dues of every kind as they may accrue, and at the same time by a partition of the revenues so collected to pay off gradually or amortize their debts.

Mr. President, I deny that it is the Monroe doctrine or any doctrine of good policy; and I do not wish to be considered as impeaching the wisdom of the distinguished President of the United States or his distinguished Secretary of State. I am discussing this thing deliberately and coolly in the Senate of the United States, interested a great deal more in the welfare of the country than I am in the preservation of the rights of the Senate, although one, in my opinion, is a great deal involved in the other, for whenever the Senate, which the eloquent Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER] said yesterday was the last refuge of free speech, in the legislative deliberation of this great Government, shall begin to give away its power, its authority, derived from the Constitution, it is but the beginning of the end. We can do no higher duty to our constituents, to this great superstructure, magnificent in its proportions, erected upon the blood and bones of our ancestors for the exercise of the right of self-government by the people of this great country. If this bulwark shall fail where will be the barricade that protects the people from the invasion of Executive aggression?

Now, it is said we need not fear the President, and we had the very great assurance, which was exceedingly comfortable to me, made yesterday by the Senator from Massachusetts that we could certainly trust the present President of the United States. I do not believe that the Senator from Massachusetts said that upon the idea that the king can do no wrong, but simply upon his utmost faith in the ability and good intention of the President of the United States.

Mr. President, I am not questioning the good intention of the President of the United States, but we have it from a pretty old authority that "The way to hell is paved with good intentions." I am concerned with results and not with processes. What are the people of this country to receive as the consequences of these acts of the Executive?

We will suppose it is true, as the gentleman says, but this thing will keep piling up and take the form almost of delegated authority of the Constitution—the authorization to do something just like it. You can keep on piling up one precedent upon another until it takes at last the place of principle as well as policy.

We will have a time probably when there will be a change of Presidents. We had the other assurance yesterday—I do not know whether it was intended as a threat or not on the part of the Senator from Massachusetts—that the President would not be a candidate for reelection.

For he himself hath said it,
And it's greatly to his credit—

And so forth, quoting the language of Pinafore.

Mr. President, we are safe now. We do not know that we will be safe hereafter. There may come a time, the Senator will admit, that when, instead of having as President a cool, dispassionate, even-tempered, logical, thinking man, we may have a hot-headed, impulsive, emotional creature in the White House. Instead of a man who, as the present President does, respects the Constitution, as we are informed by the Senator from Massachusetts—and I am very happy, indeed, to get the information—and who regards the law—and I am very glad to know that—we may have a man who will say that he has violated the law because, in his judgment, it is better to do something else. It is possible we may have such a President as that, because we can not go on as now in perpetuo. This is not Mexico. There may be a little over-lord or a little war-lord business going on. There is no perpetual President here, no American Diaz, and there never will be, I reckon. So there must be a change, and instead of this ark of safety, which we have to-day, this President whom we can safely trust, according to the Senator from Massachusetts, who never could violate the Constitution and disrespect the laws, we may have a man who imagines he is doing the very wisest and best thing in the world by upsetting the law and substituting his own judgment. It would occur, of course, to the average mind that the reason why we have law, either fundamental or statutory, is to prevent some Executive from substituting his judgment for the law.

THE MERCHANT MARINE.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. The bill (S. 529) to promote the national defense, to create a force of naval volunteers, to establish American ocean mail lines to foreign markets, to promote commerce, and to provide revenue from tonnage.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate I will say that I do not anticipate very much discussion on the bill upon the Republican side of the Chamber. On Monday next I will take occasion to offer some amendments to the bill and will make a brief reply to the very able speech of the Senator from Florida [Mr. MALLORY]. I expect to be followed by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE], and possibly brief speeches may be made by two or three other Senators on this side of the Chamber. I make this observation in the hope that other Senators who may be opposed to some provisions of the bill or to the bill as an entirety may follow, and that its consideration may go along with reasonable rapidity. I ask that the unfinished business may be temporarily laid aside.

BILLINGS LAND DISTRICT, MONTANA.

Mr. MONEY. The Senator from Montana [Mr. CARTER] desires to bring a bill before the Senate, and I yield to him for that purpose.

Mr. CARTER. I report back from the Committee on Public Lands, without amendment, the bill (H. R. 8994) to provide for a land district in Yellowstone, Carbon, and Rosebud counties, in the State of Montana, to be known as the "Billings land district." This bill was received by the Senate on the 24th instant and is identical with the bill reported by the Committee on Public Lands now on the Calender. I ask that the bill may be put upon its passage.

The Secretary read the bill; and, there being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. CARTER. I move that Order of Business 112, being the bill (S. 540) to establish an additional land district in the State of Montana, be indefinitely postponed.

The motion was agreed to.

MOROCCAN CONFERENCE AND RELATIONS WITH SANTO DOMINGO.

Mr. MONEY. Mr. President, resuming the consideration of the matter of Santo Domingo, it may be said very safely that the President of the United States has a right to negotiate a treaty. The policy of it may be as rightly contested. The question of the Santo Domingo treaty can not now be discussed except in the way that it has been; that is, in a skirmish along the outside. But there is a question that can be discussed openly and that is the authority, as distinguished from the word "right" in strict meaning, of the President to carry into operation a treaty negotiated but failing of ratification. I can not subscribe to the language of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. SPOONER] that we declined to ratify it, because the record does not show that we declined, but we simply failed to ratify it.

The President says in his message that he is now operating under an agreement with Morales, and he felicitates the country that on account of his action, the President's action, maintaining a force in the island, designating a collector of customs, the island is enjoying a season of unusual prosperity and there is no sign of disturbance. It was an early boast, and the ink was hardly dry before Morales had taken to the woods and another revolution put Caceres in power. There have been twenty-four presidents and only one was ever elected. As I said a while ago, there is a permanent anarchy there, and it is a condition that will exist in spite of everything that can be done by the United States. We may collect all their dues and all their taxes and pay every debt they owe and launch them into the business of governing themselves again, but it will be a flat failure, because of the inherent incapacity of the people for government. This is a fact which President Morales himself admitted to a number of Representatives of the House who were down there last summer, he urging our aid, "Because you see, gentlemen," he said, "we are incapable of maintaining self-government." But the question is now whether the President can make such an agreement. I wish to refer to what we were told by the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. SPOONER]. I am very sorry he is absent to-day. I told him I was going to make a speech and wanted him to be present, not only to give me the pleasure of his countenance, but that I might have the profit of his interruption.

He said the President was bound to maintain the status quo of a treaty pending and not yet concluded by the Senate. I fail to find the authority for that declaration anywhere. There may be, for I must say I have not looked for it lately.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I can point the Senator to one instance.

Mr. MONEY. I shall be very glad to get it.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. MONEY. Certainly.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. If my recollection serves, the treaty between this country and Great Britain with reference to the naval armament of both countries on the Great Lakes after the war of 1812 was acted upon for a year before the treaty was ratified.

Mr. MONEY. That has happened sometimes by the consent of both parties, I will admit that, when it is really carrying out the treaty. I can recollect an instance when it did.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I will state to the Senator, without wishing to interrupt him——

Mr. MONEY. Go ahead.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. The Senator merely called for a citation. That, of course, concerned a tremendously grave question of national policy and has affected the relations between this country and Great Britain ever since, because at that time it was proposed not only to largely fortify the coasts but to maintain an armament upon the Great Lakes.

Mr. MONEY. I understand it, and I am obliged to the Senator for reviving my recollection. Since he has done so I can recall another instance, and these two exceptions but verify and establish the rule. I can recollect now another instance, where Russia, Austria, Prussia, and Great Britain had a convention with Turkey concerning the internal affairs of the Ottoman Empire—in 1840, I think it was—and they came to a conclusion, and it was immediately put into effect before a notification even was made to the respective powers that a treaty had been made. But that was on account of the emergency of the circumstances and the fact that communication was so slow at that date it was considered best for the parties that it should be put in operation; and, in fact, every plenipotentiary at that meeting had secret instructions to agree to the immediate operation. However, all these things but prove that the rule is the other way. There are exceptions, and I am very glad the Senator reminded me of this one. I recollect now also the other. One thing brings up another. But I add this fact, however, that this treaty had been before the Senate and the Senate had failed to ratify it. Now, in that condition of things the President goes on to put the treaty in operation.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I do not want to interrupt the Senator——

Mr. MONEY. It is all right.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. MONEY. Certainly. I am glad to be interrupted.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. It would be more correct to say that the treaty is still under consideration in the Senate; not that the Senate failed to ratify the treaty, but that the treaty is still under consideration, because the expression, "The Senate has failed to ratify the treaty" seems to indicate that the Senate had taken adverse action upon it.

Mr. MONEY. The Senator did not understand me; that is all.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Well, then, I misunderstood the Senator.

Mr. MONEY. What I said was, "That the one put in operation had failed." After the meeting of this Congress it was sent again to the Senate, having been extended, I suppose, by the consent of both the parties concerned.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator will excuse me——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. MONEY. Certainly.

Mr. LODGE. It was not sent again to the Senate. It remained here in the Senate.

Mr. MONEY. Then it had failed.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. It was the same treaty.

Mr. LODGE. It failed to secure ratification and was pending before the Senate.

Mr. MONEY. It failed to secure ratification, and the contention of the Senator from Wisconsin is—and, I presume, of the Senator from Massachusetts, too, and probably of my distinguished young friend from Indiana—will be that he had the right to maintain the status quo in Santo Domingo.

Mr. President, in the first place, there is so much to be said upon the advisability of the thing as a whole that it does not seem to me the right existed in the President to carry into effect a treaty that was not ratified. That is exactly what he has done. He has been maintaining the status quo. I make that assertion, and it can not be contradicted, I think. The President has not simply maintained the status quo. The

President has gone on just as steadily as though the Senate had unanimously voted for the treaty, and has carried into operation every solitary item of it as far as he was called upon to do. When Morales fled to the woods after the fight in that country the time had come for a political convulsion. They have them there like chills and fevers. It is periodic. When Morales went to the woods the treaty went right along with the incoming Government.

We had here an important witness, from whom the Senator from Wisconsin was reading the other day. I did not know that his testimony had been made public, because I had been sick three or four weeks, but I presume from his reading from it that the bar of secrecy had been removed. This is the only witness who ever came here that I know of, and he testified most positively that he was not collecting customs on account of any treaty whatever, but that he was collecting customs on that little island and depositing 45 per cent of the gross income of the Government for its administrative expenses, and the other 55 per cent in a bank at New York, from which it can be drawn only by a check signed by the President of the Dominican Republic and countersigned by Colonel Colton, the agent. So it can be said in one sense it is not the money of anybody. But he said, "I am acting under a decree." The President said he was acting under an agreement, and the collector of customs said he was acting under a decree of Morales, and that decree was pronounced by Morales without the consent of anybody—his cabinet or his congress. He undertook to misapply the words "modus vivendi." I do not know, I only suppose, that he was ignorant of the fact that a modus vivendi requires two contracting parties and merely provides for a temporary arrangement pending negotiations for a permanent one. But this single individual issued his decree—or he calls it "modus vivendi"—that he has declared, not he and the President of the United States, but that he has declared to the United States, and the President of the United States, in obedience to the decree of that mulatto President, designates a man to collect the customs who is borne upon the civil roster of the United States and is now absent indefinitely with leave without pay; and then it is said by the Senator that there is another one so designated. That is a mistake. The other one was appointed by Colonel Colton himself, without consulting anybody, and he, too, is on the civil roster and is indefinitely on leave without pay. So they are operating under a decree of Morales, I suppose assumed by his successor in office, as under power and authority entitled, etc.

That is the condition of things according to that witness, and I take it the President means what he says, and knows as well as the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], or Colonel Colton, or as the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. SPOONER] knows, what he meant. What he said in the message is plain reading—that he is living up to the agreement. The facts show that he is absolutely carrying out in every particular the terms and specifications of a treaty which the Senate failed to ratify; and I deny the power of the President to do that. I would not care how desirable it might be, how salutary it might be, or how promotive of the interest of that little Republic or of this great Republic it might be, I deny the power and the authority of the President to do anything of the sort.

Suppose that this Senate, in this session of the Fifty-ninth Congress, should also fail to ratify that treaty; what is going to be done then? The President will continue acting under the agreement, I suppose, carrying out the treaty, while we did not ratify any treaty; and so the ratifying power of the Senate becomes an absolutely useless appendage to the Government so far as treaties go, if this can be allowed to go on without question.

The President of the United States, or the Secretary of State, or whoever else is responsible—though I should hold the President responsible, because he is the Executive head of the Government; he is really at the head of every one of the Executive Departments of the Government, and he is just as much at the head of the State Department as is the Secretary of State, and is responsible for it all—I say that the President has not any right to carry out that treaty, which has been declined ratification by this Senate, and as the Senate had full power and full opportunity to consider it, and did consider it, its failure to ratify it might very properly be considered by the President as a rejection, so far as his action was concerned in carrying it into operation.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Mr. President, would it interrupt the Senator if I were to ask him a question?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. MONEY. Certainly.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. The Senator from Mississippi is discussing a very practical question, and I am listening with great attention; but I wish to ask the Senator what he would have the President do, under the present circumstances, with reference to the money already collected?

Mr. MONEY. I will answer that question.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I should like to have an answer.

Mr. MONEY. So far as I know, the President has nothing on God's earth to do with the money, and never did have, and never proposed to have. There is no agreement, there is no treaty, and there is no decree that ever gave him any control of it whatever.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Suppose Colonel Colton were withdrawn and restored to his duties in the Philippines, and what the Senator is now describing as occurring under a modus vivendi should stop just now, to-day, what would occur?

Mr. MONEY. That may be a question of some interest to the Senator from Indiana, but it is not of the slightest concern to me. I do not care what becomes of it.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. That is just the point.

Mr. MONEY. Not at all, according to my view.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. What would happen? I suppose the Senator would admit that this money, if returned to the island, would at once be seized upon by a foreign power or by any temporary government that might there exist. In either event, with respect to the island and to American interests there—supposing that to be the case and the treaty came to a vote in executive session of the Senate and we should ratify the treaty, then where would we be?

Mr. MONEY. That may concern the Senator from Indiana, but is not of the slightest concern on earth to me.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Very well.

Mr. MONEY. Not the slightest on earth. I do not see why we should have so much concern about the debts of that Republic, every one of which was incurred in promoting and carrying through a revolution.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. But I ask the Senator what would happen if we should ratify the treaty?

Mr. MONEY. But we will not ratify the treaty; it is idle to suppose that. I do not think we shall.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. But the Senator can not assume that we are not going to ratify it.

Mr. MONEY. I do not know about that. It will depend on Senators on that side of the Chamber.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. We may reject the treaty or we may ratify it.

Mr. MONEY. We may have a lucid interval and reject it.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I repeat, we may reject or we may ratify it when it comes before the Senate in executive session. If what the Senator supposes is carried into effect, and afterwards we were to ratify the treaty, in what condition should we be left?

Mr. MONEY. That is the third time the Senator has asked the same question, and I answer it for the third time and say I do not care a continental what becomes of it, and I do not see why any American Senator, as a Senator, should be concerned about it, either.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. The Senator thinks that is a sufficient answer?

Mr. MONEY. If there is an American gentleman here who has got a pecuniary interest in it, he might inquire as to what would become of it; but I am only interested here about passing on the treaty. The disposition of the money is of the least concern. Whether it be three or four hundred thousand or a million dollars, it belongs to the little Republic in the West Indies. I do not think that is any matter of concern to us. It is too small a game; we are not hunting with bird shot. I will tell you what Colonel Colton says about it, if you would like to know. He says that Morales can not draw that money unless he countersigns the check and that he—Colton—can not draw it at all, and that the money is to be distributed as prescribed in the decree or in the treaty, for they are just the same.

Colonel Colton impressed me, as I believe he did the entire committee, as being a very capable and honest man, that would do his duty as he believed it to be assigned to him. There was nothing of dodging or equivocation or concealment about his statement. He was just as plain and open as the day, and I do not think there is a member of the committee who does not believe that Colonel Colton is going to do what he is told to do; but Colonel Colton said he was there under the decree of Morales; he was there to obey Morales; but he was designated by the President of the United States for the place by the decree of Morales. He also said that he appointed his assistants without the consent of Morales or of the President of the United States.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. MONEY. Of course I yield.

Mr. TILLMAN. It just occurred to me that Colonel Colton thinks his signature is necessary to get this money.

Mr. MONEY. That is true.

Mr. TILLMAN. No doubt that is the arrangement announced, and that Morales's signature is necessary to get the money; but Morales is no longer in Santo Domingo. He is in San Juan, P. R., or somewhere else, and now we have got to get up another modus vivendi to get that money.

Mr. LODGE. It is not Morales personally, but the President of the Dominican Republic, whoever he may be.

Mr. TILLMAN. No; that is not the arrangement. That is not what the President says. He says that President Morales is the man with whom he dealt.

Mr. MONEY. I must insist, Mr. President, that if any controversy is to go on I must be a party to it, as this comes out of my time. I do not want any controversy to go on whilst I hold the floor, unless it is directed to me. Senators may talk to me or to the Senate, but they can not talk over my shoulder.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator can not be interrupted except with his consent.

Mr. MONEY. I am perfectly willing to be interrupted. I do not see any reason why a man should decline to be interrupted if he knows what he is talking about, and I think I do. I feel greatly obliged sometimes for an interruption. It is like winding up a watch which is partially run down. Everybody knows how wholesome it is to be interrupted with questions. It is only troublesome when a man does not know what he is talking about to submit to interruptions, and when I do not know enough in relation to a subject to submit to interruptions I will stop talking at all. I want my young friend from Indiana to consider that he may interrupt me just as many times as he wants to.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I am obliged to the Senator.

Mr. MONEY. I say the President of the United States is really carrying out the treaty which this Senate has failed—I used the mildest word possible—to ratify, and that he has no authority whatever to do it, and nobody, I will venture to say, can successfully contend that he has. It is not a question whether it is desirable that this thing shall be done. It is totally dissociated from that question, absolutely differentiated. That is another question, or, as Rudyard Kipling would say, "That is another story;" but I think I can get to that probably after a while, if I have time.

But the point I am coming to now is that we are in this condition, that the President of the United States is carrying out a treaty which has never been ratified. If he can do that in one instance, he can do it in another; if he can do it in another one, he can do it in five hundred, and the effect will be that he need not pay any attention whatever to the Senate in the matter of treaties.

In this matter the President is moved by motives of great humanity. He said a year or two ago, and I think he said it more recently, in the fullness of his goodness and kind intentions toward the smaller and weaker nations on this hemisphere, that if they would be good—that is, if they would be orderly and pay their debts and not revolutionize more than once or twice a year—"not loosing the bands of civilization," I think, was one of his choice expressions, which I admired very much at the time—we could be very helpful to them. I do not know what he meant by "we"—he and the Senate or he and the Congress of the United States of America or the American nation or simply Theodore Roosevelt—the imperial "we"—I do not know. But if they did not behave in that way, there was no telling what would happen.

My friend from Wisconsin [Mr. SPOONER], whose absence I must continue to deplore, happily got off in praise of the President about the treaty that was recently made by the great contending powers in Asia, that at the psychological moment the President said "Let there be peace," and there was peace. I suppose the President is carrying the psychological moment around with him in his vest pocket; and in any time of any little trouble he has always got that psychological moment.

I should like to know, digressing a little now, when that psychological moment came into the discussion. Here were two great nations at war. They had exhausted themselves; they had no resources; they were lying still, looking askance at one another on the plains of Manchuria. They had to have peace. There was no court in Europe at which Japan was willing to hold a conference, except Great Britain, and that one Russia would not have. There was not a court in Asia, because the only one there was dominated by Japan, and, therefore, Russia would not consider that. There was but one spot on the globe to come to, and that was the United States of America, "the land of the free and the home of the brave," where everybody is at home. The President treated them like a gentleman, and they enjoyed the hospitality of this country. They held their meetings here and a treaty of peace was negotiated because of their necessities, not on account of anybody's psychological moment. On the contrary, if we can believe the newspapers—and some people do not—it was stated that every proposition made by the President was flatly and absolutely rejected by the Czar—I am using the literal language now of the Czar as reported in a dispatch from St. Petersburg—and the Mikado, in politer manner, said he had already arranged the terms upon which the treaty would be made, politely intimating that no suggestions were wanted. I do not know when the psychological moment came. That was a business proposition; and every one of the propositions made by the President was absolutely and flatly rejected by one of the parties, and the other paid no attention to them.

Sometimes it is a good thing to give a man praise when he does not get much of it; and our President, I think, needs all he can get. He is not likely to be carried away, or his head made to swim, with adulation or anything of that sort. He can preserve his equanimity and his judgment notwithstanding. So I am willing for all that to go.

Now, Mr. President, I want somebody to show me how the President has authority to carry into effect a treaty that has never been ratified by the Senate; and the shuffler of the cards can not disguise plain facts. You may call it, as the President does, an agreement. You can call it, as the Senator from Wisconsin does, a maintenance of the status quo pending the conclusion of the negotiation for a treaty, or you can call it, as Colonel Colton says, a decree of Morales; but the effect is just exactly the same. The American peple to-day are being taxed to support a fleet there, a part of which, I understand, is to be withdrawn. I make no objection to the presence of the fleet, because it is afloat and it has got to cruise somewhere, and it may just as well cruise in American waters as in some other waters. I am going now outside of that question to take up the other one, with the indulgence of the Senate, and that is the utility of this business.

What is the history of this island republic? You recollect that in the delirium of intoxication into which the first draft of freedom threw the whole French people, when they not only desired liberty more than anybody else on earth, but had it, the French nation resolved itself into a vast propaganda, with the torch of liberty lighted at the foot of the guillotine, wet with the noblest blood of France, and sent it out to light the sacred fires of liberty in other countries. Then, in that spasm of generosity, they said to these people, or the French part of them:

> Take your island, full of magnificent harbors, with the best old Roman ways since Appius Claudius, with your fine mills and plantation houses, with your splendid docks and wharves, with your hills full of precious metals, with the finest woods in the world, the home of the sugar cane and rice—take it all, with your refined French civilization and the French language, the politest in the world.

So they gave it to them; but when the spasm was passed a man came to the head of affairs—Napoleon Bonaparte. He sent his General Leclerc to Santo Domingo to subdue the people there, who were not doing well. The first thing they had was a massacre of every white person on the island, men, women, and children, and next a massacre of the mulattoes.

Liberty meant license to those people. They fought the French, who, deciminated by fever, were withdrawn. The game was not worth the candle. Toussaint L'Ouverture, who was a humane and able colored man, the head of the revolutionary party, never has been held in respect by his own people, however, because he was not a "strong man;" he did not shoot everybody that was opposed to him, and therefore he was a weak man and never held in esteem, although he has been held in respect by the world.

Dessalines, the most atrocious monster recorded in history, who shot thousands of his political opponents, has the singular honor of having his birthday a national holiday, because he was a "strong man," who never hesitated at any crime.

Then the other part of the island joined the revolutionists. That part of the island was Spanish, but they were all freed together. They rose also; and that condition of things continued until 1840, when, after a series of little revolutions and uprisings, Santo Domingo achieved her independence from Haiti, and after running themselves along for twenty-one years, their President being overthrown, they voluntarily threw themselves back into the hands of Spain, feeling their helplessness, just as they manifest to-day their incapacity to take care of themselves. It reminds us of the frogs who prayed Jupiter for a king, and he gave them a log. They soon despised the inertness of King Log and prayed Jupiter for another king, and he sent them a stork, who devoured them.

The Spaniards grossly disregarded their agreement with the people, and in 1865 they again arose and the Spanish troops

were driven out. Again the game was not worth the candle. Since that time they have elected but one out of twenty-four Presidents, showing in every single act an absolute incapacity to conceive, to maintain, to operate, or to defend self-governing institutions, and a capacity to continue in debt.

This great debt was taken up by an improvement company, whose claim was investigated by my distinguished friend Judge Gray, formerly a member of this body, and John Bassett Moore, very strong authorities. I think there was an award made in favor of the improvement company, and I am reminded here that New Jersey granted a charter to the railroad company that was an allied concern, associated in interest.

These people have shown this incapacity all the time, and these expenses have been incurred to pay off the revolutionists. It has been to revolutions that the revenue has been applied. You issue your pronounciamento, collect your regiment of ragamuffins, let them go where they will be "well peppered," as Falstaff said at the Shrewsbury fight, seize the custom-houses, and what is the result? You are the de factos. You seize everything and you pay off the troops. If you can not pay the revolutionists, how can you have a revolution? They take a material point of view of these movements down there. Even if we thought it worth while to interfere with such paltry concerns as that, it is none of our business. It is foreign to any power granted to any branch of this great Government, when the people gave it to us in convention, that we should go off and meddle in affairs of that sort that concern us not one particle in the world.

Suppose we set them on their feet, paid their debts, put everything in liquidation, and a wholesome revenue law was enacted and being operated all the time, do you think that it would be six months, after a thousand dollars got in the treasury, before there would be a revolution to get it? Those people can not govern themselves. Why expect impossibilities of anybody? The history of that race all over the globe has shown that they are absolutely incapable of self-government. There is not a man, I think, on the other side of the Chamber or a man on this side who does not recognize that; there is not a man anywhere who does not know it; and why should we shut our eyes to the facts because of any local political consideration?

Take the history of the race. Africa, according to the testimony of the rocks, is said by geologists to be the oldest continent, and they may be presumed to be among the oldest of the races of mankind. They have never risen to the dignity of a legislative council or a judiciary tribunal. They know no authority but that of the strong arm and the heavy club. These people would certainly relapse; and relapse means that this temporary occupation would become permanent occupation, permanent control, permanent management.

I was delighted to hear my learned friend, a great Senator and a great historian combined, Mr. LODGE, say yesterday that he never would agree to annexation. I suppose he made that remark, in the first place, because he honestly meant it, and I believe he does honestly mean it; and, in the second place, because there has been so much asserted in the newspapers that that would be the result, that with occupation was meant at last annexation, not with the full privilege of citizenship, but annexation after the Filipino fashion, a people whom this body has solemnly declared shall never become citizens of the United States and that their territory shall never be a part of the territory of the United States—a very whimsical sort of a declaration for the Senate of the United States, but it is yet unrepealed. True, it is an expression of opinion, but what an opinion! We do not want them under such terms as that, nor do we want them at all. The trouble with us is, we are overloaded. We do not want any more islands; we do not want any more inferior people; we want to shake off the shackles that bind us in the race for independent government.

I tell you, Senators, there is not a body of white men on top of this globe that can successfully maintain self-government with its body politic and its power of self-government weakened by the infusion of so much incompetency and incapacity for government as there is in this country, unless some measure is carried through Congress to relieve us to a great extent. We do not want any more, and if to-day the United States would relinquish her hold upon every island in the sea, she would come out of it immeasurably stronger than she is to-day, and she would relieve herself of a thousand annoyances, a thousand cares, and a thousand dangers, and would become so immeasurably strong that she would be too invulnerable to invite attack by any combination of nations on the face of this globe. But the time has come for colonization and conquest, for the extension and amplification of power. Just ten years ago this month I had the honor to speak for ten minutes before the legislature of the State of Mississippi, and I recollect distinctly that I made the statement that we were now about to totally change the nature of our foreign relations; that instead of staying at home and attending to our own affairs, as we had been advised to do by Washington, we were about to go abroad and attend to the affairs of other people, and that we were about to become a colonizing and conquering people. I am not a prophet, but there is something in the trend of events and in the changes of temperament of the people, modified and qualified by successes and vicissitudes and everthing of that sort, that I thought I saw it clear enough; and it was clear enough as it happened.

I say if this continues we will reach a condition after a while when we will sink by our own weight unless we discard this form of government. We have got a right to do that. There is nothing in the world to keep us from discarding this bunglesome sort of government. Our friend from Wisconsin said we were neither a hermit nor a baby nation. I do not know that anybody has ever said that we are; but the intimation, I think, was that we were getting too big for the clothes of the Constitution; and I have heard it very frequently said—I have heard it in this body, and I heard it said the other day by the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin—that we had inherent rights as a government. I deny any such thing as that. That is a rank heresy in this Republic. There are no inherent rights in anybody; there are nothing but delegated rights, and yet we are as great as any nation. Of course we are as a nation; as a government, no. Is the Government a good one? We think it the best in the world; but the testimony of civilization is that it is a bad Government. Why? Not because its theory is too bad, but because it is too good for practical use. The best evidence that they think it bad is that nobody imitates it; there is nobody like us or likely to be. I say we can change it whenever we get tired of it, and we are getting tired of it. There is no use ignoring the dangers; there is no use in talking platitudes. I am going to stand by the delegated authority conferred upon the three branches of the Government by the Constitution until that Constitution has expired by substitution of another. The American people are great. They have got all the inherent powers that belong to any nation in the world. Of course all nations have. It is not a question; it is not a matter of hearsay. It is something we know.

The Government of the United States is not the American nation. It is simply a form of government which the American nation has instituted here for their own self-government; and while this nation has all the power that can be exercised by any other nation, the Government has not that power. Whenever the American people get tired of this government by the Constitution, they will get rid of it. The shortest way is by three-fourths of the States agreeing to call a convention. When they meet, the first law to pass will be that "the present form of government is hereby abrogated." That settles the whole matter. Then you can set up a king here; you can set up an oligarchy, a money oligarchy, but not an aristocracy, for we have not got the material for that; but you can set up an oligarchy; you can put up a Council of Ten after the fashion of Venice; you can have a limited or an absolute monarchy; you can have whatever form of government the people want. Every people in the world have exactly that government which they ought to have. Governments are what the people make them. I do not care how bad they may be, governments are what the people make them. If you want to get a good government, you have to get good people who can appreciate the blessings of freedom.

We are not trying this for the first time. This thing has been fought over from the remotest annals of human history. People more public-spirited than we are, more devoted to their country, and more full of patriotism, and not so selfish—although it is true they were selfish as we are in fact—have tried it.

Senators, when I consider the history of the human race and see the successive rise and fall of peoples and nations and governments, I think at last that we are running in a vast cycle, in which the same things are constantly recurring under different names and in different places perhaps. It is simply history repeating itself all the time. We think we are in a time now of great commercial sordidness, avarice, greed, and all that sort of thing, and the country resounds with declamations and invectives and objurgations against the spirit of greed and plunder, which, if continued, will undermine our free institutions. That has been going on ever since there was a government. Bribing, stuffing of ballot-boxes, money for everything.

I can recall, and I suppose many others here can, one of those admirable comedies of Aristophanes, written four hundred and fifty years before the birth of Christ, when Bacchus was going down to hell to get a poet, all of the good ones being dead and

none living except a lot of scribblers in whom he had no confidence. The good ones were all in hell. He went to the house of Hercules and inquired the way. He was told, "You proceed on this road to a lake, vast and bottomless, and there you will find an old fellow, Charon, who has a boat and will ferry you across, but he will charge you two oboli." Bacchus said: "Two oboli! Then they will not let you go to hell unless you pay the fare!" [Laughter.] "Well," he said, "that is rather astonishing. By the way, I have been going around on the earth trying to find a poet. I notice that everywhere you go you have to have the oboli. You can not get on without them. Nobody will do anything for you without them. Who in the deuce introduced this thing?" "A man named Theseus."

Xanthus, who was carrying the luggage of Bacchus, said: "I can go no farther; being alive, I will not be allowed in the boat. Get some of these dead men, who are going by all the time and are bound to go to hell, to carry your luggage." Four men came along with a dead man on a litter. Bacchus halted them and said: "Say, there, you dead man, I want you to carry some light luggage to hell for me. Will you do it?"

He says "I will charge you 2 drachmas." Bacchus replied, "That is excessive; it is entirely too much. I will give you 9 oboli." The dead man said: "Go on with the litter." He would not consider it. That sort of thing happened twenty-four hundred years ago. So we need not be particularly scared here. [Laughter.]

I recollect another one of those admirable comedies, one in which the poet declaimed very much against the avarice and greed of the Athenians, and declared that it amounted to impiety against the gods. And, contrary to the law, he was allowed to have the play produced twice for its good effect on the people. We are up and down all the time, and I have about concluded that, as bad as we are, we are as good as anybody else. It is not necessary for us to flatter ourselves that we are any better, because, Senators, the time is coming when we shall have to take our descent, too. There is the rise and fall of the Roman Empire, and of all other empires, and, according to Silas Wegg in Boffin's Bower, there is also the "Rising up and falling off of the Rooshian Empire."

Getting back to the little island of Santo Domingo, if we are to take charge of it of course that means indefinite extension. The effect of its propinquity to us, 80 or 90 miles, while it is from a remote island a thousand or two miles distant, does not seem to me to amount to anything, because we can string a cordon of islands that would encircle the globe and carry our flag all over the earth.

The permanent occupation of the island is really meant. The question is, Do you want permanent occupation of any of these islands or republics? There are not many. There are two black republics on one island. When you get on farther there is France, with Martinique and Guadaloupe, with only 1½ per cent of white people. They claimed 3 per cent, according to the census of 1888, but the American consul tells me it is only 1½ per cent. Take the Danish group, 32,000 population, 2,000 white, and singularly enough, the English language. It is black. So with the Virgin Islands—5,000 black, 500 white people. Jamaica has 756,000 negroes, according to the census of 1888, and only 13,000 white people, and more than half of the white people have left since the withdrawal of the troops from the cantonment on the Blue Mountains. Barbados is the most thickly settled part of the earth and has no white population. The same condition prevails there. They have renounced in Jamaica their responsible government, as the English call it—the autonomous government, as we would call it—because of the necessity of the negro voting and the disorder that ensued. Then there are San Lucia and Grenada, of the Windward group, and they are practically all in the same condition.

When we get to the mainland, I wish to ask if there is any Senator here who is willing to take charge of Venezuela? That is a case in point. It has one white person to 21 inhabitants, and it has had eighty-two revolutions in eighty-four years. The present President is part Spanish, part Indian, and part negro. There are not any fairer constitutions and laws on this earth than are found in all the criminal and civil codes of the Spanish-American States. There are no better written ones here. The trouble is that nobody pays any attention to them there. Theirs is a personal government; somebody has said "a personal despotism tempered by assassination."

If we settle the debts of Santo Domingo and take care of their well-being, to use the kindly language of our Executive, to be helpful to them, we will find ourselves with our hands full attending to the business of other people and nothing left for the American people. I do not believe the American people have conferred any power upon the President of the United States to interfere in settling the debts of other people and maintaining order in other countries.

Not only that, but the President is to guarantee to maintain their territorial integrity. That is a pretty strong guaranty. That means that he will call out the whole Navy if necessary. There was a great deal of fear manifested some time ago that an Italian war ship might seize a custom-house in Santo Domingo. They would not have found much in it. I think Colonel Colton is getting about all the money going now. Could we have offered any reason against the Italians seizing a port to enforce a debt? We sat very quiet a good many years ago and saw Great Britain take possession of Vera Cruz. We saw them make a hard bargain with Mexico, and compel Mexico to surrender all the customs receipts at Vera Cruz to pay the interest on the $50,000,000 gold debt; and about all the imports into Mexico were through Vera Cruz. Tampico was not much. Mazatlan, Acapulco, and San Blas had declined since the Philippines had ceased to be an appendage of the viceroyalty of Mexico.

We have submitted—I will not say submitted to it, but I will say that we have permitted it—because we certainly could stop it if we wished to, but we have permitted it from a sense of right, because in the main when we run along and stagger and fall down and get up again the American people do about what is right. They are trying to do what is right. The only question is whether we agree with them or not; whether the opinion of a great many is better than the opinion of any one man.

In a multitude of counsel there is safety. But at any rate it is taken as a presumption granted that every man is to do his duty as laid down for him by the Constitution and laws of this country, and therefore we do not want to impugn the motives of anybody.

We do not want to say—I do not want to say, and I will not say—that the President simply wishes to extend the influence of the United States, to mark and signalize his Administration as a brilliant one in history. I think the President a man full of restless physical energy and industry, and, I will say, intellectually also restless and ambitious and very anxious to do something and to be continually impressing himself upon current events, and he may do that through a very laudable ambition, with no desire to set aside the Constitution. But the question is for us to determine whether he is doing it or not. As I said a while ago, the way to hell is paved with good intentions, and the last man to judge the intention is the man himself. He will see it if he is wrong, giving him credit for the proper motive always.

I will not discuss the treaty here, but, in my opinion, the Senate has lost very directly and substantively a part of its authority when it permits—I will use that word—without a protest the President to carry into effect a treaty which never has been here ratified, and no euphemism in the English language can conceal the fact that that is being done.

Whether it is desirable on the part of the American interests there that it should be done is also a question among them. I have had communications from a man who is the largest American owner in the island, and he thinks the treaty would not be best for reasons which he sets forth at great length. He is an intelligent man. He evidently understands what his own business is. He has the largest estate there, and if you permit him to say so there will not be any treaty. But we can not permit a man who has transferred his property to a foreign country to come in and act as a makeweight in deciding the policy of this country toward another, even if the President should consider it very "helpful."

I do not believe any amount of help will make these people stand on their feet. I do not believe there is a country under heaven that would consent to receive that island, or any part of it, as an appendage, a dependency, or an integral part. If you could suddenly remove the inhabitants, you would have perhaps the most beautiful and the most fertile island in the world, with greater capacity probably than any other, but you can not kill off the people; you can not transport the people. If in a republic there could be such a punishment as banishment inflicted upon people, without giving them a day in court, it would be an act of the highest consideration and the highest importance to the future of this Republic to transport every colored man in the United States to some congenial climate and provide him for a year or two with subsistence; I mean looking in the long run at the future of this great Republic, with its enormous possibilities and capacities. I am looking at it from a cold-blooded standpoint, stripping myself of all sentiment in the matter. There is no sum that can be calculated and no number of ships that can be built for which I would not be willing to

vote in order to carry those people where they could be happy and contented and could prosper.

I wish to say further that I would not infringe upon the rights of a single solitary one of them here or elsewhere, in this country or anywhere else. I would not try to suppress and put down a ruler, whether in a republic or a monarchy, because he was black or brown or red or yellow. I would give freedom to every country having the territorial area and a population sufficiently large in number and sufficiently homogeneous. I believe those are the definitions that Mr. Webster laid down in connection with the revolt of the Hungarians. When he sent Mr. Mann to investigate the extent of the Magyar strength, the Austrian minister, Baron Hulsemann, resented the inquiry, which indicated a disposition to acknowledge belligerent rights in the Hungarians. Mr. Webster said, with great emphasis, that whenever any country anywhere has territory sufficient, people enough, and a people sufficiently homogeneous in their interest, the United States will not turn a deaf ear to their appeal for moral support. I feel those words of Daniel Webster tingling in every drop of blood in my veins; and I do not care whether the people are under the control of this country or any other.

I say, moreover, that a man who loves liberty for himself and denies it to other people has not the faintest conception of what the principle of liberty is. He only values it as a personal convenience to himself, and he does not know the great abstract principle that governs human life.

Now, Senators, I have no desire to continue this inconsequential talk that I have made here, I must say without any preparation whatever, but simply have made because of speeches which I heard delivered yesterday. I have heard only two or three, but they seem to be so wide from the mark that I felt called upon to submit some views of my own upon this question, I hope with some effect. I am not one of those people so modest as to believe that they can never give any sort of enlightenment to anybody in the world, because I think it would be very presumptuous for a Senator to rise in his place and occupy the time of the Senate if he did not think that what he said would interest, if it did not instruct very much. I will not call names, but one of my friends entirely deprecated his own ability, and of course it looked very modest of him with a deferential hand to wave aside these compliments. I suppose he has heard somewhere that modesty does much become a woman. At any rate, I am not one of that class. I want to thank the Senate for its attention, and I wish to say when the question comes up in secret session I will speak further.

Right here I wish to make one remark, and I shall be through. The question was asked by my distinguished friend the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILLMAN] yesterday, of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], I think, whether or not we could not have the discussion of the treaty with open doors; that it was a matter of vast public interest, and that the time for secrecy in the discussion of our foreign affairs had passed away; that the people were losing confidence in the Senate. I am against any open-door consideration of any treaty. It does not make any difference to me about the curiosity of people. They have delegated their authority to the Senate, and they await the issue. They are not in a hurry to know what the Senate is going to do. Therefore I do not subscribe to the habit of allowing myself to be quoted in the newspapers as to how I shall vote on measures. Let time develop it. There is no use of polling votes in advance of the time. If a motion is made to open the doors, I shall vote against it. There may be nothing in this treaty which demands secrecy, but once you establish the open door you will never shut it again. In fact, I think the experience of over one hundred years has about demonstrated the fact that the Senate proceeds, as a general thing, in the best possible way to do its business, and I am for adhering to old customs and all old manners.

Mr. HEYBURN. Mr. President, it seems to me—and I am impelled to say it by remarks made by the Senator who has just taken his seat [Mr. MONEY] in regard to the question whether this is a consideration of the people of this island or of the territory—it seems to me that this is purely a business proposition which presents itself, and it relates to the territory of the island of Santo Domingo and not the people. Whatever I may say or however I may vote in regard to this matter, at any rate it will be from that standpoint and not from the standpoint of a few thousand or a few hundred thousand people who may happen to occupy this island. If the Senate thirty-five years ago had performed what now appears to have been its plain duty, this question would not be before the Senate. There was an opportunity, when there were about a hundred and sixty thousand people upon this island, to make them a part of the geographical area of the United States.

The reasons given them are as apt to-day as when they were given. The handful of natives who occupy that island would be, if I may use the term, farmed out in one generation, just as we farmed out a corresponding element on the Pacific coast when we took it. They would be lost in the predomination of the white race and white interests. They would be Americanized. I am not in favor of the acquisition of more islands or additional territory for the purpose of maintaining the status of the territory as we find it. I am not in favor of holding the Philippine Islands in order to maintain the Philippine characteristics. I am not in favor of retaining the island of Porto Rico for the purpose of maintaining a civilization upon the status in which we found it. The only justification on earth for the addition of territory to this country is that we may bring it within the influence of our own civilization and that we may transform it from the character in which we found it to the character which we recognize as being the foundation of our own country.

The island of Santo Domingo is without population as I understand it. The whole question that has been under consideration for days would be settled by the annexation of this island to our country by treaty, not for the purpose of gaining agricultural facilities or possibilities, not for the purpose of adding these people to our population, but for the purpose of establishing there in the mouth of the canal a picket post which would give us at least equal advantages with the other nations of the earth should difficulty arise in regard to possession of the canal. Every other island in the Caribbean Sea is owned or controlled by a foreign nation that may in any hour be a hostile nation. This is the only remaining island which is free to deal with itself and its own affairs. It is the last on the counter in the markets of the world, and at this time it is free to make a treaty that shall bring its soil under our dominion, subject to our necessities or our conveniences. But if we are to stand off and draw fine lines as to what we may do or what we should do out of consideration for the people of that island, in an hour when we least expect it we will find complications arising through foreign interference and influence which will make it impossible for us to acquire that soil upon which to make our coaling stations, upon which to establish our picket posts in front of our great possession on which we are about to expend hundreds of millions of dollars. I say we will find it closed to us.

I am free to say that when this matter was up for consideration only a few months ago I had a letter from a prominent man in that island, who told me it was within his knowledge that there was at that time an attempt being made to enter into an arrangement with one of the most powerful governments of Europe with a view to doing just what we did—acting as the financial agent to collect the revenues of the ports of the country and to give them a foothold. Great nations of the earth, when they once have a foothold, keep it. It is true that the instance of our possession of Cuba is cited as an exception, but we kept our influence there, and our influence in Cuba is as potent to-day as though it were a part of the domain of the United States, because we have the right to control the Cubans in their foreign relations. That is what counts among the nations of the earth. It is seldom that interference in the domestic affairs of a dependency amounts to anything. The controlling nation, as a rule, is very glad to have them take these local arrangements off its hands, but what it is persistent in maintaining is the control of that nation in its dealings with other nations.

There is a cordon of islands in the West Indies which, with the exception of Cuba and Santo Domingo, are owned by the great nations of the world. England and France and Denmark and the combination of European nations own a continuous line of islands, through which there are two openings of over 90 miles in width almost within the reach of a cannon shot. Every vessel that sails from an Atlantic port to the Panama Canal passes the islands of Santo Domingo and Cuba. Cuba is friendly to-day under our control; free in time of war to make alliance with foreign nations; and this little island in the market for any nation to buy or control.

The solution of this question, one that would avoid the necessity of considering the question how far we can go in protecting it, is for this body, in its capacity under the constitutional privilege of advising the President, to advise that a treaty of annexation be made. There are less than 1,000,000 on the island. It is capable of sustaining more than 8,000,000 people, according to the recognized basis on which such estimates are made.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. HEYBURN. Certainly.

Mr. TILLMAN. I have examined this matter, and there are nearer 2,000,000 than 1,000,000. The Senator is clear off on that.

Mr. HEYBURN. The Yearbook gives a population of 510,000 for Santo Domingo, and in my judgment the population of Haiti is just about the same.

Mr. TILLMAN. It has always been recognized by every geography that I have seen that there are twice as many in Haiti as in Santo Domingo.

Mr. HEYBURN. The population is necessarily merely a matter of estimate. I know men who are in the island, and I have attempted to ascertain as nearly as possible what the population of those two republics is, and I feel justified in saying, from such information as I have obtained, that the population has been largely overestimated in the Yearbook, and that there are less than a million people in the two republics, while the island is capable of sustaining a population, upon a liberal basis, of more than 8,000,000 people.

The United States have never undertaken a contract with civilization that we have not made good, and it would be a sorry admission if we could not civilize an island situated as is the island of Santo Domingo. We would civilize it by replacement, by substitution of American institutions and American citizenship for those of the natives. Will any Senator admit that our people are not capable of dominating a handful of natives who have never shown any capacity for self-government, who have had 18 revolutions in twenty-five years; a country where out of 18 presidents 16 were overthrown by revolution; in whose history but five men have ever lived to serve out their terms as president; a nation utterly incapable of protecting itself in the financial dealings of the world, that had to reach out to us or to some other nation for help in order to protect itself against the sheriff's hammer?

So, I say, at this time it seems particularly appropriate that we should take up for consideration the resolution now resting with the Committee on Foreign Relations, which provides that the Senate shall advise the President of the United States to open negotiations for acquiring this island as a part of our own country, and then to deal with it as we would deal with any other frontier—use it for the purpose of protecting this great investment, not only an investment in money, but an investment that shall be so potential in the event of foreign war on the part of this country, that without it it might mean, not defeat, but difficult victory.

Mr. TILLMAN. The Senator evidently is in earnest, and I would suggest that as we have the President, the only President of Santo Domingo of which we know anything, already in our keeping, it would be a very easy matter to make a negotiation with him, representing the Government of Santo Domingo, for this one or two millions of population, whichever it may be. If the Senator's colleagues on the other side have not enough colored people in the Philippines and in the South and are gluttonous, I think he had better put the matter to a vote and let us see.

Mr. HEYBURN. What I am asking is not for the colored people of Santo Domingo, but I am asking that the white people who may become citizens of Santo Domingo be given the opportunity and protection that would naturally come with the acquisition of that country. I want to substitute the white race there for the natives who are there now. Does the Senator object to that?

Mr. TILLMAN. Not at all, but I should like the Senator to be a little consistent in dealing with the colored people and not be so kind to those near by and so cruel to those abroad.

Mr. HEYBURN. I do not know to what act or word of mine the Senator refers in drawing that comparison. I will deal with each of those questions, so far as I am concerned, as they arise; but for the present it is sufficient to consider the question as it pertains to the island of Santo Domingo and the inhabitants there. They are a rebellious and incompetent people, and it would be a slander upon the American people to say that an equal number, or a much less proportion, of Americans could not overcome them in their habits of life and the grasp they have upon the affairs of the country, and that it would not be merely a question of a gradual displacement and substitution. It is a fair land. I might speak from a selfish standpoint and talk of its resources, of the possibilities of its commerce and its agriculture, of its mines and its forests. I am speaking solely and simply from the standpoint of national defense, from the necessities of to-day and to-morrow, and I say that this country should possess that territory without regard to whether there is a man, white or black, upon it. That is the position. I say the substitution of that view will eliminate these questions of detail as to whether or not the President had the power, as to whether or not he exceeded his power, as to whether or not he should have done this or should not have done that. All those questions would be settled by a single stroke of the pen that seals the bargain and makes that island a part of the United States geographically.

Mr. TILLMAN. Who is going to sign for the other people, though?

Mr. HEYBURN. The Government of that island. We have a treaty with Hayti. We had until 1898 a treaty with the Republic of Santo Domingo.

Mr. TILLMAN. Are you going to let some little President who happens at the time to be in power sign for them and then go on and seal it?

Mr. HEYBURN. Under the law of nations that binds them just as surely, and if it does not we have a way of making them keep their contract and observe their treaty. There is no difficulty about finding contracting parties. There is one here, and we will find one there. We will determine the question as to the power of the party that assumes to contract for the people of Santo Domingo.

I merely desired, Mr. President, as this question of Santo Domingo was before the Senate, to express these views. I do not desire to discuss the bill that is already in committee and under consideration there, but I felt that it was opportune at this time to make these suggestions.

MISSIONARY BAPTIST CHURCH, OF ROCK SINK, FLA.

Mr. TALIAFERRO. I ask unanimous consent for the consideration of the bill (S. 1725) granting certain land to the Missionary Baptist Church, of Rock Sink, Fla.

The Secretary read the bill, and there being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration. The bill was reported from the Committee on Public Lands with amendments, in line 5, before the word "Florida," to insert "Rock Sink;" in the same line, after the word "Florida," to insert "and their successors," and in line 9, after the word "east," to insert "and when no longer used for said purposes the same shall revert to the United States;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to convey to the trustees of the Rock Sink Missionary Baptist Church, of Rock Sink, Fla., and their successors, in trust, the following-described land for use for school, church, and cemetery purposes: The south half of lot 11, section 13, township 8 south, of range 13 east; and when no longer used for said purposes the same shall revert to the United States.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

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

POST-OFFICE BUILDING AT ELIZABETH, N. J.

Mr. KEAN. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 846) to increase the limit of cost of the United States post-office at Elizabeth, N. J.

The Secretary read the bill; and there being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration. It proposes to increase the limit of cost of the United States post-office at Elizabeth, N. J., from $200,000 to $250,000, and allows the Secretary of the Treasury to use the sum of $150,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, for the purchase of a suitable site upon which to erect the building.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

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 a bill (H. R. 12707) to enable the people of Oklahoma and of the Indian Territory to form a constitution and State government and be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States; and to enable the people of New Mexico and of Arizona to form a constitution and State government and be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States; in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate.

REORGANIZATION OF THE CONSULAR SERVICE.

Mr. LODGE. I ask the Senate to take up Senate bill 1345, the consular bill. I should like to have it read and the committee amendments agreed to. It is the unanimous report from the committee. I do not expect to discuss it this afternoon, but I should like to have the bill read and the amendments disposed of.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will be read for the information of the Senate.

The Secretary read the bill (S. 1345) to provide for the re-

organization of the consular service of the United States; and there being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations with amendments.

The first amendment was, in section 1, page 1, line 4, after the word "act," to strike out "and under such rules and regulations not inconsistent herewith as shall be prescribed by the President;" so as to make the section read:

That the consular system of the United States be reorganized in the manner hereinafter provided in this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 1, after line 6, to strike out section 2, in the following words:

SEC. 2. That there shall be not more than two consuls-general of the first class, at $12,000 each per annum; not more than seven consuls-general of the second class, at $8,000 each per annum; not more than nine consuls-general of the third class, at $6,000 each per annum; not more than eleven of the fourth class, at $5,500 each per annum; not more than fourteen of the fifth class, at $4,500 each per annum; and not more than seven of the sixth class, at $3,500 each per annum. That there shall be not more than ten consuls of the first class, at $5,000 each per annum; not more than thirteen consuls of the second class, at $4,500 each per annum; not more than twenty-two consuls of the third class, at $4,000 each per annum: not more than thirty-two consuls of the fourth class, at $3,500 each per annum; not more than forty-five consuls of the fifth class, at $3,000 each per annum; not more than fifty-eight consuls of the sixth class, at $2,500 each per annum; and not more than ninety-two consuls of the seventh class, at $2,000 each per annum.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, after line 16, to insert the following as a new section:

SEC. 2. That the consuls-general and the consuls of the United States shall hereafter be classified and graded as hereinafter specified, with the salaries of each class herein affixed thereto.

CONSULS-GENERAL.

Class 1, $12,000.—London, Paris.

Class 2, $8,000.—Berlin, Habana, Hongkong, Hamburg, Rio de Janeiro, Shanghai.

Class 3, $6,000.—Calcutta, Cape Town, Constantinople, Mexico City, Montreal, Ottawa, Vienna, Yokohama.

Class 4, $5,500.—Barcelona, Brussels, Canton, Frankfort, Melbourne, Panama, St. Petersburg, Seoul, Tientsin.

Class 5, $4,500.—Auckland, Beirut, Buenos Ayres, Callao, Chefoo, Guayaquil, Halifax, Hankau, Mukden, Niuchwang, Rome, Rotterdam, St. Gaul, Singapore.

Class 6, $3,500.—Bogota, Budapest, Guatemala, San Salvador, Stockholm, Teheran, Tangier, Lisbon.

Class 7, $3,000.—Christiania, Copenhagen, Athens.

CONSULS.

Class 1, $8,000.—Liverpool.

Class 2, $6,000.—Manchester.

Class 3, $5,500.—Antwerp, Marseilles.

Class 4, $5,000.—Bremen, Dawson, Belfast, Havre, Kobe, Lourenço, Marquez, Lyon, Pretoria.

Class 5, $4,500.—Amoy, Amsterdam, Birmingham, Cienfuegos, Coburg, Fuchau, Glasgow, Kingston (Jamaica), Nottingham, Santiago, Southampton, Veracruz, Valparaiso.

Class 6, $4,000.—Antung, Bahia, Bombay, Bordeaux, Dresden, Colon, Dublin, Dundee, Hangchow, Leipzig, Munich, Nanking, Naples, Nuremberg, Para, Pernambuco, Plauen, Santos, Stuttgart, Toronto, Vancouver, Victoria.

Class 7, $3,500.—Apia, Barmen, Barranquilla, Basel, Berne, Bradford, Chemnitz, Chungking, Cologne, Dalny, Edinburgh, Geneva, Genoa, Georgetown, Lucerne, Mannheim, Monterey, Montevideo, Nagasaki, Odessa, Palermo, Prague, Quebec, Reichenberg, Rimouski, San Juan del Norte, Smyrna, Tamsui, Vladivostok, Winnipeg, Zurich.

Class 8, $3,000.—Aix la Chapelle, Annaberg, Barbados, Batavia, Batum, Burslem, Calais, Carlsbad, Colombo, Dunfermline, Florence, Freiburg, Ghent, Hamilton (Ontario), Hanover, Harput, Huddersfield, Jerusalem, Kehl, La Guaira, Leghorn, Liege, Mainz, Managua, Nantes, Nassau, Newcastle (New South Wales), Newcastle (England), Port Antonio, Port au Prince, St. John (New Brunswick), St. Michaels, St. Thomas (West Indies), San Jose, Sheffield, Swansea, Sydney (Nova Scotia), Sydney (New South Wales), Tampico, Three Rivers (Quebec), Trieste, Trinidad.

Class 9, $2,500.—Acapulco, Aden, Algiers, Alexandretta, Bamberg, Belize, Bergen, Breslau, Brunswick, Cardiff, Chihuahua, Ciudad Juarez, Ciudad Porfirio Diaz, Collingwood, Cork, Crefeld, Curaçao, Dusseldorf, Eibenstock, Gothenburg, Hamilton (Bermuda), Hull, Jerez de la Frontera, La Rochelle, Leeds, Magdeburg, Malaga, Malta, Maracaibo, Martinique, Mazatlan, Milan, Moscow, Nice, Nogales, Nuevo Laredo, Orillia, Plymouth, Port Limon, Puerto Cortez, Rheims, Rosario, Roubaix, St. Johns (Newfoundland), St. Etienne, Sault Ste. Marie, Seville, Sherbrooke, Stettin, Tamatave, Tegucigalpa, Teneriffe, Trebizond, Valencia, Weimar, Yarmouth, Zanzibar, Zittau.

Class 10, $2,000.—Aguascalientes, Amherstburg, Antigua, Asuncion, Bagdad, Belleville, Belgrade, Bristol, Brockville, Campbellton, Cape Gracias, Cape Haitien, Cartagena, Castellamare di Stabia, Catania, Ceiba, Charlottetown, Chatham, Coaticook, Colonia, Cornwall, Durango, Ensenada, Fort Erie, Funchal, Gaspe, Gibraltar, Glauchau, Goderich, Goree-Dakar, Grenville, Grenoble, Guadeloupe, Guelph, Hermosillo, Hobart, Iquique, Jalapa, Jamestown, Kingston (Ontario), La Paz, Limoges, London (Ontario), Madrid, Manzanillo, Maskat, Matamoros, Messina, Moncton, Niagara Falls, Patras, Peterborough, Port Hope, Port Louis, Port Rowan, Port Stanley, Prescott, Progreso, Puerto Cabello, Puerto Plata, Riga, Rouen, Saigon, St. Christopher, St. Hyacinthe, St. Johns (Quebec), St. Pierre, St. Stephen, St. Thomas (Ontario), Saltillo, Sarnia, Sierra Leone, Sivas, Stanbridge, Stavanger, Stratford (Ontario), Suva, Tahiti, Turin, Turks Island, Tuxpam, Utilla, Venice, Wallaceburg, Warsaw, Windsor (Ontario), Windsor (Nova Scotia), Woodstock.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 3, page 6, line 10, after the word "consuls," to strike out "of the sixth and seventh classes, provided for in the third section of this act;" in line 15, after the word "consuls," to strike out "and shall be eligible for promotion equally with other consuls of the sixth and seventh classes;" and in line 18, after the word "heretofore," to strike out "commercial agents shall be brought into the classification of the service under this act, and the grade shall thereafter cease," and insert "the grade of commercial agent is abolished;" so as to make the section read:

SEC. 3. That the offices of vice-consuls-general, deputy consuls-general, vice-consuls, deputy consuls, and commercial agents shall be filled by appointment, as heretofore, except that whenever, in his judgment, the good of the service requires it, consuls may be designated by the President without thereby changing their classification to act as vice-consuls-general, deputy consuls-general, vice-consuls, and deputy consuls; and when so acting they shall not be deemed to have vacated their offices as consuls. Consular agents may be appointed, when necessary, as heretofore. The grade of commercial agent is abolished.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I should like to ask the Senator from Massachusetts whether the list of consuls-general in the bill is taken from the present law?

Mr. LODGE. It is, Mr. President. It is taken exactly from the present law. I will say to the Senator that I had no intention of going further with the bill this afternoon than to have the amendments adopted. Then it will be perfectly easy, if the Senator should desire to make any change in the list, to do so.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I simply inquire for information. I understand the present law places the consulship at Monterey, Mexico, as a consul-generalship of northern Mexico. That has been my understanding of it.

Mr. LODGE. The official report of the State Department describes it as a consulate.

Mr. DOLLIVER. It certainly has consular jurisdiction over a great territory there beyond the borders of Monterey.

Mr. LODGE. If it is a consul-generalship and the report of the State Department is incorrect, it is a very easy matter to restore it.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I simply wanted to make the inquiry.

Mr. LODGE. I do not propose to go on with the bill this afternoon. I merely wish to get the committee amendments adopted and the bill reprinted so it will be convenient for the Senate in the future. I do not think there will be very much opposition to the bill. It is a unanimous report from the committee.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee to section 3.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, after line 21, to strike out section 4, in the following words:

SEC. 4. That within one year after the date of the passage of this act the President shall classify the consulates-general and the consulates in accordance with the provisions of section 3, and after such classification shall have been made the classification of any consulate-general or consulate may be changed, or a new consulate-general or consulate created and placed in any class, the complement of which is not filled, by Executive order of the President.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 7, after line 4, to strike out section 5, in the following words:

SEC. 5. That immediately after the classification required by the foregoing section shall have been made the incumbents of the consulates-general, consulates, and commercial agencies who are included in the provisions of this act then holding office shall be assigned by the President to the various classes as nearly as possible in accord with the duties, conditions, and compensation of the offices they held when said classification was made.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 7, after line 20, to strike out section 7, in the following words:

SEC. 7. That the Secretary of State, or such officer in the Department of State as the President shall designate, the chief of the Consular Bureau, and the chief examiner of the Civil Service Commission or some person whom said Commission shall designate, shall constitute a board of examiners for admission to the consular service.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 8, after line 2, to strike out section 8, in the following words:

SEC. 8. That it shall be the duty of said board to formulate rules for and hold examinations of applicants for admission to the consular service; and whenever a vacancy shall occur in the sixth or seventh class of consuls which the President deems it expedient to fill, the Secretary of State shall require the said board to examine such applicants as shall be designated therefor by the President. The board shall as soon thereafter as possible hold such examination and certify to the Secretary of State the names of the applicants who have passed the examination. No one shall be examined who is under 21 or over 40 years of age, or who is not a citizen of the United States. The scope and method of the examination shall be determined by the board, but among the subjects shall be included at least one modern language other than English, and the commercial resources and business of the United States, especially with reference to the possibilities of increasing and extending the trade of the United States with foreign countries. In certifying to the Secretary of State the list of those eligible for appointment, the board of examiners shall accompany the certificate with a detailed report showing the qualifications, as revealed by the examination, of each person so certified.

When it is designed by the President to assign a consul who is to be

appointed to a consulate in a country where the United States has extraterritorial jurisdiction, the Secretary of State shall so inform the board of examiners, who shall include in the list of names certified by it in accordance with the following provisions of this section only such persons as have passed the examination provided for in the foregoing paragraphs of this section, and who also have passed an examination in the fundamental principles of the common law, the rules of evidence, and the trial of civil and criminal cases.

The list of names which the board of examiners shall furnish as required by this section shall be sent, with the accompanying reports, to the President for his information.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 9, after line 13, to strike out section 9, in the following words:

SEC. 9. That whenever a vacancy shall occur in the office of consul-general, or consul above the sixth class, members of the two classes next below that in which the vacancy occurred shall be deemed eligible to be selected to fill such vacancy.

For the purpose of such promotion consuls and consuls-general shall be classified together according to salary.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 9, after line 20, to strike out section 10, in the following words:

SEC. 10. That the foregoing provisions of this act shall not apply to consular offices which are filled by those who are also accredited as diplomatic agents of the United States.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 12 (6), page 11, line 3, after the word "which," to strike out "exceeds" and insert "is;" and in line 4, after the word "year," to insert "or more;" so as to make the section read:

SEC. 6. No person who is not an American citizen shall be appointed hereafter in any consulate-general or consulate to any clerical position the salary of which is $1,000 a year or more.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 13 (7), page 11, line 9, before the word "agent," to strike out "commercial" and insert "consular;" so as to read:

SEC. 1699. No consul-general, consul, or consular agent receiving a salary of more than $1,000 a year shall, while he holds his office, be interested in or transact any business as a merchant, factor, broker, or other trader, or as a clerk or other agent for any such person to, from, or within the port, place, or limits of his jurisdiction, directly or indirectly, either in his own name or in the name or through the agency of any other person; nor shall he practice as a lawyer for compensation or be interested in the fees or compensation of any lawyer; and he shall in his official bond stipulate as a condition thereof not to violate this prohibition.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 11, line 25, before the word "agent," to strike out "commercial" and insert "consular;" so as to read:

SEC. 1700. All consular officers whose respective salaries exceed $1,000 a year shall be subject to the prohibition against transacting business, practicing as a lawyer, or being interested in the fees or compensation of any lawyer contained in the preceding section. And the President may extend the prohibition to any consul-general, consul, or consular agent whose salary does not exceed $1,000 a year or who may be compensated by fees, and to any vice or deputy consular officer or consular agent, and may require such officer to give a bond not to violate the prohibition.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KEAN. The sections should be renumbered.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. That is clerical and will be done.

Mr. KEAN. All right.

Mr. LODGE. I ask that the bill may be printed as amended by the Senate.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, the bill will be reprinted as amended.

Mr. LODGE. The clerks will see that the sections are numbered in accordance with the changes in the bill.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The sections will be renumbered.

LIGHT-HOUSE SERVICE.

Mr. NELSON. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 1358) to amend an act entitled "An act authorizing the construction of additional light-house districts," approved July 26, 1886.

The Secretary read the bill; and, there being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Commerce with an amendment, in line 7, after the word "exceeding," to strike out "eighteen" and insert "nineteen;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 4670 of the Revised Statutes is hereby amended so as to read as follows:

"SEC. 4670. The Light-House Board shall arrange the ocean, gulf, lake, and river coasts of the United States into light-house districts not exceeding nineteen in number; that any law or regulation prohibiting the employment in the light-houses of the United States of persons of more than 45 years of age be, and the same is hereby, repealed."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

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

WYOMING STATE SOLDIERS AND SAILORS' HOME.

Mr. KEAN obtained the floor.

Mr. WARREN. I ask the Senator from New Jersey to yield to me for a moment to call up a bill.

Mr. KEAN. I was merely going to move an executive session, but I withhold the motion for the present.

Mr. WARREN. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 608) granting to the State of Wyoming 50,000 acres of land to aid in the continuation, enlargement, and maintenance of the Wyoming State Soldiers and Sailors' Home.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will be read for the information of the Senate, subject to objection.

The Secretary read the bill.

Mr. PETTUS. Mr. President, I inquire of the Senator in charge of this bill whether it does not cover all the public lands in the State and whether it would not repeal the laws which forbid mineral lands from being entered?

Mr. WARREN. It does not cover anything but nonmineral and unappropriated lands, and it does not repeal any other law. It simply provides for the selection of 50,000 acres of unappropriated, unwithdrawn, nonmineral lands.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wyoming for the present consideration of the bill which has been read?

Mr. CARTER. Mr. President, the question presented by this bill has been the subject of some discussion since this and another bill were reported favorably from the Committee on Public Lands.

The question is quite a serious one. When the respective States were admitted into the Union—the Dakotas, Montana, Washington, and, later, Idaho and Wyoming—grants of public lands were made for specific purposes, and all the grants were about equal in size. In a given State the amount of land appropriated for public purposes happened to be less than in another and adjoining State, but to counterbalance that the amount of land granted for agricultural college purposes or for normal schools happened to be larger in the State having the smaller allowance for public buildings. These grants having been substantially equal in the beginning, and for all public purposes considered as proper objects of national solicitude, may be disturbed by subsequent appropriations for individual States.

Now, it is quite obvious, I think, that if the State of Wyoming were given 50,000 acres of land for a soldiers' home, we should give a like acreage for a similar purpose to all States similarly situated.

This manifest spirit of equity in dealing with the States brings up another question, as to whether it is proper to diminish the public domain, diminish the source from which the great irrigation and reclamation fund is to be constantly replenished, by continuously granting in piecemeal, but still in large quantity, the public domain of the United States.

My impression is that these grants to the States have not been in the main wisely administered. The old swamp-land grant made in 1850 became a public scandal, and it lingers still as a stench in the nostrils of decent administration. The land grants of our Western States have not been selected with that wisdom and regard for the institutions intended to be endowed which should have characterized the matter of selection. I know in the State of Montana the interests of the large cattle-raising people have been particularly consulted. The land grant provided that the lands could not be sold for less than $10 per acre; and yet it is a notorious fact that wheresoever the interests of a large cattle or sheep holding concern became involved lands were selected on mountain tops and hopeless places, where within no range of possibility can the land ever be sold by the State. On the contrary, the land is leased out on a slight rental for long terms, insuring great consolidated land holdings, which are a detriment to the community and in contravention of the general purposes of the Government.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. Mr. President——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. CARTER. I do not know that I have the floor.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair will state that this discussion has been proceeding by unanimous consent.

Mr. CARTER. I will yield to the Senator from North Dakota if I have the floor.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. I wish to make a suggestion to the Senator from Montana. He is now speaking of the State of Montana. I want to call his attention to the fact that the

conditions in many other States are entirely different from those he describes as pertaining to Montana.

Mr. CARTER. We do not arrogate to ourselves in the State of Montana excessive virtue, nor do we seek to have it understood that it is impossible for a higher standard of public excellence to exist elsewhere. I am speaking of things of which I know, and I am informed that similar conditions have existed in other public-land States.

I have no objection to granting 50,000 acres of land to the State of Wyoming to maintain a soldiers' home, but we are also called upon to give the State of Idaho 50,000 acres, I believe, or thereabout, for a like purpose. The State of Idaho received a larger grant in aid of public institutions than some States of much greater area. As to whether that grant has been wisely administered or the land wisely selected, I do not know; but I am free to say now that when the Idaho bill comes forward, asking that Congress grant an additional 50,000 acres of land to aid a soldiers' home in Idaho, I shall feel constrained to object, because a bill for granting land in this manner should be a general bill.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. CARTER. In a moment.

As to the policy of such general bills I have very determined views, and I shall oppose such grants all along the line.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I wish to say that the States do not all have State soldiers' homes.

Mr. CARTER. Montana has one in operation.

Mr. WARREN. I want to say further that as to the equality between the States the State of Wyoming lies a great deal higher in average altitude than the State of Montana, the State of Idaho, and all other States, except Colorado. I say very frankly that no State in this Union has been treated so badly as to the amount and character of public land granted her in the act of admission as was the State of Wyoming, and I wish to say further that Wyoming had no swamp lands and no mismanagement of her State lands.

This bill has passed the Senate, I think, every session for some six or eight years, and so in calling it up I presumed it would excite no debate; otherwise I should not have called it up at this late hour. There is a Home established by the State of Wyoming for old soldiers and sailors. It was thought better rather than to have the United States Government take care of them in National Homes, because the men who went years ago to that country and have lived long in that altitude and atmosphere are happier and their lives are prolonged by sending them to local Homes rather than to distant places.

This land, under the constitution of Wyoming, can not be sold for less than $10 an acre, but it can be leased, and the money goes to this fund, or if any residue, the surplus goes to other charitable institutions.

The bill seems to be well guarded, and I hope the Senate will do as it has done before—allow it to be put upon its passage.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CARTER. Mr. President, in view of the fact that the same question will arise with reference to the Idaho bill, I feel constrained at this time to object, to the end that the entire question involved in additional grants of land may be taken up at the proper time and acted upon.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. There is objection to the present consideration of the bill.

Mr. DUBOIS. Mr. President, I intended to call up a bill precisely similar to the one which has just been objected to by the Senator from Montana [Mr. CARTER], a bill which has been passed through the Senate two or three times; but in view of the statement of the Senator from Montana that he will object, I shall not detain the Senate by asking it to allow me the courtesy of having the bill to which I refer now considered.

Mr. DRYDEN. Mr. President——

Mr. ALLISON. Will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. DRYDEN. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. ALLISON. Before this question passes from the consideration of the Senate I wish to call attention to the fact—I would not do so, but for a suggestion made by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN]—that the Government of the United States now pays $100 per annum for each soldier in the State Homes of every State; and $100 for each soldier aggregates a much larger sum than one-half of the entire cost of maintaining those Homes in the States, as I happen to know.

Mr. WARREN. The Senator does not maintain that the sum allowed covers all the cost?

Mr. ALLISON. It does not cover all the cost, it is true, but it covers the greater portion of the cost in every State. It covers nearly the cost in my own State. We appropriate annually to these Soldiers' Homes in the respective States $100 for each soldier; and it is a wise thing to do, because it does keep the soldiers in their own States, instead of transporting them to distant parts of the country from their own Homes to the National Homes.

Mr. President, I want to call the attention of the Senator from Wyoming to the fact that the Government is now contributing largely more than one-half of the cost of the State Homes, and that is a general provision, and applies to every State Home in the United States.

Mr. WARREN. That is true, except as to it being more than one-half. In a State like Wyoming it does not amount to one-half.

Mr. ALLISON. Does the Senator contend that it costs more than $200 per capita to take care of the soldiers of Wyoming?

Mr. WARREN. It does.

Mr. ALLISON. It costs from $130 to $140 per capita in my State.

Mr. WARREN. The cost of living is cheaper in Iowa; but it costs more for each soldier in Wyoming.

Mr. ALLISON. Very likely; but I know there is a provision here—I shall not detain the Senate long—that if the land is not needed for a Soldiers' Home, it shall go to other charitable institutions, which I take it, under the circumstances, will happen if the present relation between the United States and those States should continue.

Mr. DUBOIS. Mr. President——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. DRYDEN] is entitled to the floor. Does he yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. DRYDEN. I do.

Mr. DUBOIS. Mr. President, I think it is fair to state that the argument just now advanced by the Senator from Montana [Mr. CARTER], while new to me, appeals to me very strongly. The moneys now derived from the sales of public lands are put into a reclamation fund, to be used for the reclamation of waste land throughout the United States in the arid region, and in consequence all of the States embraced in the arid and semiarid belt are interested in these public lands, no matter where they may be situated. I think that the subject is serious enough for the Committee on Public Lands to consider it.

PUBLIC BUILDING AT JERSEY CITY, N. J.

Mr. DRYDEN. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 2087) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building at Jersey City, N. J.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds with an amendment, on page 2, line 4, after the word "appropriated," to strike out "nor shall any site be purchased until estimates for the erection of a building which shall have sufficient accommodations for the transaction of the public business, and which shall not exceed in cost the balance of the sum herein limited after the site shall have been purchased or condemned and paid for, shall have been approved by the Secretary of the Treasury;" and in line 13, after the word "alleys," to strike out "and that no money appropriated for this purpose shall be available until a valid title to the site for said building shall be vested in the United States, nor until the said State of New Jersey shall have ceded to the United States exclusive jurisdiction over the same, during the time the United States shall be or remain the owner thereof, for all purposes except the administration of the criminal laws of the said State and the service of civil process therein;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to purchase by private sale, secure by condemnation, or otherwise acquire, a site for and cause to be erected thereon a suitable building, with fireproof vaults therein, for the accommodation of the United States post-office and other Government offices of the United States in the city of Jersey City, in the county of Hudson and State of New Jersey. The plans, specifications, and full estimates for said building shall be previously made and approved, according to law, and shall not exceed, for the site and building complete, the sum of $325,000, which is hereby appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated: *Provided*, That the site shall leave the building unexposed to danger from fire in adjacent buildings by an open space of not less than 20 feet, including streets and alleys.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

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

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY.

Mr. ALLISON. For the convenience of Senators, I desire to make a motion. I understand that quite a number of the im-

portant committees of the Senate wish to meet to-morrow and Saturday, and, therefore, I move that when the Senate adjourns to-day it be to meet on Monday next.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Iowa, that when the Senate adjourns to-day it be to meet on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to.

PUBLIC BUILDING AT ATLANTA, GA.

Mr. CLAY. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 800) to provide for the erection of a public building at Atlanta, Ga.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill. It proposes to appropriate a sum not exceeding $1,000,000 for the erection at Atlanta, Ga., on a site already owned and possessed by the United States, a suitable building for the use and accommodation of the United States post-office, Treasury Department, and other Government offices in the city of Atlanta.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SETTLERS WITHIN NORTHERN PACIFIC RAILWAY GRANT.

Mr. FULTON. I ask unanimous consent for consideration at this time of the bill (S. 2292) for the relief of certain entrymen and settlers within the limits of the Northern Pacific Railway land grant.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Lands with amendments.

The first amendment was, in section 1, page 1, line 8, after the word "Company," to insert "and also the provisions of the act of March 2, 1901, entitled 'An act for the relief of settlers under the public-land laws to lands within the indemnity limits of the grant to the Northern Pacific Railroad Company;'" so as to make the section read:

That the provisions of the act of July 1, 1898 (30 Stat., pp. 597 and 620), which provided for the adjustment by the Land Department of conflicting claims to lands within the limits of the grant to the Northern Pacific Railroad Company, and also the provisions of the act of March 2, 1901, entitled "An act for the relief of settlers under the public-land laws to lands within the indemnity limits of the grant to the Northern Pacific Railroad Company," be, and they hereby are, extended to include any bona fide settlement or entry made subsequent to January 1, 1898, and prior to May 31, 1905, in accordance with the erroneous decision of the Land Department respecting the withdrawal on general route of the Northern Pacific Railroad between Wallula, Wash., and Portland, Oreg., where the same has not since been abandoned.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, after line 8, to strike out section 2, as follows:

SEC. 2. That this act shall become effective upon an acceptance thereof by the Northern Pacific Railway Company being filed with the Secretary of the Interior.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

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

POTOMAC RIVER HIGHWAY BRIDGE.

Mr. FRYE. I reported this morning from the Committee on Commerce Senate joint resolution 23. It is important that it should become a law as soon as possible, from the fact that the time for building the approaches to the Potomac Bridge expires February 18. The joint resolution simply provides for an extension of the time.

There being no objection the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the joint resolution (S. R. 23) providing for an extension of time for completing the highway bridge and approaches across the Potomac River at Washington, D. C.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED.

An act (H. R. 12707) to enable the people of Oklahoma and of the Indian Territory to form a constitution and State government and be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States; and to enable the people of New Mexico and of Arizona to form a constitution and State government and be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Territories.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

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

Mr. WARREN. Will the Senator from Massachusetts yield to me that I may secure the consideration of a public-building bill?

Mr. LODGE. I yield to the Senator.

Mr LATIMER. I ask the Senator from Massachusetts to yield to me for just a moment.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. LODGE. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. LATIMER], and then I will yield to the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN]. I do not want to cut off any Senator.

Mr. LATIMER. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration——

Mr. WARREN. I believe the Senator from Massachusetts has yielded to me.

Mr. LODGE. I first yield to the Senator from Wyoming, and afterwards I will yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair would suggest to Senators that the right to the floor must come from the Chair. The Chair had not recognized the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN], but had recognized the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. LATIMER]. The Senator from South Carolina.

PUBLIC BUILDING AT ANDERSON, S. C.

Mr. LATIMER. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 1447) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Anderson, in the State of South Carolina.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds with an amendment, on page 2, after line 18, to strike out:

If, upon consideration of said report and accompanying papers, the Secretary of the Treasury shall deem further investigation necessary, he may appoint a commission of not more than three persons, one of whom shall be an officer of the Treasury Department, which commission shall also examine the said proposed sites, and such others as the Secretary of the Treasury may designate, and grant such hearings in relation thereto as they shall deem necessary; and said commission shall, within thirty days after said examination, make to the Secretary of the Treasury written report of their conclusion in the premises, accompanied by all statements, maps, plats, or documents taken by or submitted to them, in like manner as hereinbefore provided in regard to the proceedings of said agent of the Treasury Department; and the Secretary of the Treasury shall thereupon finally determine the location of the building to be erected.

The compensation of said commissioners shall be fixed by the Secretary of the Treasury, but the same shall not exceed $6 per day and actual traveling expenses: *Provided, however*, That the member of said commission appointed from the Treasury Department shall be paid only his actual traveling expenses.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to acquire, by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, a site, and cause to be erected thereon a suitable building, including fireproof vaults, heating and ventilating apparatus, elevators, and approaches, for the use and accommodation of the United States post-office and other Government offices in the city of Anderson and State of South Carolina, the cost of said site and building, including said vaults, heating and ventilating apparatus, elevators, and approaches, complete, not to exceed the sum of $75,000.

Proposals for the sale of land suitable for said site shall be invited by public advertisement in one or more of the newspapers of said city of largest circulation for at least twenty days prior to the date specified in said advertisement for the opening of said proposals.

Proposals made in response to said advertisement shall be addressed and mailed to the Secretary of the Treasury, who will then cause the said proposed sites, and such others as he may think proper to designate, to be examined in person by an agent of the Treasury Department, who shall make written report to said Secretary of the result of said examination and of his recommendation thereon and the reasons therefor, which shall be accompanied by the original proposals, and all maps, plats, and statements which shall have come into his possession relating to the said proposed sites.

The building shall be unexposed to danger from fire by an open space of at least 40 feet on each side, including streets and alleys.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

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

PUBLIC BUILDING AT SHERIDAN, WYO.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. LODGE. I yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. WARREN. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 610) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Sheridan, in the State of Wyoming.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill. It directs the Secretary of the Treasury to acquire a site and cause to be erected thereon a suitable building for the use and accommodation of the United

States post-office, court, and other Government offices in the city of Sheridan, Wyo., the cost not to exceed $160,000.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

THE MERCHANT MARINE.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated by title.

The SECRETARY. A bill (S. 529) to promote the national defense, to create a force of naval volunteers, to establish American ocean mail lines to foreign markets, to promote commerce, and to provide revenue from tonnage.

Mr. KEAN. Let it be laid aside temporarily.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, the unfinished business will be laid aside temporarily.

PURE-FOOD BILL.

Mr. HEYBURN. Mr. President——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. LODGE. I do.

Mr. HEYBURN. I desire to give notice that on Monday, the 29th of January, I shall ask the Senate to fix a time for taking a vote on Senate bill 88, known as the "pure-food bill."

SCHOOL LANDS TAKEN FOR GOVERNMENT RESERVES.

Mr. HEYBURN. I wish to give notice that on Monday, January 29, after the routine business of the morning hour, I shall ask the Senate to take from the table the bill (S. 1661) to reimburse the States and Territories for sections 16 and 36 when taken for forest or other Government reserves, for the purpose of submitting some remarks thereon.

Mr. GALLINGER. I trust the Senator from Idaho will endeavor to complete his remarks by 2 o'clock, as the unfinished business will be pressed somewhat at that hour. I hope we may not have to yield to the Senator after 2 o'clock.

Mr. HEYBURN. If it becomes necessary to ask the Senator to yield, I will trust to his generosity and the convenience of the Senate.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

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

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After ten minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 4 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, January 29, 1906, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 25, 1906.

AMBASSADOR.

Luke E. Wright, of Tennessee, to be ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary to Japan.

AUDITOR OF PORTO RICO.

George Cabot Ward, of New York, to be auditor of the island of Porto Rico.

COLLECTORS OF CUSTOMS.

Charles E. Knowlton, of Maine, to be collector of customs for the district of Belfast, in the State of Maine.

John B. Whelan, of Michigan, to be collector of customs for the district of Detroit, in the State of Michigan.

RECEIVER OF PUBLIC MONEYS.

Oliver R. Robinson, of Los Angeles, Cal., to be receiver of public moneys at Los Angeles, Cal.

PROMOTION IN THE ARMY.

Cavalry Arm.

Second Lieut. Charles Burnett, Fifteenth Cavalry, to be first lieutenant from January 3, 1906.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

Commander Lewis C. Heilner to be a captain in the Navy from the 7th day of January, 1906.

Lieut. Commander Harry S. Knapp to be a commander in the Navy from the 27th day of December, 1905.

Lieut. Waldo Evans to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 1st day of January, 1906.

POSTMASTERS.

GEORGIA.

Lena Brimberry to be postmaster at Camilla, in the county of Mitchell and State of Georgia.

Willie A. Sheats to be postmaster at Monroe, in the county of Walton and State of Georgia.

John T. Stilwell to be postmaster at Montezuma, in the county of Macon and State of Georgia.

IDAHO.

Fred G. Havemann to be postmaster at Salmon, in the county of Lemhi and State of Idaho.

PENNSYLVANIA.

George C. Burns to be postmaster at Montrose, in the county of Susquehanna and State of Pennsylvania.

Ezra H. Ripple to be postmaster at Scranton, in the county of Lackawanna and State of Pennsylvania.

NEBRASKA.

William J. Hildreth to be postmaster at Exeter, in the county of Fillmore and State of Nebraska.

OHIO.

Clinton F. Bonham to be postmaster at Harrison, in the county of Hamilton and State of Ohio.

William Bowen to be postmaster at Louisville, in the county of Stark and State of Ohio.

David H. Harriman to be postmaster at West Mansfield, in the county of Logan and State of Ohio.

Reuben M. Hull to be postmaster at Salineville, in the county of Columbiana and State of Ohio.

John J. Leedom to be postmaster at St. Paris, in the county of Champaign and State of Ohio.

Arkinson B. Pond to be postmaster at New London, in the county of Huron and State of Ohio.

Onesimus P. Shaffer to be postmaster at Youngstown, in the county of Mahoning and State of Ohio.

John H. Stover to be postmaster at Waterville, in the county of Lucas and State of Ohio.

Henry D. Weaver to be postmaster at Leetonia, in the county of Columbiana and State of Ohio.

PENNSYLVANIA.

John C. Burden to be postmaster at St. Marys, in the county of Elk and State of Pennsylvania.

Wallace W. Oberly to be postmaster at Womelsdorf, in the county of Berks and State of Pennsylvania.

SOUTH CAROLINA.

John C. Hunter to be postmaster at Union, in the county of Union and State of South Carolina.

George S. McCravy to be postmaster at Laurens, in the county of Laurens and State of South Carolina.

Luther McLaurin to be postmaster at McColl, in the county of Marlboro and State of South Carolina.

Elizabeth A. S. Mixon to be postmaster at Barnwell, in the county of Barnwell and State of South Carolina.

Preston Rion to be postmaster at Winnsboro, in the county of Fairfield and State of South Carolina.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, *January 25, 1906.*

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

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

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

DEMOCRATIC ABSENTEES.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, I wish, by unanimous consent, to make a statement with reference to the pairs and absentees of yesterday. There is nothing in what I may say which reflects upon anybody, but it is an explanation that I think is due absent Members.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, a report is current to the effect that some Democrats on yesterday were away and refused to vote, and that they did so corruptly is intimated in some instances. I wish to say that there were thirteen absent Democrats. There were two Democrats present who were paired with Members who were absent. One of these was Mr. PATTERSON of South Carolina, who was paired with Mr. CROMER of Indiana. Mr. CROMER is in that State engaged in his canvass and has been since the holidays. Mr. PATTERSON paired with him before the holidays and has been paired with him ever since. The other Member present who was paired was Mr. SULZER of New York, who was paired with Mr. ANDRUS of New York, who was away and is away, as I understand it, because of a death in his family. The Democrats absent were Mr. BELL of Georgia, who was paired with Mr. BURTON of

Delaware. This pair was put up some ten days ago. They were both going away, as I understand it, on business of importance to themselves. Mr. BROUSSARD of Louisiana was away. He left last Thursday to go to his home in order to attend to some important business there. Mr. BYRD of Mississippi has been gone for several days and is engaged in the trial of a murder case in which a relative of his is interested. Mr. COCKRAN of New York is in the West and has been in bad health since the holidays and unable to be here. Mr. HEARST is in the West on account of important business interests. He has not been here since the holidays. Mr. HILL of Mississippi was called away last Wednesday, if I remember the date right, on account of important business in his State. Mr. LITTLE of Arkansas is not here and has not been here since the holidays. Mr. LITTLE is engaged in an active canvass for governor of the State of Arkansas. Mr. MCDERMOTT is not here. He has been sick and unable to be here. Mr. PATTERSON of Tennessee was not here. He has not been here during the session and, in fact, has not been sworn in. Mr. SOUTHALL of Virginia was not here, but he is sick with pneumonia and unable to be here. Mr. SULLIVAN of New York has not been in attendance since the holidays. He has been in the West, and it was impossible, as I understand it, for him to be present. Mr. VAN DUZER of Nevada is away and has been away on account of sickness in his family. He has not been able to be here since the holidays. Mr. ZENOR of Indiana is not here and has not been for a number of days. Like Mr. CROMER of Indiana, he is engaged in a canvass in his own State.

STATEHOOD BILL.

The SPEAKER. In accordance with the special order, the House will resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 12707—the statehood bill—and the gentleman from Indiana, Mr. CRUMPACKER, will take the chair.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan has forty-four minutes in time remaining, and the gentleman from Tennessee has two hours and six minutes.

Mr. MOON of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield fifteen minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN].

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, the San Francisco Chronicle of January 20, which came to hand this morning, has the following editorial, which I desire to read:

JOINT STATEHOOD—PROPOSED JOINDER OF ARIZONA AND NEW MEXICO INEXCUSABLE.

The joinder of Arizona and New Mexico as one State, even with the hearty assent of both Territories, would be unstatesmanlike and grossly improper. To compel it against the wishes of the people of either Territory would be a political crime.

It would be unstatesmanlike and improper for the reason that it would not give adequate relative representation in the Federal Government to a great area of territory with enormous material interests. Population never was and never ought to be the sole consideration in admitting to statehood. Area and industries are also to be considered. The live-stock interests require a comparatively small number of men to operate and direct them, but no one can deny their supreme importance to the people of the whole country, and they are entitled to a just weight in the Government. The same thing may be said with respect to the mining interests. Agriculture and commerce now have an overwhelming preponderance in the national councils, and mining and live stock are entitled to all the additional weight which can be given by two States. But even as to agriculture, and the denser population which agriculture brings, no one can foresee what is in store for Arizona and New Mexico. They both have enormous areas of fertile soil. The limit of their agricultural development will be fixed by the water supply. This has hardly yet begun to be exploited. What the outcome will be it is not yet possible to say, but what may be said with absolute certainty is that the next or the second generation will see in those States an agricultural population which will place either of them far in advance of several States whose title to statehood nobody disputes.

It would be a political crime to join together against the wish of either two populations so diverse as those of Arizona and New Mexico, which are divided from each other by sectional lines. The great majority of the New Mexicans are of the Latin race, or of mixed Latin and Indian. The great majority of those of Arizona are American. The two peoples have different customs, different languages, different civilizations, different ideals. To join them together against their will is to doom them to eternal hatred and strife. The New Mexicans may be willing, because they are in the majority and can impose Latin-American ideals on the American minority; but it would be a crime to permit them to do it, nevertheless.

Mr. Chairman, that editorial represents the unanimous opinion of the people of the State of California, and there is one part of it that has particular application to the question that is now before this House, namely, the question as to what the future of those two Territories will be. American statesmanship has never yet been able to foresee what the future had in store. The expansion of our country has always met with more or less opposition from the centers of population in the East. What has been the history of our acquisitions, and what has been said about them from time to time? Why, sir, when it was proposed to organize the Oregon country as a Territory of this Union there were grave and reverend Senators of the United States who arose at the other end of the Capitol and denounced the proposition in unmeasured terms. I will read for the edification of the House some sentiments which were uttered upon that question. Senator Dickerson, of New Jersey, arose in the Senate, February 26, 1825, and soberly said:

But is this Territory of Oregon ever to become a State, a member of this Union? Never. The Union is already too extensive, and we must make three or four new States from the Territories already formed.

The distance from the mouth of the Columbia to the mouth of the Missouri is 3,555 miles; from Washington to the mouth of the Missouri is 1,160 miles, making the whole distance from Washington to the mouth of the Columbia River 4,703 miles, but say 4,650 miles. The distance, therefore, that a Member of Congress of this State of Oregon would be obliged to travel in coming to the seat of government and returning home would be 9,300 miles. This, at the rate of $8 for every 20 miles, would make his traveling expenses amount to $3,720.

Every Member of Congress ought to see his constituents once a year. This is already very difficult for those in the most remote parts of the Union. At the rate which the Members of Congress travel according to law—that is, 20 miles per day—it would require, to come to the seat of government from Oregon and return, four hundred and sixty-five days; and if he should lie by for Sundays, say, sixty-six, it would require five hundred and thirty-one days. But if he should travel at the rate of 30 miles per day, it would require three hundred and six days. Allow for Sundays, forty-four, it would amount to three hundred and fifty days. This would allow the Member a fortnight to rest himself at Washington before he should commence his journey home. This rate of traveling would be a hard duty, as a greater part of the way is exceedingly bad, and a portion of it over rugged mountains, where Lewis and Clark found several feet of snow in the latter part of June. Yet a young, able-bodied Senator might travel from Oregon to Washington and back once a year; but he could do nothing else. It would be more expeditious, however, to come by water round Cape Horn, or to pass through Bering Strait, round the north coast of this continent to Baffins Bay, thence through Davis Strait to the Atlantic, and so on to Washington. It is true this passage is not yet discovered, except upon our maps, but it will be as soon as Oregon shall be a State.

Mr. Dayton, another distinguished Senator, said:

I trust I may be pardoned here for reading an extract from a western paper of recent date (Louisville Journal), republished in the National Intelligencer, of this city. Here it is:

"What there is in the Territory of Oregon to tempt our national cupidity no one can tell. Of all the countries on the face of the earth it is one of the least favored of Heaven. It is a mere riddling of creation. It is almost as barren as the desert of Africa, and quite as unhealthy as the Campania of Italy. To leave the fertile and salubrious lands on this side of the Rocky Mountains and to go beyond their snowy summits a thousand miles, to be exiled from law and society, and to endeavor to extort food from the unwilling sand heaps which are there called earth, is the maddest enterprise that has ever deluded foolish man. We would not be subjected to the innumerable and indescribable tortures of a journey to Oregon for all the soil its savage hunters ever wandered over. The journey thither, from all accounts, is horrible enough, but it is paradisean when contrasted with the wasting miseries which beset the wretched emigrant when he has reached a point where he fancied his unutterable woes were to cease, but where he finds they are to be increased beyond all endurance. Of the last party of emigrants that left Missouri for Oregon, only eight died of starvation before reaching Fort Hall, which is halfway to the country that is reckoned inhabitable by those who are afflicted with the Oregon mania.

"All the writers and travelers agree in representing Oregon as a vast extent of mountains and valleys of sand, dotted over with green and cultivable spots. This is the representation given by Cox, Bonneville, Farnham, and Hinds. Now, that such a wretched territory should excite the hopes and cupidity of citizens of the United States, inducing them to leave comfortable homes for the heaps of sand, is, indeed, passing strange. Russia has her Siberia and England has her Botany Bay, and if the United States should ever use a country to which to banish its rogues and scoundrels, the utility of such a region as Oregon will be demonstrated."

I read the extract without adopting the sentiments as to the character of the country in the full extent, but this description in a paper of the West so widely circulated as the Louisville Journal is evident to my mind that public sentiment there in behalf of the settlement of Oregon is not so universal as some gentlemen have presented it. I desire here to disclaim any intention to burlesque the subject or feelings of Senators who seem to be extremely sensitive upon the point. With the permission, therefore, of the Senate I will call attention to another extract of a grave tone and from a paper above all exception. I read from the Christian Advocate of the 7th of this month (February):

"The West has land enough yet to settle and improve at home. The population can not be so crowded for half a century to come as to be willing to incur horrors of war to acquire waste lands on the other side of the globe. Indeed, when we take into view the inducements which must be offered to a people circumstanced as the habitants of the Western States and Territories are, in order to induce them to emigrate, and compare them with what Oregon Territory presents, we should be inclined to think the representation of their feelings as having been made on very insufficient grounds. We have some opportunity from our position to form a correct estimate of the soil, climate, productions, and facilities of the country from the Rocky Mountains to the Pacific Ocean, as we have had a large mission there for several years, distributed in small parties over the Territory, and from all we have learned we should prefer migrating to Botany Bay. With the exceptions of the lands on the Willamette and strips along a few of the smaller water courses, the whole is among the most irreclaimable barren wastes of which we have read, except the Desert of Sahara.

"Nor is this the worst of it. The climate is so unfriendly to human life that the native population has dwindled away under the ravages of its malaria to a degree which defies all history to furnish a parallel in so wide a range of country, and the scattered remnants of the wandering tribes of Indians who still remain exhibit a degree of decrepitude, loathsome disease, and moral degradation which is unknown among any other portion of the aborigines. So entirely sunken and subdued

are these wretched people and so rapid has been their decay that they predict their own annihilation from the 'cold sickness,' as they have learned to call the ague, which is a prominent symptom of the terrible malady which annually visits them in all their wanderings."

Mr. Dayton, after arguing that the country was not worth contending for, that it was too remote from the seat of Government, that the distance to the capital around Cape Horn was 18,000 miles and across the continent 5,000 miles, concluded in this fashion:

The power of steam has been suggested. Talk of steam communication—a railroad to the mouth of the Columbia! Why, look at the cost and bankrupt condition of railroads proceeding almost from your capital, traveling your great thoroughfares. A railroad across 2,500 miles of prairie, of desert, and of mountains! The smoke of an engine through those terrible fissures of that great rocky ledge, where the smoke of the volcano has rolled before! Who is to make this vast internal or, rather, external improvement? Whence is to come the power? Who to supply the means? The mines of Mexico and Peru disemboweled would scarcely pay a penny on the pound of the cost. Nothing short of the lamp of Aladdin would suffice for such an expenditure. The extravagance of the suggestion seems to me to outrun everything which we know of modern scheming. The South Sea bubble, the Dutchman's speculation in tulip roots, our own in town lots and multicaulis are all commonplace plodding in comparison.

These are fair samples of some of the views entertained by distinguished statesmen in those days concerning the magnificent empire which has since been divided up into the Commonwealths of Oregon, Washington, Idaho, and parts of Montana and Wyoming. In 1838 there were only fifty Americans in that great stretch of country, and where is the American to-day who does not feel proud of the advancement that has been made on that northwest border of our common country?

In speaking of the acquisition of California and New Mexico, as was pointed out by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCOTT] the other day, the immortal Daniel Webster stated that "they are not worth a dollar, and we pay for them vast sums of money." I have the honor to represent one of the districts of the Golden State. There is not a man, woman, or child within the confines of California that is not proud of her history.

If at the time the great Senator from Massachusetts spoke at the other end of the Capitol, when the question of the acquisition of California was being discussed, anyone had predicted the magnificence, the wealth, the splendor, the greatness of the beautiful metropolis that sits beside the Golden Gate; if anyone had attempted to foretell the surpassing beauty of Los Angeles, of Oakland and Alameda, of San Jose, Sacramento, Stockton, Pasadena, Riverside, and dozens of other splendid municipalities within the confines of the Golden State; if anyone had stated that within fifty years there would be established in California those great universities at Berkeley and at Palo Alto; if anyone had had the temerity to speak of the wonderful development in agriculture, in mining, in shipping, in railroading, in manufactures, and in commerce that would take place within the borders of the new Eldorado, it is not improbable that the "godlike Daniel" would have scornfully pronounced it an iridescent dream or the wild imagination of a diseased brain.

But she has not alone kept pace with her older sisters, she has outstripped many of them in the march of progress. Sir, it will not be long ere the vision of her great poet, Joaquin Miller, will be fully realized:

Dared I to say a prophecy
  As sang the learned men of old,
Of rock-built cities yet to be
  Along those shining shores of gold,
Crowding athirst into the sea,
  What wondrous marvels might be told!
Enough to know that Empire here
Will burn her loftiest, brightest star;
Here art and eloquence shall reign
  As o'er the wolf-reared realm of old;
Here learn'd and famous, from afar,
  To pay their royal court shall come,
And shall not seek nor see in vain,
  But gaze on all, with wonder dumb!

Mr. Chairman, the men who believe that Arizona and New Mexico have no future discount the genius of American citizenship. Why, sir, when Louisiana was annexed it was said that territory was so remote from the seat of Government it would never be possible for us to have easy communication with it. But the genius of Robert Fulton brought forth the first steamship, and it was but a short while before space and distance were being annihilated by the leviathans of the ocean. And so, when New Mexico and California were annexed, again American genius asserted itself, and before long we found railroads, those forerunners of civilization, going out into what was then described upon our maps as the "Great American Desert." And, in 1868, the genius of George Westinghouse brought into existence the air brake, that wonderful invention that made it possible to run the lightning express, and which has brought San Francisco within four days' travel of the Capitol at Washington.

Sir, the possibilities of Arizona and New Mexico are illimitable. It is less than twenty years since it has been safe for settlers to go into Arizona. We all remember how, less than a score of years ago, Geronimo and Natchez with their bands of marauding Apaches shot down the adventurous frontiersman. It was like taking life into one's own hands to go there. It was almost like a deliberate attempt at self-slaughter. Instead of deriding the people of that Territory we should applaud their pluck and courage and enterprise.

The gentlemen who favor this measure have no conception of the possibilities of that country under a system of modern irrigation.

Why, in the southern part of my own State up to five years ago there was a great stretch of barren waste that was marked on the map as the "Colorado Desert." The railroad conductors, as you passed across it, pointed it out to you and told you that at its lowest point it was 300 feet below the level of the sea; that not a human being inhabited it, and that it was shunned even by the wild coyote and the death-dealing rattlesnake. And yet, sir, within five years life-giving water has been brought upon that land, and as though it had been changed by the touch of a magician's wand, the whole character of the landscape has been altered. It is no longer called the "Colorado Desert;" it is now known as the "Imperial Valley," and it affords a habitation, a shelter, and a home to 8,000 happy human beings. Where before the sagebrush and the cactus held undisputed sway, thriving farms and busy towns have sprung up over night seemingly.

Sir, the development of irrigation systems brings manufacturing in its train. Wherever there is an impounding dam, electric power can be generated. It has been so in my own State, for where we have constructed our irrigation works we have also been able to develop electric power. We carry that power for two and three hundred miles. We are building factories and workshops hundreds of miles away from the source of the power. Up to twenty years ago the cotton growers of South Carolina and Georgia were sending their raw product to the factories in New England; but in more recent years they concluded that it would be wiser to bring the factory to the cotton field; and in these recent years the development of the South has been marvelous. So will it be with Arizona. [Applause.]

To-day she is sending all of the wool, which she produces in abundance, to the eastern seaboard. With the development of her electric power the factory will come alongside of the sheep range. It is not improbable that she will turn out great quantities of cloth, and felt, and cashmere, and shawls, and carpets, and everything that is manufactured from wool. It is not an empty boast to say that within a few years her inhabitants will be turning their attention to manufacturing interests, just as they have heretofore turned their attention to mining and agriculture, to sheep herding and cattle raising. The Colorado, the Salt, the Gila, and the Little Colorado rivers will give her sufficient electric power to run millions of spindles. With the opening of the Panama Canal she will be enabled to send her products into the markets of the world and become an effective competitor with her eastern sisters.

In California there lives a man who has wrought wonders in the development of plant life. His name has become a household word. I speak of Luther Burbank, of Santa Rosa, Cal. He has lately produced a spineless cactus. It will not be many years before the arid and semiarid regions of the Territories of Arizona and New Mexico will be converted into magnificent pastures. When you consider that in 1870 Arizona had but 172 farms, containing 22,000 acres; that in 1890 she had but 1,400 farms, containing 1,300,000 acres; that in 1900 she had 6,000 farms, containing 2,000,000 acres, and that all of this acreage was cultivated under most adverse conditions, it requires no great stretch of imagination to predict a marvelous future for the agricultural interests of that Territory.

And New Mexico has also been retarded in her growth. She has been cursed with the so-called "Spanish and Mexican land grants." Take the Maxwell grant alone; it contains millions of acres. In extent it equals many of the principalities of Europe. These grants are held by few people. They are not cut up into small holdings. In my own State, before similar grants were cut up and sold in small tracts, there was arrested development, but as soon as the settler was allowed to purchase a few acres of these extensive domains conditions altered. Towns and cities sprung up in the midst of fertile fields. So will it be in New Mexico when the great land grants of that Territory are divided into small farms that will sustain a large population of thriving agriculturists. And, by the bye, there has been much said about population in this debate. Arizona

to-day has a population of nearly 200,000. Within the past five years there has been a wonderful development within her confines. I visited Yuma last summer and saw the evidences of progress and prosperity on every hand.

Why, sir, of the thirty-two States that have been admitted into the Union since the formation of our Government, twenty-four had a smaller population than Arizona now has when they were admitted, and twenty-seven out of the thirty-two had a smaller amount of taxable property.

I maintain, too, that the people of the United States made an implied promise to the pioneers who braved all the hardships of the frontier to build a State out of the desert and wilderness. The act of Congress which created the Territory of Arizona and fixed its boundaries contained the following language:

Provided, That nothing contained in the provisions of this act shall be construed to prohibit the Congress of the United States from dividing said Territory nor changing its boundaries in such manner and at such time as it may deem proper: *Provided further, That said government shall be maintained and continued until such time as the people residing in said Territory shall, with the consent of Congress, form a State government republican in form as prescribed in the Constitution of the United States, and apply for and obtain admission into the Union as a State on an equal footing with the original States.*

It is the only Territory that has ever been organized to which such a provision was attached. It was detached from the Territory of New Mexico by act of Congress approved February 24, 1863, and when Congress declared—

Provided further, That said government shall be maintained and continued until such time as the people residing in said Territory shall, with the consent of Congress, form a State government republican in form, as prescribed in the Constitution of the United States, and apply for and obtain admission into the Union as a State on an equal footing with the original States—

To my mind it held out the promise of future statehood to those who should be brave enough to go out into the new Territory and build a home at that outpost of our civilization.

I do not say at this time we should give these Territories statehood. If they have not the requisite population, if they have not the requirements that Congress demands for statehood at this time, let them wait; but I maintain it would be a crime to join them at this time into one State, and thus forever prevent the possibility of the construction of two Sates out of that vast domain of 235,000 square miles.

Sir, that area is as large as the States of California and Missouri combined; that area is as large as all of the New England and Middle States, with Maryland thrown in. To go from Yuma to the proposed capital of the new State is a distance of 880 miles. It is wrong, it is unjust, it is outrageous to compel the people of any State to travel so far to their capital. You can travel from Washington to St. Louis, from New York to St. Paul, in a shorter time than you can travel between Yuma and Santa Fe.

The people of the Territory of Arizona ask to be allowed to continue as a Territory. Many of the inhabitants of New Mexico would rather continue to live within her borders as a Territory indefinitely than be joined with Arizona.

I believe that each Territory should be allowed to vote separately upon the question of jointure. I believe they are entitled to such a vote in the name of justice, right, and decency. Section 3 of Article IV of the Federal Constitution reads:

New States may be admitted by the Congress into this Union; but no new State shall be formed or erected within the jurisdiction of any other State; *nor any State be formed by the junction of two or more States, or parts of States, without the consent of the legislatures of the States concerned* as well as of the Congress.

From a reading of that section it is evident that no two States could be joined except upon the separate action of the legislatures of said States, and by a parity of reasoning no two Territories ought to be joined into a single State except upon the express vote of the people of the two Territories, taken separately.

The emblem of our country bears upon its field forty-five stars. Not one of them has been placed there by coercion. The people of the different States have all come into the Union voluntarily, and many of them were kept knocking at the doors of Congress year after year before they were finally admitted. When admission came it was upon the prayer of a united people. Do not cast a cloud upon that splendid galaxy by forcing the people of Arizona into a union which is distasteful to them and which can bring forth no good results if consummated.

But, sir, it is unfortunate that the admission of Oklahoma and Indian Territory should have been coupled with Arizona and New Mexico in one bill. It is generally understood and universally believed that the people of the former Territories want joint statehood, and if my vote and the votes of my colleagues from California could give it to them, they would have it without delay. But a majority of this House has decreed otherwise. We had hoped that the Members of this body would vote down the rule which was adopted yesterday.

Mr. Chairman, I am afraid that we are rapidly approaching the condition which the brilliant satirist, W. S. Gilbert, referred to when he said of the English House of Commons:

When in the House M. P.'s divide,
If they've a brain and cerebellum, too,
They have to leave that brain outside,
And vote just as their leaders tell 'em to.

Sir, the eight Members from the State of California upon this floor would vote unanimously for the admission of the State of Oklahoma, but we would be false to our constituencies, false to our State, false to our trust, and false to our principles if we were to vote for the jointure of Arizona and New Mexico.

Mr. MOON of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL].

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, the rule which was adopted and under which this bill is being considered precludes the possibility of amendment. Therefore nothing remains for us when the time comes to vote but to vote for or against the measure as a whole. The bill contains two separate, distinct propositions. It provides for the admission into the Union of the Territories of Oklahoma and Indian Territory as a single State, which we all favor and favorable action on which should have been taken by Congress at least two years ago; and the other proposition is the jointure of the Territories of New Mexico and Arizona against the unanimous, earnest, vehement protest of the people of Arizona, and, I believe, contrary to the wish of the people of New Mexico, who have been brought to a half-hearted support of this measure only because they believe that in this way alone can they secure admission to the Union at this time. While I favor that portion of the bill that relates to Oklahoma, I am so unalterably opposed to that portion providing for the jointure of the Territories of Arizona and New Mexico that I shall vote against the bill as a whole.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] said yesterday in the course of his remarks: "When these Territories are filled up with a sufficient population to be admitted as independent States in this Union, the Congress that then exists will deal justly and fairly, I have no doubt, with the question." Certainly the gentleman did not mean to hold out the hope that there could ever be a division of the proposed State of Arizona if this bill providing for the jointure of the two Territories shall become a law. We all know that the action taken by this Congress, if the bill shall pass, will settle the question for all time. That only through war or revolution will there be a division of one or a jointure of two American States.

The same gentleman, in the course of his remarks, complained because there are fourteen States in the Union that have twenty-eight Senators and only twenty-eight Representatives; because there are six with twelve Senators and only six Representatives, and he clearly indicated the motives that controlled him in his vote by his appeal in behalf of the people east of the west line of Kansas as against the people west of that line. The gentleman is frank enough to admit that he is endeavoring to curtail western representation in the United States Senate. If he had the power to do it, I assume from the line of his argument that neither Arizona nor New Mexico nor the two Territories joined would be admitted to the Union.

The gentleman complains of this so-called inequality of representation in the Senate of the United States, as though it were not a fundamental feature of our political system, established and provided for by the fathers, and continued in all the legislation touching the admission of States since the foundation of the Government.

The very worst that could occur to Oklahoma is a delay of a few months, possibly a year, in the date of its admission to the Union, while if we force this unwilling wedlock of Arizona and New Mexico, without benefit of clergy, with no recourse to divorce courts, we shall have committed a wrong that can never be rectified.

Mr. DALZELL. May I ask my friend a question? Does the gentleman not know that the admission of these new States was never contemplated nor foreseen by the men who made the Constitution? The gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN] has just read, not ten minutes ago, speeches made not more than twenty or thirty years ago in the United States Senate, predicting that the western country never would become part of the United States. Surely the gentleman does not mean to contend that the men who made the Constitution contemplated that we were going to have such a Senate as we have now, as compared with the House of Representatives?

Mr. MONDELL. I think they did, Mr. Chairman. There was almost as great a difference in the population of the States admitted into the Union as there is between some of the newer

and some of the older States to-day, and the men who framed the Constitution of the United States, by the ordinance of 1787, provided for the admission into the Union of States when they should have a population one-fifth the average population of the States at that time and a population of about one-tenth of several of the States at that time. This must of necessity be. In the first instance it was necessary in order to form this "more perfect union," and in a country growing and developing as ours is, where the star of empire and the center of population is ever moving westward, there must of necessity be an inequality of representation in the Senate on the basis of population, unless the Western Territories of the Union were kept waiting for a century to have an opportunity to develop to the full stature of the largest States, and unless later, when the West is fully developed, the smaller Eastern States were consolidated, which, of course, could never occur.

But as the gentleman has complained here of this fundamental principle of our Government, I suppose gentlemen in coming days will do the same. In that future day when the historian, sitting in the shade of the orange groves and the oleander hedges of the Salt River Valley of Arizona, amid all the splendid evidences of the tremendous population, wonderful development, and magnificent civilization that shall flourish there, shall write the history of the worked-out coal measures, the exhausted oil fields, the chilled and silent furnaces, and dismantled mills of the now great Commonwealth of Pennsylvania—the story of the passing of that store of fuel upon which her present imperial greatness rests—possibly in that day some Representative of that glorious Southwest will arise here and, equally forgetful as other gentlemen have been of this great principle of our Government, will complain because his magnificent, populous, mighty Commonwealth has no more representation in the Senate of the United States than declining and waning States east of the Allegheny Mountains. I hope not, but I imagine that may occur.

In the day that is sure to come when the magnificent Commonwealth I have the honor to represent on this floor shall have fully developed her 30,000 square miles of coal lands and shall have an output of hundreds of millions of tons of fuel per year, when the mighty steam shovels shall ceaselessly feed her inexhaustible mountains of iron ore into the devouring maws of countless furnaces and mills, when her limitless fields of oil and gas shall light the midnight heavens with the glory of her numberless factory fires, when her fertile valleys and uplands shall all bear golden and abundant harvests, and her splendid citizenship shall have multiplied a hundredfold, possibly some Representative of that mighty Commonwealth may stand on this floor and carp and cavil because the fathers ordained that a State, without regard to its infancy or its decadence, should have equal representation on the floor of the United States Senate. I hope that will never occur. I trust that in that coming day no Representative of the glorious golden West, of the heroic, chivalric West, will ever be so ungenerous as to twit gentlemen from other States upon the fact that his magnificent Commonwealth has so outstripped them in the race of development, progress, and prosperity.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that the unwilling jointure of the Territories of Arizona and New Mexico in a single State would be as unfortunate for the balance of the Union as it would be unfair to the people of those Territories, that as great as the outrage would be upon the people of Arizona to compel them against their will to enter the Union as the hopeless minority of the proposed Commonwealth, in the long run the Union as a whole would be the greater loser from this enforced alliance.

Let us reflect for a moment what the proposed action involves. First, the jointure of two Territories against the vehement protest of practically all of the people of one and with only the tardy, luke-warm acquiescence of the inhabitants of the other in the belief that only by agreeing to this distasteful alliance, which places them in the attitude of aiding and abetting in the outrage of a sister Territory, can they hope to obtain statehood. Second, the absolute disregard of the rights and the wishes of at least 150,000 citizens of the United States, if we count only the people of Arizona and do not take into consideration the large number in New Mexico, to whom this jointure is repugnant. Third, the creation of a State of such tremendous dimensions that, owing to its peculiar mountainous topography, the administration of its internal affairs could only be accomplished at enormous cost in revenue and never-ending vexation, expense, and loss of time to its citizens. The proposed State would contain 236,283 square miles—six times the area of Ohio—which, together with the State of Texas, containing 262,506 square miles, and California, with 156,203 square miles, constitutes an area of 654,992 squares miles, or over one-fifth of our continental territory, largely of rich and fertile lands in three States. Were all of our States of the same average area we should have less than twelve instead of forty-five States.

The argument is made in support of this enforced jointure that the two Territories separately are not prepared for statehood; that they have neither the population nor the resources necessary to support a proper State government, nor to constitute States which in population, wealth, intelligence, and resources are entitled to be placed upon a par with the other Commonwealths of the Union.

I do not pretend to say, in view of the critical attitude which so many of our leading statesmen have assumed in these latter days toward Territories seeking statehood, and of the great growth in wealth and population of the balance of the country, that there may not be some question as to the wisdom, propriety, and justice of bringing either or both of these Territories separately into the Union at this time. My contention is that the people of these Territories should have a fair opportunity and a reasonable length of time in which to demonstrate the value and permanence of their mineral resources, their possibility of development along agricultural lines, with a view of determining whether or no each of them separately is capable of permanently supporting, according to American standards of living, a population sufficient in numbers to warrant their being brought into the Union with all the rights and privileges of sovereign States.

I know there are some who, departing from the time-honored policy of the Republic and of our party, would, if they had the power, insist that all new Territories should have a development as complete as that of great States before admission into the Union, and who, I fear, if they had their way about it, would thrust from the Union some States already admitted. I can not hope to appeal successfully to the judgment of those who hold such views, but I do appeal to those who hold the old-fashioned ideas that every Territory of the Union which has a sufficient population of the proper character to support and maintain according to American standards a State government, and having resources which may be reasonably expected to support a large and prosperous population permanently, shall be eventually admitted into the Union.

Mr. Chairman, at one time and another, here and elsewhere, some of those who have discussed this question have been taken to task because they presumed to suggest that every part or portion of our country is entitled to just and equitable treatment as compared with other portions, and some gentlemen have assumed to refer to this as "sectionalism." Mr. Chairman, I am not disturbed by such suggestions. I have long since discovered that it is a habit with some people to charge others with errors and faults of which they are themselves the most conspicuous victims. To say that the people of the Southwest are entitled to fair and reasonable treatment, compared with other portions of the country, in connection with the consideration of the question of the admission of their Territory into the Union, is not to discuss the issue from a sectional standpoint in any offensive sense, but from the standpoint of truth and justice.

I maintain, Mr. Chairman, that it is not only of the utmost importance to the people inhabiting any portion of the United States that they shall have the opportunity to come into the Union under such conditions as regards extent of territory and character of political organization as will enable them to establish, develop, and maintain a Commonwealth that can be administered economically, that is homogeneous and harmonious, providing, of course, that there is a reasonable probability of such a State fairly well measuring up, by all proper standards, with the average of their sister States, but it is also important to other portions of the Union that this should be done, in order that there may be that fair balance of power, influence, and responsibility which was the intention of the founders of the Republic and upon which its greatness and stability rests.

I have no quarrel, Mr. Chairman, with the facts of history touching the inequality of area, population, and wealth so marked among the thirteen original States of the Union and by comparison with most of the States of the Union which have been added since. Each has performed, in its own way and along its own lines of development, useful, helpful, and honorable service to the nation. The absence of any one of them or the consolidation of any two of them would have been an inestimable loss to the nation, and each and every one has added its important quota to the sum total of that development along industrial, economic, educational, social, and governmental lines which, in its entirety, measures the glory and the progress of the Republic.

Mr. Chairman, the question of equal representation in the Senate of the United States is but a minor and relatively unimportant factor in the sum total of the power and influence of a Commonwealth in the Republic. Maine, New Hampshire,

Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and Connecticut as one Commonwealth might have had, had it been so ordained, the same numerical strength in the Senate that the six Commonwealths have to-day; and yet does anyone imagine that thus joined they would have exerted anything like the splendid and helpful influence upon the life and history of the Republic that they have exerted as six separate Commonwealths?

This is a government of the people, for the people, and by the people, but it is not a mobocracy; the people exert their influence locally and nationally along well-defined lines. Under our form of government the united voice of the people constitutes public sentiment, and public sentiment is exerted largely by and through Commonwealths. It is so in this body. To the strength of a Congressional delegation is added the force and power and effectiveness which results from the action on many contested points of a State delegation as a unit. In national conventions party platforms more nearly register the united judgment of the States than the opinion of the majority of the lump sum and total of the delegates. In every healthful, useful movement—political, economic, educational—the voice of the American people in assembly and convention expresses itself infinitely more through the solidarity of State units than by mere numerical majority.

The field of our activities in this body is narrow and restricted. The activities of the Commonwealth cover an infinitely wider field and to a vastly greater extent affect the daily life and the personal interests of the individual. Every American Commonwealth is independent of every other, working out the numberless and multiplying problems which confront a free people in the onward march of civilization. You may not applaud the methods of Maine and Kansas in their efforts to put an end to the evils of intemperance by prohibition; you may doubt the wisdom of South Carolina in its legislative efforts to minimize those evils by a State dispensary; you may not in all respects hold wise the legislation of Texas in her efforts to curb the power of great corporations; you may even lag behind the onward march of Massachusetts in her legislation to better conditions surrounding those who labor, and to protect the children of the Commonwealth; you may differ from the citizens of my State in their views and practice as to woman suffrage; perhaps you do not believe in the Iowa idea; and yet we must all admit that these activities mark the earnestness with which the American Commonwealths, along the lines which seem best to the majority of their people, are trying to work out the great problems of the ages, and no student of American history but must confess the obligation which the nation owes to each and every one for its contribution to the sum total of our moral, intellectual, and material betterment.

But for the clarion call of California, which for a long time fell upon the unheeding ears of the country, we would not have awakened to the infinitely deplorable problems that would surround the assimilation of a vast horde of Asiatics into our body politic. More than once Massachusetts has sounded the call to a great national duty; from Mississippi has come—sometimes many of us have thought with unnecessary insistence and persistence—the challenge to stand guard against the tendencies toward centralization, which, in their essential features, are no more approved in Maine than in Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, rather than fewer we need more American Commonwealths, providing that they fairly well measure up to the proper and reasonable dignity of an American State.

Now, it happened that by the fortunes of war, through the sacrifice of patriots and as an inevitable outcome of valorous and heroic deeds, there came into the Union as one State, with the privilege of later dividing, the Republic of Texas, with her 262,000 square miles of territory, a little less in area than that of all of the thirteen original States. There she stands to-day, proud of her magnitude as she is of her history, indivisible, as one of her eloquent sons has said, not that division might not be in the interest of economy of administration and lead to a possible increase of influence, but because it is impossible to divide and separate her priceless legacy of the heroic sacrifice and devotion of her founders.

The irresistible magnet of gold drew to the Pacific coast of our newly acquired Mexican possessions the bold, daring, and adventurous pioneer. The fabulous wealth lying ready for the harvest in many a lode and placer attracted a great population, whom the exigencies of the situation led to seek admission to the Union before the possible development of the region and the coming great increase of population had been dreamed of or suspected, and, under these conditions, added a new star to the banner of the Republic, whose rays illuminated a territory of 156,000 square miles, or over three times the extent of any other State in the Union at that time. Thus, not in the ordinary course of events, but by the fortunes of war and the exigencies of political, not party, conditions, there came into the Union down on the Rio Grande and on the southern reaches of the Pacific two States, comprising more than one-eighth of the entire territory of the Union.

I shall not argue how nearly the advantages and disadvantages surrounding the situation of these two States in the Union compare relatively, but they came into the Union as complete and distinct political entities. Each had its individual history and traditions. There was neither consolidation nor division of political units in their admission to the Union. They remained as they had been, bearing the same names they had always borne, without the sharing or surrender of any of their history or traditions, without division or loss of any of their accomplishments or aspirations as a people.

Now, the admission and the presence of these two great States, one on the coast and the other on the Gulf, in the Southwest, is held by the proponents of this bill as an argument why the two Territories now under discussion should be joined. But it seems to me, Mr. Chairman, instead of this condition of affairs being an argument for, it is rather an argument against the proposed action, for the conditions were entirely dissimilar. California, whatever may be the expense and difficulties of administering State affairs in so large a territory, is homogeneous, a common ocean fronts the entire length of her territory, practically the same general conditions exist in all portions of the State. Texas, without mountains, compact, with the differing conditions in the distantly separated portions of the State blending almost imperceptibly one into the other, can form no criterion for the action that is now proposed.

But, Mr. Chairman, the presence in that great Southwest country of two great States which are vast, not only in territory, but so rich in resources that they will ultimately contain greater populations than almost any of their sister States, is an argument for the exercise of care, not only in the interest of the Southwest, but of all the country as well, that the people of the remaining territory in that region be not forced into unwilling jointure in another vast, and in this case, unwieldy and inharmonious, State, but rather that time and opportunity be given them to demonstrate to the satisfaction of the most critical, carping, and exacting that they have sufficient resources, when developed, to support two prosperous and populous Commonwealths, measuring well up to the best American standards, and in all essential elements equal to the average of their sister States.

Mr. Chairman, in the limited time at my disposal it would be impossible for me to discuss, except with the utmost brevity, the present condition and the future possibilities of the Territories of Arizona and New Mexico, with a view of setting forth the facts upon which to found an opinion as to whether these Territories, either now or at some future time, are or shall be, by virtue of their population, wealth, and resources, entitled to admission into the Union as two States, but I propose to treat of these subjects briefly. No one will suggest that either of the Territories has not sufficient area to make a State of imperial size. The area of New Mexico, compact in form, and measuring 122,545 square miles, is three times that of Ohio and nearly thirteen times that of Massachusetts. Her population, at the time of the census of 1900, was 195,310, an increase in ten years of 42,000. From the best available sources of information, it is safe to say that her population at this time is more than 250,000, a greater population than most of the States have had when admitted into the Union.

I shall not go into the question of the character of this population, because I take it for granted, that the Committee on Territories having concluded, after careful consideration, that the population is of a character entitling them to joint statehood, it will scarcely be urged that it is such as would debar New Mexico from admission into the Union as a single State, providing other conditions are satisfactory. As a matter of fact, while there are a considerable number of people in New Mexico who speak the Spanish language, it is also true that there are comparatively few who do not also speak English, and the percentage of Spanish-speaking population is constantly decreasing, and it is conceded that they are a God-fearing, law-abiding people.

In considering the claims of the friends of jointure that Arizona and New Mexico have not proven the existence within their borders of sufficient resources to permanently support large populations, it should be remembered that both of these Territories are on the extreme frontier, and in the case of New Mexico, until within a very few years, a large portion of her territory was claimed as grants from Spain and Mexico, and by reason of these claims, which have only been adjusted within the last ten years, both mining and agricultural development has been largely delayed and retarded.

New Mexico has within her borders, according to a report

issued by the Geological Survey in 1902, no less than eleven known coal areas, which in the present state of very limited development, in the report of the same bureau for 1904, are said to contain 1,849,600 acres. This area is estimated to contain 8,813,840,000 tons of coal valued, at an exceedingly low estimate, at $10,000,000,000. Anyone acquainted with the history of coal development knows that, in all probability, the area which will finally be developed will vastly exceed that which has been uncovered and mapped out in the course of the very limited prospecting and development already carried on.

These coals are among the very best bituminous coals in the country. Taken as a whole, they average higher in quality than any coals west of the Allegheny Mountains. In common with Colorado, New Mexico shares in the distinction of being one of the two regions west of the Alleghenies which contain and produce true anthracite. Her vast area of coal lands already prospected would give New Mexico an annual coal tonnage equal to the present bituminous output of Pennsylvania for nearly one hundred years. The value of this wonderful deposit of fuel is greatly enhanced by the fact that there is a vast territory to the south, southeast, and southwest which contains practically no fuel, and which must depend upon New Mexico for fuel for its homes, mines, mills, and manufactories, assuring a mighty industry in coal and coke.

The Territory also contains deposits of iron ore which, as the demand increases, will probably be found to be very considerable in extent, and with a certainty that there will ultimately be built up there numerous manufacturing industries in iron and steel which will make New Mexico a second Pennsylvania.

The Territory also contains enormous deposits of other valuable minerals. In 1903 over 7,000,000 pounds of copper were produced, as well as gold and silver, graphite, gypsum, mica, turquoise, zinc, and other minerals in considerable quantities. But great as are the mineral resources of the Territory, magnificent as her development in mineral production is certain to be, she has infinitely greater wealth in her wonderful soil, and I shall refer to this a little later.

Rich as is New Mexico in mineral, Arizona has greatly exceeded her in actual production, and to-day has a mineral output far in excess of that of any Territory at the time of its admission into the Union. Arizona's copper product for the year 1904 is given by the Geological Survey as 191,602,958 pounds, and as estimated for the calendar year 1905 by the Iron Age it amounts to 255,000,000 pounds, of an approximated value of $30,000,000, while her gold and silver output amounts to about $5,000,000 per annum, or $35,000,000 per annum from the production of these three minerals alone.

The Territory contains deposits of and produces, in addition to the minerals above referred to, asbestos, fluorspar, gypsum, malachite, marble, and many other valuable minerals. The mineral wealth of the Territory alone is sufficient to maintain, for an indefinite time to come, a large and prosperous population. But as Territories should not be admitted into the Union on the basis of their area in square miles, neither should we admit them with the expectation that their mineral wealth alone will, in connection with the manufactories that they produce and develop, support large populations permanently. After all is said and done, the surest and best foundation for a commonwealth is found in a fertile and productive soil, and fortunately, contrary to the generally accepted and popular view among those who have not thoroughly investigated the subject, both Arizona and New Mexico are rich in fertile soils, and not lacking, to the extent that has been popularly supposed, in the life-giving waters which make these soils productive.

It is true that these Territories contain vast areas of lands that can never be utilized except for pasture, that they have some areas that are desert and practically valueless; but we should remember that two-thirds of the Territory of New Mexico might be utterly obliterated from the face of the map and still leave an area as large as the great State of Ohio, that two-thirds of Arizona might be absolutely valueless and there still remain an area as large as Indiana.

While a considerable portion of both Territories is most valuable for grazing purposes, the area of valuable agricultural land is by no means as limited as has been generally supposed. According to estimates of the Reclamation Service, Arizona contains about 1,000,000 and New Mexico about 800,000 acres of lands that may be irrigated in their larger river valleys—in Arizona along the Gila, Salt, Colorado and its tributaries, and in New Mexico along the Rio Grande and its tributaries, the Canadian, the Pecos, and other streams. Let it be remembered that this is simply an estimate of possible irrigation in large areas along the principal streams, and does not take into consideration the practically limitless opportunities for irrigation by pumping, storage, and flood irrigation all over the two Territories. It should not be forgotten that these two Territories—the portions where the greatest opportunities for irrigation occur—have a tropical and semitropical climate; that the soil is marvelously rich; that there are no lands on earth, not excepting the Valleys of the Nile or the Ganges, more fertile than the Valleys of the Gila, the Salt, the Colorado, the Rio Grande, and the Pecos, or that the lands which may be irrigated along those streams produce practically all the products of the Tropics, and that the production per acre is from two and three to twenty times the value of the production per acre of the rich lands of the upper Mississippi Valley.

The Salt River Valley in Arizona produces practically every useful agricultural crop from the cereals of the North Temperate Zone to the date palm of Arabia, and these irrigated lands will support as great a population per acre, and under the improved and intense methods of agriculture practiced, will very probably sustain a greater population than any irrigated area on earth. Egypt, on 5,000,000 acres of irrigated land less than the irrigable area of Arizona and New Mexico, with no forests, no mineral, and few manufactures, supports a population of 11,000,000 souls, pays three millions tribute annually to the Sultan, supports an army of 30,000 men, and one of the most expensive governments on earth, with a staggering bonded debt on which interest must be paid.

But this reclamation of the large river valleys will but mark the beginning of development, for the ultimate irrigated area of both Territories will unquestionably be several times that of their great irrigable valleys. British India has 13,000,000 acres of land irrigated by pumps. In the Madras Province there are upward of 40,000 tanks or reservoirs for the storage of water for use in irrigation. With the marvelous climate and the wonderful soil of these two Territories, surely American energy, genius, and enterprise will not lag behind the populations of India in the development of their irrigation possibilities. To those who suggest that this is chimerical, fanciful, improbable, I would say read the history of every irrigated country on earth; learn what has been done as proof of what will be done in these splendid Territories with ther rich soil and their marvelous climate, which brings to maturity the orange, the fig, and the pomegranate.

But the agricultural possibilities of these two Territories are by no means limited by the area of their irrigable lands. We are fast learning that all lands are not arid or even semiarid within the so-called "arid region." There is in every arid State and Territory of the West considerable areas of land which have hitherto been considered valuable only for pasturage and utilized for that purpose, that with the growth of population and the demand for agricultural products, will be utilized and cultivated for the growth of cereals, forage plants, and vegetables. No one feature of western development in the past few years is more striking and carries greater promise for the future than the increase of lands adapted to so-called "dry farming." Let those who are skeptical on this subject visit the wheat fields of eastern Washington and Oregon, or the dry farming lands of my State. Lands that a few years ago were considered suitable only for grazing and of no great value for that purpose, now produce millions of bushels of wheat and other cereals; vast areas which but a decade ago supported only a few scattered flocks and herds are now under cultivation and supporting large populations.

Fortunately for Arizona and New Mexico, they both contain large areas of land adapted to this class of agriculture. While the southern portion of both Territories is low in altitude, has but limited rainfall, and is arid or desert in character, the northern portions of both Territories are elevated and have an annual precipitation that places them within the semiarid rather than the arid belt. It has been demonstrated in many portions of the intermountain west, from Canada to Mexico, that loam soils having an annual precipitation of from 12 to 20 inches, fairly well distributed, produce, particularly where the land lies fallow every alternate year, forage plants, grains, and vegetables in sufficient quantity and certainty to make their cultivation profitable. Both New Mexico and Arizona have very considerable areas with a rainfall of from 13 to 20 inches and altitudes from five to seven thousand feet and a rich loam soil—ideal conditions for so-called "dry farming"—and in many places in the regions referred to farming without irrigation is now carried on to a limited extent profitably and satisfactorily.

I know that it will be said that these suggestions are largely in the nature of prophecy and that the development to which I have referred is too remote to warrant considering it as a basis of the population requisite for the establishment and maintenance of an American State, but I deny that this development is but a possibility. It is assured by what has already been done in other portions of the West and by reason of which the ultimate vast agricultural development of these two Territories is

assured. In any event, in view of the development elsewhere under like conditions, the least we can in justice do is to give these Territories an opportunity to develop their resources, to show what can be done within their borders, and not force them into an unwilling union when there is every reason to believe they will, within a very short time, have demonstrated their ability to maintain large and prosperous populations.

It will and has been urged that these Territories have had the opportunities of development in the long years of their settlement. The fact has been referred to and reiterated that they were the first regions of the present territory of the United States to be settled by white men, and that therefore they should have a much greater development at this time than we find there. Assuredly such an argument can have but little weight with any reasonable student of history. So far as opportunities for any considerable development were concerned, Arizona and New Mexico might as well have been undiscovered countries during the period they were under the dominion of Spain and Mexico. They were outlying provinces far from any considerable population, without means of transportation. Even the marvelous copper deposits of Arizona were valueless until reached by railways from the States. The vast coal deposits of New Mexico are even now almost untouched. Such deposits can be utilized to no considerable extent except with the advance of population, settlement, building up of manufacturing industries, and the establishment of those conditions could only come from the settlement of large populations in adjacent regions.

To-day Arizona and New Mexico are the extreme frontier of the Republic. There has been only a limited development of the farming possibilities of the two Territories, because the sparse population, depending upon mining and cattle grazing, the first industries of a new country, has had little incentive to agricultural development; settlers have not been attracted there while there remained nearer to the older States of the Union the illimitable, fertile plains of the Mississippi Valley. Those lands having been largely settled and developed, the tide of immigration, the flood of homeseekers, must in the very near future spread over these Territories and develop their agricultural, as well as their mineral, resources. The growth and development of an irrigated agricultural region is always necessarily slow, tedious, and laborious; but once the costly works necessary to bring the water within reach of the arid soil have been constructed the tendency is to a constant subdivision of the lands into small areas and the growth of only the more valuable crops, producing larger returns per acre and supporting dense populations.

That Arizona is not the hopeless and arid wilderness that it has been pictured to be by the gentlemen who are insisting upon the jointure of these two Territories is eloquently proclaimed by the fact that she has vast areas of timber lands practically untouched. Arizona and New Mexico together have, according to Governor Brodie, "the largest single belt of pine timber in the United States, exending from the Grand Canyon into New Mexico, covering an area of from 60 to 80 miles in width and 300 miles in length." The enormous amount of timber on these lands is almost beyond calculation.

Governor Kibbe, of Arizona, in his annual report for 1905, referring to the timber lands of the Territory, says:

> Probably the largest unbroken forest in the world lies within the San Francisco Mountains and Black Mesa Forest Reserves. Its area is estimated at 6,000 square miles, * * * but the timbered area of the northern portion of the Territory stretches to and beyond the Grand Canyon on the north to Bill Williams Mountain on the west, and southward to the great rim where the Colorado plateau breaks to the southern plains. In the Mogallon Mountains * * * there are, in addition to yellow pine, large bodies of oak timber suitable for the manufacture of farm machinery, wagons, etc., and for finishing lumber.

Lands which produce such timber are not arid, and large areas within these timber belts will ultimately be utilized for agricultural purposes.

Those who have sought to minimize the possibilities in agriculture of these great Territories have quoted from statements of the members of scientific bureaus of the Government relative to the probable areas susceptible of irrigation. These statements have, in practically every instance, been limited to the possibilities within the larger valleys, and none of them have taken into consideration or pretended to base their estimate upon the possible or even probable development by the irrigation of small isolated tracts. It is a conservative estimate to say that, in addition to the 2,000,000 acres that will unquestionably be irrigated in the larger irrigable valleys of Arizona and New Mexico, at no distant period there will be at least an equal area that will be irrigated by pumping, by the impounding of flood waters in small reservoirs, and by flood irrigation, and to this aggregate of four or five million acres we must add at least an equal area—probably a considerably larger area—that will be cultivated and farmed without irrigation.

In addition to this are the marvelous possibilities of the Territories in stock raising and dairying. In connection with the discussion of this feature of the situation, some very curious statements have been made. Some time in the past some one seems to have made the very natural remark that grazing animals can not feed the grass of the ranges more than 5 miles on each side of water, and immediately gentlemen whose business and purpose it is to minimize the possibilities of the Territories begin to argue that even the grazing possibilities are limited to strips of territory 10 miles in width along the streams. I would advise gentlemen who have been using that kind of argument to visit the range country of the West and learn what the actual conditions are. One does not need to know much about the habits of grazing animals to know that they can not ordinarily graze more than 5 miles from water. As a matter of fact, that distance is rather beyond a reasonable limit, but everybody knows, who knows anything about the western country that stock water is found to but a limited extent in flowing streams; that over the greater portion of the region stock is watered in water holes, where the water gathers in times of storm, and where these water holes are not found or where there is a likelihood of their drying up during the grazing season, small reservoirs are built, wells are sunk, windmills erected, tanks are constructed, and thus every blade of the valuable grass is eventually utilized. Of all of the arguments that have been used relative to the productive capacities of these Territories, I imagine this 5-mile-grazing argument has most clearly indicated to those who know the facts the lack of knowledge of conditions among those who assume to speak of the possibilities of these Territories.

Not only are the possibilities of growth and development in these two Territories vast and boundless, but they have been developing in the past few years since railways have reached them, since the tide of immigration has been setting toward them, in a way that ought to have stopped the mouths of these carping critics. In the last census Arizona showed a per capita value of farm products higher than that of Ohio, double that of New York, and four times that of Massachusetts. While the increase in value of the farm products of the farms of the entire Union from 1890 to 1900 was only 28 per cent, that of Arizona was 160 per cent; while the increase of the farms of the Union in that decade was 92 per cent, that of Arizona was 470 per cent.

On these arid plains, with the water limitations gentlemen have so eloquently portrayed, there are, in Arizona alone, more sheep than in all New England and more cattle than in half the States of the Union. While she is not asking for admission into the Union at this time, she had even five years ago a greater population than twenty States had when they were admitted, and her percentage of increase in population between 1890 and 1900 exceeded that of any State in the Union. She actually gained more population between 1890 and 1900 than Kansas and Delaware combined, and the percentage of her increase in mineral output for the last five years exceeded that of any American Commonwealth.

These two Territories are forging ahead by leaps and bounds. Their development long delayed by reason of the vast area of fertile lands lying nearer the older settled States, their mineral development retarded by lack of transportation and markets, is now growing with marvelous rapidity. To the doubting Thomases who can see no possibility of future growth and development in these splendid Territories I would commend as a warning the words of faint-hearted statesmen of other days relative to other Territories of the Union, and I look forward to the time in the not distant future when the marvelous development of these Territories will prove how lacking they are in the gift of prophecy. The doleful forbodings of the Josiah Quincys of to-day, remind us of the original Josiah, who, when the great Territory of Louisiana was purchased, filled the Hall of the House of Representatives with his doleful croakings of the destruction of the liberties and property of the people by the admission into the Union of these lands and their inhabitants. They are not the first Representatives in Congress who have seen no good in certain portions of American territory. Arizona and New Mexico look no better to them than Oregon did to some gentlemen of the same disposition who were in the House at the time that Territory was admitted into the Union.

But, Mr. Chairman, in spite of all these lugubrious predictions we have developed and populated the Territory of Louisiana and the State of Oregon; we have even found Alaska, by many gentlemen high in public life at the time of its purchase held to be worthless, of some value. And when in the days to come Arizona and New Mexico, as splendid States of the Union, shall

be teeming with a prosperous, intelligent, and industrious population, when their agricultural and mineral resources shall have been developed, when their splendid climate shall have attracted to their borders, as it has already done to a certain extent, vast numbers of the most enlightened and progressive of our people, the descendants of these gentlemen of little faith will see their names coupled in unenviable notoriety with those of the pessimists and croakers of other days, who, like they, have been proven false prophets.

Mr. Chairman, by reason of their isolated location, by reason of the character of their resources requiring unusual time, effort, courage, and enterprise for their development, some portions of the Territory we acquired from Mexico are still but in the morning of their growth; but the pledge, given in good faith when they became a part of our territory—a pledge which has not been overlooked or forgotten by our party platforms—should be kept in good faith. The people of these Territories, the last to come into the Union, are entitled to fair treatment. They have for half a century been developing two American Territories, each along its own line, each with its own traditions, hopes, and aspirations. I have no criticism to make of the people of either Territory. They are, in my opinion, all of them good material for American citizenship, infinitely superior to millions we are getting from abroad, but the people of the two Territories, understanding their differences, prefer to come into the Union separately. We can not afford to ignore their wishes and desires. We can not afford to deny justice to the Southwest. We can not, in view of our traditions, our practices in the past, our promises, deny them an opportunity, if we do no more, to still further develop their region and demonstrate their possibility of growth and development. New Mexico, with her mixture of Spanish and American blood, Arizona, with her splendid citizenship, will each of them make States of which their sisters may well be proud. Let us give them both an opportunity to fully qualify for separate entrance into the sisterhood of States.

Mr. MOON of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. FLOYD].

Mr. FLOYD. Mr. Chairman, I have no disposition to enter into any lengthy discussion of a question which is already practically decided. I simply rise for the purpose of entering my protest against the passage of this bill in its present form. The distinguished chairman of the committee said on yesterday that it was sometimes necessary to use one poison to counteract another, but it seems to me that in the bill now under consideration they have injected too many poisons for a Representative in the American Congress who believe in justice to the people concerned in this legislation to vote for it.

Much has been said in defense of Arizona. Little has been said in regard to the union of the Indian Territory with Oklahoma. I want to explain my position on that question. Rather than not have statehood for the Indian Territory and Oklahoma I should vote for joint statehood between them if that question were submitted to Congress as a separate proposition, but I want to submit that there is serious objection to the admission of Oklahoma and the Indian Territory under the restrictions of the present bill. What is the condition? One part of the new State of Oklahoma will be under Federal jurisdiction to a certain limited extent. One part of the State of Oklahoma will not be under Federal jurisdiction. One part of the State of Oklahoma will be, by virtue of a Federal statute, under prohibition to a limited extent, and another part of the State of Oklahoma will not have prohibition, but will be open so far as the liquor question is concerned.

Mr. HAMILTON. If the gentleman will pardon me, prohibition will not be by Federal statute, but by constitutional enactment.

Mr. FLOYD. I understand it will be a constitutional enactment. If the State goes into the Union under this bill it is required to incorporate into that constitution this question of prohibition.

Mr. HAMILTON. That is true.

Mr. FLOYD. Now, one, and perhaps the most distinguished, leader of the Republican party once said that no nation could exist half slave and half free, and I submit that it is an unjust and unwise provision to require one part of a State to submit to certain laws and another part be left open and free upon that question. But I think, Mr. Chairman, that the wishes of the Indians are entitled to be considered upon this question. What are the desires of the people of the Indian Territory in regard to statehood? If the question was submitted to them, nine-tenths of the population of the Indian Territory would vote for separate statehood for the Indian Territory. I think as they are the wards of the nation, as we have by a policy pursued in the past enabled the Five Civilized Tribes to rise to a high degree of civilization, that their wishes, when it comes to this question of statehood, should be considered.

The distinguished chairman of the committee on yesterday, in closing his remarks in a splendid and eloquent peroration, described this Union of forty-five States, and said he wanted to add two more stars to that glorious flag. When our Pilgrim fathers landed in this country the Indians occupied this vast territory from the Atlantic to the Pacific. Step by step the white man encroached on their rights until finally, by the negotiation of treaties with their chiefs in Georgia and in Alabama and other portions of the country, the Indian Territory was set apart for them. [Applause.]

It was to be their country, their heritage, to them and their posterity forever. They were permitted under the treaties to make their own laws, govern their local affairs, punish their own criminals, and where the rights of the white man or the Government were not involved for years and years the Government interfered in no way with their local concerns. Under subsequent treaties and by acts of Congress former conditions have been changed, allotments have been made of their land, and on the 4th day of March, 1906, their tribal relations are to cease and the Indian race as a nationality is to die.

The Indian chief, the highest official ruler of the tribe, is to be relegated from authority, and the people of the Indian Territory—the Indians and others who have settled amongst them and intermarried with them—are to assume a new and different relation to the Government than that existing heretofore.

I insist that on account of and by reason of the peculiar conditions existing there, growing out of mixed and varying property rights and former customs, usages, laws, and the habits of industry of these people, it would not be wise and expedient to unite their Territory in a State with Oklahoma. Complications of law, vexed questions of taxation, road making, and other issues will arise that will produce annoyance, disagreements, and antagonisms between the two sections of the Commonwealth that can all be avoided by separate statehood.

We, the people of the United States, have appropriated all the rest of this vast domain, from ocean to ocean, to our own use, except the Indian Territory. Then, why not, in the final adjustment of the question, keep faith with our own treaties made with the Indians, segregate the Indian Territory, their country, to the "noble race and brave," who, notwithstanding occasional cruelty in war, have ever manifested the high and exalted virtues of love of country, love of home, and that inflexible courage and bravery, which never fails to find a sympathetic chord in the hearts of all mankind, whether displayed by a Japanese soldier from the mast of a sinking battle ship or by a brave American boy as he rushes to death in a charge up San Juan Hill, or an Indian warrior in a hand-to-hand contest with the invincible white man.

They desire separate statehood, and I assert, as a Member upon this floor, that the equity of the situation is such and our obligations by treaties are such as to entitle them to it as an act of simple justice. Here I desire to pay a worthy tribute to the Five Civilized Tribes. Under legal conditions and restrictions that have hampered them at every step of their progress, they have builded in their beautiful country a splendid civilization. They have their farms, their factories, their mills, their stores, their schools and churches, and a number of magnificent cities.

My district borders upon their country. Iron posts, set one mile apart, placed there by the Government, mark the line between the Indian Territory and the State of Arkansas; and but for these posts no one traveling through the country could discover the boundary, so similar are the habits, the intelligence, the customs, and the manners of the people on both sides of the line.

These Indians are civilized. I have been among them. I look upon them as neighbors and friends. I am unwilling, therefore, that this act of injustice, as I see it, should be done them without registering my protest against it.

A few months ago they held a constitutional convention at Muskogee, adopted a constitution, and asked Congress to grant them separate statehood under the name of Sequoyah. Their petition has been ignored. Their wishes have been disregarded. I can conclude my remarks on this part of the subject in no more fitting language than to quote the words of the late E. C. Boudinot, a noted Cherokee. Said he:

> You talk of the noble race and brave; you tell how they once paddled their light canoes along your rocky shores, how they dipped their noble limbs into your sedgy lakes; but their wrongs are written in your histories, their names are upon your rivers, and you can not wash them out.

I do not wish to discuss the case of Arizona. It has already been ably discussed by many Members of this House who have spoken in opposition to this bill. I concur in all they have

said, and I characterize the action of the majority in their effort to enforce forever an incompatible and unholy union between the Territories of New Mexico and Arizona, against their consent and over their protests, as an act of the highest injustice, wholly unjustifiable and utterly indefensible by a people who claim that "governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed."

I also desire to protest against the rule reported on this bill and adopted by the majority, which limits debate—in fact, renders debate superfluous, and cuts off the right of amendment to a measure of such grave magnitude as the one under consideration.

At the beginning of Congress our distinguished Speaker, in his speech of acceptance, congratulated the membership of this House upon the fact that this House was the only body under our system of government where the voice of the people could be heard without the intervention of other machinery; and yet in less than two months this House is confronted by the intervention of other machinery, commonly known as a "gag rule," which stifles the voices of the people's Representatives on this floor and prevents the free, fair, and open discussion of a bill which involves the admission or rejection of Territories as sovereign States into our constitutional Union.

No reason has been given for the support of this bill except that it is a party measure. In my opinion, no reason can be given for the support of this bill except that it is a party measure. It has been argued by the gentleman from New York, who spoke in favor of this measure, that if we made four States out of these four Territories it would mean to make four Democratic States, with eight Democratic Senators. I do not know that this argument is well founded; in fact, I do not think it is well founded. I am inclined to the opinion that if the Republican party would deal fairly with the people of these respective Territories that when admitted as States some of them, perhaps all of them, would support the Republican ticket; but if the leaders of the dominant party will pursue persistently and continuously the policy adopted in this instance of overriding the expressed will and wishes of the people for whom and concerning whose rights and liberties they are legislating; if their floor managers will not yield one minute of time to members of their own party who entertain opposite views upon questions of proposed legislation, these same leaders may find in the end that, in their zeal to maintain party supremacy, instead of making four Democratic States with eight Democratic Senators they have pursued a course that has resulted in making many Democratic States with many Democratic Senators.

I know of no more appropriate words in which to conclude these remarks than to add, God speed the day.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Chairman, how much time has the gentleman on the other side consumed?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee has consumed thirty-eight minutes this morning.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Chairman, I now yield ten minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. COLE].

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, the chairman of the Committee on Territories, in a masterly and eloquent argument yesterday, assigned the principal reasons for the adoption of this measure. All we lesser lights can hope to do is to revolve about him as a solar center reflecting the radiance he has shed upon us; and in the performance of that humble yet somewhat important function I desire to call the attention of the committee to certain phases of this question which he, by reason of limited time and the necessity of some degree of generalization, has been unable to present. The gentleman from Arkansas opposes the passage of the bill because it prohibits the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors, except for mechanical and medicinal purposes, in the Indian Territory and the Indian reservations in Oklahoma. He contends that it will imperil the stability and prosperity of the new State. He reenforces his statement by the immortal maxim of Lincoln: "A nation can not permanently endure half slave and half free." I insist that the application is not proper, because it is better to encourage sobriety in one-half the State than in none at all. [Applause.]

The committee has inserted a provision in the enabling act requiring the constitutional convention of the new State of Oklahoma to provide for the prohibition of the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors in the present Indian reservations. The constitutionality of that section has been called in question. What power has the Congress to impose a special limitation upon a State? The Supreme Court has held in many cases that the States of the Union are upon an equal footing; that each possesses in the fullest degree all the incidents of State sovereignty. The regulation and control of the liquor traffic is a police power, and therefore exercised by the legislature of the State; and Congress can not reach out into a State and impose any restriction upon that right. But Congress can compel a Territory seeking statehood to insert such a provision in its constitution or deny it admission into the Union. After the Territory becomes a State, however, the people have the power to amend the constitution and strike out such a provision any time they so desire. But if a Territory accepts statehood under such conditions, there is a moral, if not a legal, obligation to maintain it.

The purpose of this prohibitive clause is to carry out the policy of the Federal Government toward the Indians since 1832. The established policy of the nation is to prohibit the sale of liquor among the Indians. The treaties signed by the Dawes Commission with the Five Civilized Tribes, under which their lands have been allotted and under which they have accepted citizenship, provided that—

> The United States agrees to maintain strict laws in the territory of the said nations against the introduction, sale, barter, or giving away of liquors and intoxicants of any kind or quality.

It was understood by the members of the Commission and by the Indians that this treaty promise should be kept sacred by the National Government. It is now the duty of this Government to use all of its powers to fulfill that promise and impose upon the State of Oklahoma the moral responsibility for the accomplishment of that purpose. That section is in line with the nation's established policy and demanded by every consideration of justice to the Indian as he assumes the great responsibility of American citizenship. [Applause.]

The gentleman from Wyoming has portrayed a beautiful picture of the progress and development of the great West. I rejoice with him as the course of empire takes its way to the westward. I can see no reason, however, for apprehension on the part of the West. We are as much interested in the West as in the East. There can be no controversy on fundamental principles between the two sections. He complains that the West is being deprived of representation in the Senate. At this time there is absolutely no foundation for that statement. The other day a gentleman from Arizona stated before the committee that five of the Southwestern States had a greater population than five of the New England States. I have had occasion to compute the population of the eleven Rocky Mountain and Pacific coast States, including New Mexico and Arizona, and that of the eleven next smallest States in the Union, and find the latter almost twice as great. The eleven States of greatest population have 40,000,000 people, in comparison with 4,000,000 of the Western States just mentioned.

The increase in population in each of the States of New York, Pennsylvania, and Illinois has been greater in the last decade than it has in the eleven Western States. Ohio has as great a population as these States. They have twenty-two United States Senators and Ohio has but two. I submit some interesting statistics to prove to my friend from Wyoming that there is no danger for some centuries to come of representation in the Senate unfair to the West.

Population of eleven Western States and Territories, 1900.

1. Arizona	122,000
2. California	1,485,000
3. Colorado	539,000
4. Idaho	161,000
5. Montana	243,000
6. Nevada	42,000
7. New Mexico	195,000
8. Utah	276,000
9. Washington	518,000
10. Wyoming	92,000
11. Oregon	413,000
Total	4,086,000

Population of the eleven smallest States, 1900.

1. Connecticut	908,000
2. Delaware	184,000
3. Florida	528,000
4. Maine	694,000
5. New Hampshire	411,000
6. Rhode Island	428,000
7. South Dakota	401,000
8. Vermont	393,000
9. West Virginia	958,000
10. Maryland	1,188,000
11. Nebraska	1,066,000
Total	7,109,000

Population of eleven largest States, 1900.

1. New York	7,268,000
2. Pennsylvania	6,302,000
3. Illinois	4,821,000
4. Ohio	4,157,000
5. Missouri	3,106,000
6. Texas	3,048,000
7. Wisconsin	2,069,000
8. Massachusetts	2,805,000

9. Michigan	2,420,000
10. Indiana	2,516,000
11. Iowa	2,231,000
Total	40,743,000

Gain in population from 1890 to 1900.

1. New York	1,265,000
2. Pennsylvania	1,044,000
3. Illinois	995,000
4. Ohio	485,000
Total	3,789,000

Population in 1890.

1. Arizona	88,243
2. California	1,213,000
3. Colorado	413,000
4. Idaho	88,000
5. Montana	142,000
6. Nevada	47,000
7. New Mexico	160,000
8. Utah	210,000
9. Washington	357,000
10. Wyoming	62,000
11. Oregon	317,000
Total	3,097,000
Population in 1900	4,086,000
Population in 1890	3,097,000
Gain in last decade	989,000

Population of the five largest cities and the gain in last decade.

City.	Population.	Gain.
1. New York	3,437,000	1,921,000
2. Chicago	1,698,000	598,000
3. Philadelphia	1,293,000	246,000
4. St. Louis	575,000	123,000
5. Boston	560,000	112,000
Total	7,563,000	3,000,000

Why should the East do injustice to the West? There are 30,000 sons of Ohio now in the State of Colorado. They are in every Western State. They are flesh of our flesh, and there must be no contentions portending future trouble. But we insist that there should be a just and proper proportion between the population of a State applying for admission into the Union and the remainder of the Republic. It does not give it to admit these Territories separately. It does not give it to admit them jointly. But we are willing, in view of the deplorable internal conditions of these Territories, which can only be remedied by the exercise of all the powers of statehood, to admit them as a single State and permit it, as every other member of this Union has done or must do, to work out for itself an equitable internal policy. There must be no sectional feeling. But we insist that you shall not substitute hills for homes and mountains for men. [Applause.]

We do not object to the quality of your citizenship. There can be none nobler. We simply say the proper proportion is not maintained. Some patriot, in eulogizing American manhood, said:

God sifted seven nations of Europe to get good seed to sow in this virgin soil, and it has produced a magnificent standard of manhood, but still Columbia sings:

"Give me men to match my mountains,
Give me men to match my plains,
Men with empires in their bosoms
And new eras in their brains;
Men to right earth's wrongs
And to cleanse old error's fen.
Give me men to match my mountains,
Give me men!"

We are pleased to accept your majestic mountains as metaphorical of men, but we pause at the substitution of mountains for men. [Applause.] Now, the gentleman from Texas contends that there are social, industrial, and sentimental reasons for not uniting these Territories. The evidence before the committee discloses that they have precisely the same school system and code of laws. Arizona is now adopting the sanitary laws of New Mexico. They have dubbed the Mexican a "greaser." It is an opprobrious epithet, defamatory of Mexican character, and repudiated by the Americans in New Mexico. If the people of Arizona can live under the sanitary provisions of the Mexican, I can't see the force of any serious objection to any other part of their statutory law. They say the people of New Mexico and of Arizona can not mingle in friendly relations. Can not amalgamate. Why? Have not the Americans in New Mexico mingled with the Mexicans there? Are not the Americans in New Mexico of the same character as the people of Arizona? They have sent a distinguished gentleman, Mr. Rodey, up here as a Delegate for the past ten years to plead their cause. He is a grand son of the Emerald Isle, a man of high character and splendid ability. He has labored with patriotic devotion for the cause of his people, and I trust that when this new star shall illumine the flag, as a reward for the services rendered, he will be given a seat in the United States Senate. [Applause.] If men of such character can mingle with the Mexicans of New Mexico, why can not the people of Arizona? There are no social conditions that would bar them from coming in closer touch and enjoying together the blessings of statehood.

Area is not the prime consideration for statehood. Present population and industry combined with their future possibilities constitute the chief qualification. The charge that the proposed State is too large is given complete refutation by the preservation of the territorial integrity of Texas for over a half century in the face of a clause in the enabling act granting the power to establish five different States. But it is asserted that State pride and local sentiment sustains Texas intact; that division of her great domain would despoil her heroic history. I understand the force of sentiment. I understand that popular opinion can be crystallized into a veritable Niagara of social or political power that can agitate a nation to its profoundest depths. But sentiment must be sustained by reason and justice or it can not permanently endure. A great portion of New Mexico and even of Colorado belonged originally to Texas. When your State applied for admission her territory extended beyond the line of the Missouri Compromise, not far from the 42° north latitude. What has become of the sentiment of the people living in those sections? They had fought for the freedom of Texas. They had helped her establish an independent republic. Have they ceased to love the Lone Star State because they do not live within her limits? No. Her heroic history, her hallowed associations and sacred memories are just as dear to them as they are to a son of Texas. Every life sacrificed for the glory of that flag is just as sacred as every other life. State lines can not lessen our love of heroic deeds. As long as the flag of the great Republic floated from the heights of New Mexico's mountains they were not greatly concerned about the territorial subdivision in which they should exercise the rights and privileges of American citizenship.

Conditions are so deplorable in these Territories that the people should be given power to institute a new order. They can not successfully battle against existing evils until commissioned by the Republic. The inequalities of taxation are simply intolerable and perhaps account for the attitude of the railroads in this controversy. I desire to insert in the RECORD a computation I have made showing that the railroads all but escape taxation in the Territories. What is true of railroad property applies with equal force to the mining interests of Arizona.

Taxation statistics, Department of Commerce and Labor.

Value of property in New Mexico	$350,000,000
Assessed value for taxation	$42,000,000
Value of property in Arizona	$400,000,000
Assessed value for taxation	$45,000,000
RAILROAD TAXATION.	
Commercial value of railroads in New Mexico	$86,400,000
Assessed value of railroads in New Mexico	$8,511,538
Commercial value for taxation per cent	9.9
Number of miles of single track	2,504
Assessed value per mile, $3,400, equals	$8,511,538
Commercial value of railroads in California	$350,694,000
Assessed value of railroads in California	$92,376,550
Commercial value for taxation per cent	26.3
Number of miles of railroad in California	6,262
Assessed value per mile, $14,760, equals	$92,376,550
Commercial value of railroads in Arizona	$68,356,000
Assessed value of railroads in Arizona	$6,667,349
Commercial value for taxation per cent	9.7
Commercial value per mile	$39,000
Number of miles of railroad in Arizona	1,751
Assessed value per mile, $3,800, equals	$6,667,349
Commercial value of railroads in Texas	$237,718,000
Assessed value of railroads in Texas	$95,209,785
Commercial value for taxation per cent	40
Commercial value per mile	$20,100
Number of miles of railroad in Texas	11,848
Assessed value per mile, $8,100, equals	$95,209,785
Total value of railroads in the United States	$11,244,852,000
Total assessed value of railroads in the United States	$3,213,747,000
Commercial value for taxation:	
United States per cent	28
Arizona do	9.7
New Mexico do	9.9
Commercial value per mile of railroads:	
New Mexico	$34,500
Arizona	$39,000
California	$56,000
Texas	$20,100
Taxes per mile:	
New Mexico	$116
Arizona	$135
California	$317
Texas	$110
Average commercial value of railroads in the United States	$52,600
Total taxes paid by railroads	$61,658,373
Number of miles of railroad	213,932

Taxes paid, per mile	$301
Santa Fe assessed (flat rate)	$175
Value per mile	$56,000
Average rate of taxation per cent	3
3 per cent of $56,000 equals	$1,680
Average value of property for taxation per cent	25
25 per cent of $1,680 equals	$420
Loss of State per mile ($420—$175)	$245

There is only one way to overcome those adverse conditions. Give them statehood. Give the people power to establish a new internal policy—a permanent policy—not subject to Federal supervision, but supreme in all the incidents of State sovereignty, and in due time a system of laws will be formulated and adopted requiring every interest to bear its just and equal share of the public burden and enforcing justice among all men alike.

In the process of readjustment between the two Territories there may be conflicting interests. There doubtless will be. But these will be submerged by the patriotic endeavor to build wisely for the coming generations like the master minds that wrought out the Republic. They will soon become accustomed to the new relationship. The bond of common interest will bind them together. Common hopes and common aspirations will harmonize all discordant elements. Sentiment will focus about a new and nobler standard, and in the achievement of a grand common destiny they will raise up in the great Southwest a State rivaling Texas in imperial dominion, California in diversity of industry and variety of products, and shall sustain an unsullied citizenship worthy of the new century, a standard of manhood that will "match in majesty America's mountains," a State worthy of a star on the flag of the Republic. [Applause.]

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield ten minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. CAPRON].

Mr. CAPRON. Mr. Chairman, I do not approach the discussion of this subject with any fear that I shall do violence to the real desires or wishes of the people of Arizona or New Mexico. If government should be by consent of the governed, I will ask my friends discussing this question upon the other side how it happens that they so readily override the wishes which are presented here by men now in this city who assert that the joining of the Indian Territory and Oklahoma is an outrage also? Every man who has spoken on the other side has said that he perfectly agreed to that, while these gentlemen say that the great State of Sequoyah—you have all heard of that State before, I reckon—ought to have its separate statehood and does not want and protests against being joined to Oklahoma. Now, then, this joining of people together is like the mingling of the waters of a river. They may be discolored for a little at the confluence, but they become one stream, and in a little time, a year or so from the time this statehood act is accomplished, you and I well know that this people will be satisfied and proud of the jointure, and that those people who are desiring the offices will have obtained them, and that the greater Arizona will begin its career as one of the great States of this Union to prosper as other States have prospered.

We know that she will succeed according to the measure of her possessions in minés and in agriculture, and we will be glad. We are giving them this day the opportunity to say whether or not they wish to become a sovereign State in this great Republic of Commonwealths. Let us not for a moment think we are doing violence to the rights of either of these Territories. It would be an outrage if this Congress were to permit half of the people of Arizona to deprive the balance of the people of the two Territories the opportunity to obtain the blessings of statehood. Why, the late census gives the population of Arizona as 123,000 and that of New Mexico as 195,000, a total of 318,000. One-half of the people of Arizona, or 62,000, would leave 256,000 people to be outraged by 62,000. They will be glad and will thank us later for what we are doing to-day, and now, as I may not go into detail in this discussion, which has been so amply considered already, I am going to ask the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN] if he will state, as he stated in my presence within a few hours, the exact conditions which existed regarding the admission of the State of Iowa and the State of Maine into statehood, and to say whether it is a unique and unusual way of doing violence to the people who come here objecting. I will now yield to the gentleman from Iowa to answer my question. [Applause.]

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Chairman, I think a great deal is said about the wishes of the people of the Territories with reference to expected statehood that is imaginary upon the part of those who spoke. I lived in a Territory at the time we passed from Territorial existence to statehood. I know that it required three distinct efforts to force the people of Iowa into statehood. It was not desired by the great mass of the people, and I undertake to say that the mass of people of the State of Arizona that is to be are quite careless about the matter. Two or three times the people of Iowa voted down a proposition for statehood. Three or four times the people of Maine voted down a proposition for statehood. In neither instance were those Territories dragooned into the Union until after the political parties in the State and in the Union aided in bringing about that result. The national parties were interested in Maine, because at that time there must be an equipoise preserved in the Senate between those States that recognized slavery and those that did not, and when a slave State was brought in a free State must be added. The controversy about Missouri, the controversy of 1820, began in 1819, and it was necessary that Maine should be forced into the Union in order that this equilibrium in the other body should be preserved, and, therefore, the party in power in the Government aided the ambitious partisans in the State who desired to be governors and judges and Senators, and through the combined power, by a small majority, Maine was induced to accept a constitution. So it was in the State of Iowa. The majority on the third or fourth occasion, after it had been voted down on two or three occasions, where statehood was the only issue, was, according to my recollection, less than a thousand—eight hundred and something. Nearly a majority of the people were opposed to statehood, and yet it was forced upon them——

Mr. ADAMS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Iowa yield?

Mr. HEPBURN. Certainly.

Mr. ADAMS of Wisconsin. Was any effort ever made by anybody to compel the people of the Territory of Iowa or the Territory of Maine to come into the Union in connection with some other country against their wishes? Was their will not supreme when they expressed their judgment at the polls?

Mr. HEPBURN. My impression is, Mr. Chairman, that the case at bar and the case with Iowa are precisely similar in effect. I say but a few more than a majority in the State of Iowa were in favor of statehood. Nearly a majority were opposed to it, and after a canvass, mind you, and after the people had spoken, mind you, and after there were truthful returns as to public sentiment, mind you. I am not willing to permit the gentleman from Minnesota to speak for the people of Arizona. In the instance in which I said the people of Iowa spoke for themselves and recorded their voice, and when that voice was heard it was their voice—not the voice of a Representative a thousand miles away.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. That is what Arizona asks now, and all she asks.

Mr. ADAMS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Iowa yield?

Mr. HEPBURN. Yes.

Mr. ADAMS of Wisconsin. If the gentleman will not permit a Representative, not from Minnesota, but from Wisconsin, to express his judgment about the sentiment of the people of that country, will he permit the political conventions of all parties in the Territory, fifty-three out of fifty-five newspapers of that Territory, the church organs, and——

Mr. HEPBURN. Now, Mr. Chairman, I am perfectly willing to have any reasonable question put to me, but I submit to the gentleman that he can not be permitted to inject the delayed portion of his yesterday's speech into mine. [Laughter.] It very often happens, Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. HEPBURN. If the gentleman [Mr. HAMILTON] has control of the time, I would be glad if he would give me five minutes more.

Mr. HAMILTON. Can the gentleman manage with three minutes more?

Mr. HEPBURN. No, sir.

Mr. HAMILTON. Then he may have five minutes.

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Chairman, it has been a frequent and universal custom in the admission of States for the Government to fix the boundaries. When the State of Iowa was admitted, or prior to its admission, the eastern half of South Dakota, the eastern two-thirds of North Dakota, the whole of Minnesota west of the Mississippi River was a part of the Territory, but those people in Minnesota and in the Dakotas—very few in the Dakotas and not very many in Minnesota—were cut off without being consulted at all. They had no voice in the matter whatever. And I undertake to say that the proportion of this dissent in the State of Iowa to admission into the Union was fully as great as will be the dissent should a vote be taken in the new Territory of New Mexico and Arizona. We had within 800 of a majority against statehood. I believe that the majority of the people there are in favor of statehood, although there may be a large minority that is opposed. Some methods have to be

taken to determine how this is to be done. And the voice of the majority will control.

Mr. JAMES rose.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. JAMES]?

Mr. HEPBURN. Now, Mr. Chairman, I believe there is no method that can be adopted that will be satisfactory to all the people of any of the Territories.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN] yield to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. JAMES]?

Mr. HEPBURN. I would prefer not to do so. I have only a moment, and I would like to finish the thought which I have. The people of this new State will have their day in court. They will have the opportunity to negative this whole proposition if they see fit to do so. They are not to be dragged into the Union, as has been done many times, without an opportunity for assent or dissent. They are to speak. And are we to make a change in their exception in determining who is to govern? In this land of ours the voice of the majority has been enthroned as our king. It is the voice of the majority that speaks authoritatively. Is not the voice of the majority to be heard in this instance? Why should an exception be made here that the people of Iowa did not have the benefit of, or that the people of Maine did not have the benefit of? Are these gentry in this new southern Territory of a different mental mold, that some other rule must be established for them that is not applied equally to the common people of the land? I want them to have all their rights, and no more. And if the majority is against this coming into the Union, then let them stay out; but if the majority is in favor of it, those that live within those limits territorial, that the Congress alone has the right to fix, if the majority within that jurisdiction want to come in, that is the rule, and they ought to come. [Applause.]

Mr. HAMILTON. Can the gentleman on the other side use some of their time now?

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WEBB] fifteen minutes of time.

Mr. WEBB. Mr. Chairman, I was very much interested and amused on yesterday in the discussion of the three bosses on the Republican side and in their efforts in their discussion to impress the Republican Members that this bill, providing for the jointure of New Mexico and Arizona as one State, is a "party measure." Be it said to their credit, there were forty-three Republicans who could not be driven and whipped into any such position, but voted with the Democrats in their opposition to the passage of the "gag" rule, which passed this House on yesterday by a majority of twenty-seven. Mr. Chairman, when the time comes that some historian shall write the history of yesterday's struggle on the floor of this House, if he be true to his duty and to his task, he will record that the forty-three "insurgent" Republicans were orthodox Republicans, and that the majority have broken their party platform pledges. Now, why do I say this? I hold in my hand a book containing all the Republican platforms adopted by that party since its formation. Let me read for the edification of the gentlemen on the other side of the Chamber, who seem to have forgotten their solemn pledges made in their great conventions, what four national Republican conventions have said on the subject of statehood for Arizona and New Mexico. The first reference to that subject by that party was sixteen years ago in their convention which nominated Benjamin Harrison for President. Listen to the language:

The pending bills in the Senate for acts to enable the people of Washington, North Dakota, and Montana Territories to form constitutions and establish State governments should be passed without unnecessary delay.

Now, mark the following strong language:

The Republican party pledges itself to do all in its power to facilitate the admission of the Territories of New Mexico, Wyoming, Idaho, and Arizona to the enjoyment of self-government as States.

That was in 1888. Then they promised in clear and unmistakable language single statehood for New Mexico and Arizona. Now you are violating that pledge and undertaking to force New Mexico and Arizona to coalesce and form one State only. Let us examine the Republican platform of 1892 and see what the "grand old party" pledged itself in regard to these Territories then. Here is the language, and I ask the other side of the House, who are attempting to make joint statehood a party measure, to listen to your platform and see how you are now trying to reverse it:

We favor the admission of the remaining Territories at the earliest practicable date.

That is your platform in 1892. Let us go a step further and see what your party platform contained on this subject in 1896. Here is the language:

We favor the admission of the remaining Territories at the earliest practicable date.

This is an exact reaffirmation of your platform of 1892. But let us examine your declaration on this subject made in your party convention in 1900, when Mr. McKinley was nominated for President and Mr. Roosevelt for Vice-President. This is the last deliverance of the Republican party in convention assembled on this question of statehood:

We favor home rule for and early admission to statehood of the Territories of New Mexico, Arizona, and Oklahoma.

Now, Mr. Chairman, here are four distinct declarations of the Republican party, in their national platforms, declaring in favor of single statehood for these two great Territories. Therefore I take it that single statehood is the Republican party's policy on the question of these two Territories; but there is a little coterie of Republicans in this House who have undertaken to make joint statehood a party question, and are trying—and will succeed in their efforts—to force Republican Members to nullify their platform promises on that subject for the last eighteen years. This handful of bosses have passed the word along and have cracked their whip, and no timid soul will dare oppose them, but with the docility of a child will cast their votes on this great question affecting the sovereignty of two States of the Union as they are told to cast them.

Who has undertaken to make this a party question? A strong hand in the White House, an able ally in the Speaker's chair, and an obedient majority on the Rules Committee! That is the source of the political pabulum that makes joint statehood a party question! It is a humiliating spectacle to see strong men with big minds, on the Republican side, who are violently opposed to this measure, run to cover and vote for it when a half dozen men crack a whip and tell them it is the party lash that descends upon their backs.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Let me state to the gentleman we did pass this bill giving separate statehood by Republican votes in this House.

Mr. WEBB. That is so. That was done upon a unanimous report of the Committee on Territories, whose chairman, Mr. Knox, was a Republican from Massachusetts, in the Fifty-seventh Congress. But, Mr. Chairman, pertaining to the idea of Executive influence in the passage of this unjust and reprehensible measure, let me say that I was pained the day before yesterday to read in the public press of the 23d instant, on the front page, and in bold letters, the following:

PRESIDENT LABORS WITH INSURGENTS.

Administration influence is being exerted in a heroic attempt to-day to save the joint-statehood bill, which the insurgents of the House threaten to bludgeon to-morrow, with the assistance of the Democrats under JOHN SHARP WILLIAMS'S leadership. A number of insurgents were summoned to the White House, and there given some straight talk by the President, who is mightily interested in the passage of the measure.

Mr. Chairman, could such information reach the long-departed spirit of George Washington, whose body lies over yonder at Mount Vernon, it would disturb his peaceful rest and cause him to turn over in his grave. Such news would make the spirit of Thomas Jefferson groan in disapproval. It was the intention of our fathers that the legislative, executive, and judicial departments of this Government should be kept separate and distinct. The powers and functions of these departments are defined in three distinct articles of the Constitution, and so careful were the founders of this Republic to keep these three departments separate and distinct, and avoid the influence of the executive upon the legislative department, that they actually built the White House, the Executive Mansion, more than a mile from the Capitol.

Luther Henry Porter, of New Jersey, in his Constitutional History of the United States, says:

The Government of the Constitution, being national, required three distinct departments: The legislative, to form laws; the executive, to execute them; and the judicial, to interpret them and apply them in case of doubt. These departments are independent of each other so long as they are true to their duties. The independence of the three departments of each other renders each responsible to the Constitution and to the people.

The Constitution permits the President to recommend to Congress in his annual message such legislation as he thinks should be enacted, and it also gives him the right to veto such legislation as he thinks should not be enacted. But it was never intended that the executive head of this Government, with his powerful influence through the dispensation of patronage, should use this influence in privately and personally causing members of this sovereign legislature to vote for any measure. The three great departments under our Constitution—the legislative, executive, and judicial—are the magnificent trinity upon which the fabric of this Republic rests. The three departments, separate and distinct from each other, are the pillars upon which our Government is founded; and when one of these pillars is destroyed, by usurpation or other-

wise, then the entire foundation, builded by our fathers, will become useless, and this splendid Republic of ours will crumble and decay. Has the time come, Mr. Chairman, when this House of Representatives is but an arm of the Executive, a mere handmaid to the President? What would the world think if the Members of this Congress should summon before the bar of this House the nine great jurists who sit on the Supreme Court bench, and demand of them that they should declare a certain act of Congress constitutional because they had passed it and were interested in it? It would shock every man from one end of the country to the other. I protest, Mr. Chairman, that these three great distinct departments under the Constitution should be kept distinct, even though Theodore Roosevelt is President of this Republic.

Mr. POWERS. Can the gentleman distinguish between a question of party policy, on a measure of this kind, and a question of constitutional law?

Mr. WEBB. Oh, yes; I can and do make this distinction, but I did not know that the President is your party and makes your party platforms. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Chairman, the analogy is a correct one, and I am arguing that no one of these three great departments should undertake to bring pressure to bear on the other to influence it in its action, except in the manner pointed to in the Constitution itself.

On May 7, 1902, Mr. Rodey, the Republican Delegate in this House from New Mexico, discussing the bill for the admission of New Mexico and Arizona as separate States, said:

> If it be a political one, I contend that New Mexico has the political qualification, but I also contend that he who places the rights of American citizens upon a partisan basis is unworthy to enjoy the privilege of American citizenship. [Applause.] Every man on the floor will repudiate his political platform for the last generation, be he Democrat or Republican, if he votes in opposition to this bill.

That, Mr. Chairman, was at a time when the Republican party presented to the House a bill which is just the opposite to the one we are now considering. They then presented a bill for separate statehood for Arizona and New Mexico, and it was passed by that Congress unanimously; but three years later we find them reversing their position, and forcing through this House a bill to make New Mexico and Arizona one State.

Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this bill, which provides that the great Territories of New Mexico and Arizona shall be merged into one State, because the people of New Mexico do not want it. In October, 1901, a great convention was held in that Territory, at which ringing resolutions were adopted favoring single statehood. The legislature of that Territory has passed strong resolutions protesting against being joined to Arizona. Mr. Rodey, the Republican Delegate from that Territory, in May, 1902, said on the floor of this House:

> We don't want to be joined to Arizona with the Rocky Mountains between us. Arizona is on the Pacific slope and New Mexico is on the Atlantic slope of the continent. The Continental Divide runs between New Mexico and Arizona north and south. There is nothing in common between the people of the two Territories save their splendid western spirit of enterprise. Such a provision as that of the gentleman from Indiana (that they join the two Territories as one State) would mix the conditions of these peoples in such a manner that they would never extricate themselves.

I am aware that Mr. Rodey now says that his people would accept joint statehood, but it is because, and I assert it as a fact, this Congress has browbeaten them into believing that they will never get single statehood. The chief executive of New Mexico, Governor Otero, uses this language in regard to the proposed jointure of the two Territories:

> There is no doubt that the great majority of the people of New Mexico are opposed to joining New Mexico with Arizona under one Commonwealth, as is proposed by pending legislation. Even the small percentage who would acquiesce in such legislation prefer single statehood for each Territory. This is not due to any innate animosity between the two Territories, but to the inherent differences in the population, in legislation, in industries, and from historical and ethnologic standpoints, not to mention that the consolidation of two Commonwealths like New Mexico and Arizona into one is unprecedented in American history. The new State would be an unnatural and unwilling alliance. It would be a coercion of two populations which are unlike in character, in ambition, and largely in occupation. The union would be abhorrent to both.

There is no man who would stand on the floor of this House and claim that the people of New Mexico prefer joint statehood. Even the chairman of this committee will admit, and I see him sitting before me, and I challenge him to deny it, that if the people of New Mexico were permitted to decide between joint statehood and single statehood 99 per cent would vote for single statehood. Your Republican governor of New Mexico says the people of his Territory don't want it, and he is supposed to know the sentiments of his people. Mr. Rodey, upon whom the chairman of this committee bestowed so much praise on yesterday, and I join in the spirit of that praise, declared three years ago that the people did not want it, and I submit that Mr. Rodey is qualified to know and does know the sentiments of the people of his Territory as well or better than any man in it.

I am opposed to this proposition to join New Mexico and Arizona because the people of Arizona are violently opposed to it. I say without fear of any contradiction, and I challenge any Member to deny it, that 98 per cent of the people of Arizona are not only opposed to this jointure with New Mexico, but are unalterably and passionately opposed to it. Now, listen again to Mr. Rodey, to what he said in the House three years ago, and I like to quote from him because he is such distinguished authority. At that time the motion had been made to join the two Territories as one State, which motion was voted down by a Republican Congress by 106 to 28. On this motion to combine the two Territories Mr. Rodey said:

> Arizona does not want to be joined to New Mexico. It has forty years of its own history behind it. It has its own county debts. It has its own municipal debts. It has its own Territorial debt. New Mexico does not want to be joined to Arizona, and its people are opposed to this amendment. We would never adopt a constitution under such a bill.

Governor Brodie, of Arizona, another Republican executive, appointed by the President, in his report of 1904 says:

> I can not add to the protest that has already been made by the people of the Territory of Arizona against this reprehensible measure (joint statehood with New Mexico), and I have only to say that they would desire that their Commonwealth remain a Territory indefinitely rather than be joined to New Mexico.

Another chief executive, Governor Kibbey, of Arizona, in 1905, having succeeded Governor Brodie, says, among many other arguments against joint statehood:

> The proposed union is regarded by our people as a menace to the prosperity and progress of the Territory.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. WEBB. Certainly.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Is it not a fact that the governors of these Territories are Republicans and Republican appointees?

Mr. WEBB. Yes; of course. They are Republicans, and I suppose that they express Republican sentiments, which ought to influence the Republicans in this House.

The Committee on Territories, of which committee I am a member, has had this bill for the jointure of these two Territories under consideration for more than a month, and during that time we have received petitions with thousands upon thousands of names upon them from the people of Arizona protesting against this crime which you are about to commit. They are not asking statehood for Arizona. They are praying that you permit them to remain a Territory indefinitely rather than tie them up with New Mexico. They do not ask for statehood. We have had before our committee from Arizona men from all the walks of life—farmers, ranchmen, lawyers, ministers, newspaper editors; in fact, men representing every profession—and every one of them has protested in bitter terms against being united with New Mexico. These citizens paid their way to Washington, some 3,000 miles, and have come before this our committee, in this Congress, begging us, praying us, imploring us in God's name not to ram down their throats this detestable legislation. [Applause.]

In the face of all these earnest protests you Republican majority are going to pass this bill, and tell the people of these two Territories that they have got to accept against their will this distasteful and unnatural marriage. You will not even permit the people of Arizona and New Mexico a single vote upon the proposition of jointure. If you would permit such an amendment, allowing each Territory to vote on it separately, there would be scarcely any opposition to this bill, but no, you are afraid that the proposition would be overwhelmingly voted down in each Territory.

General Sampson, one of the petitioners before our committee, a former foreign minister to Ecuador, told the committee that in order to test the sentiment of the people of the Territory in which he lived he carried around a petition asking this Congress not to put upon Arizona this jointure bill. He approached 1,009 persons, and out of that number only 7 declined to sign, while 1,002 signed it with enthusiasm. Not long ago there was a great meeting in Phoenix, Ariz., composed of citizens from all over that Territory and mayors from all the towns. That convention passed ringing resolutions against the proposed legislation of joining these two Territories. Yet you are going to disregard the feelings of this people and force this bill upon them. The offense which gave rise to the Boston tea party was an insignificant bagatelle as compared to the crime of passing this bill against the unanimous wishes of the people whom it affects.

I am opposed to this bill, again, to join these Territories, Mr. Chairman, on another ground—because when the Territory of

New Mexico was ceded by old Mexico to the United States, in the ninth section of the treaty ceding this Territory, which treaty was ratified in 1848 at Guadalupe Hidalgo, there occurs the following:

Mexicans who, in the Territories aforesaid, shall not preserve the character of citizens of the Mexican Republic conformably with what is stipulated in the preceding article, shall be incorporated into the Union of the United States, and be admitted at the proper time (to be judged of by the Congress of the United States) to the enjoyment of all the rights of citizens of the United States, according to the principles of the Constitution; and in the meantime shall be maintained and protected in the free enjoyment of their liberty and property, and secured in the free exercise of their religion without restriction.

It will be seen from reading this section that the United States morally promised separate statehood to New Mexico; and so thoroughly was this understood that in 1850, when California, which was a part of the ceded Territory, elected her United States Senators and Representative, New Mexico did likewise. The representatives from both Territories presented themselves to Congress. The Senators and Representative from California were retained, while the Senators from New Mexico were sent back home and their Representative was allowed to remain as a Delegate from that Territory. Away back in 1846, when General Kearny marched into this Territory and hauled down the flag of old Mexico at Santa Fe and hoisted the flag of the United States, he said to the vast company of people assembled:

It is the wish and intention of the United States to provide for New Mexico a free government, with the least possible delay, similar to those in the United States.

Ever since that good hour New Mexico has been knocking, knocking at the door of this Congress for admission to statehood, and asking that you carry out the obligation made both by our victorious general and by treaty. Three years ago, in discussing this very statehood question, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] took the position, and argued it strongly for one hour, that no Territory had a right to become a State. In his speech on yesterday he agreed that he would yield always his wisdom to that of his national party convention. Now, the Republican convention of 1860 said that Kansas, as of right, should be made a State. In 1889 the Republican national convention declared again that North Dakota, as of right, should be admitted into the Union as a State. The Supreme Court of the United States, in the case of Shively *v.* Bowlby (57 U. S.), says:

Upon the question of territory acquired by the United States, whether by cession from one of the States, or by treaty with a foreign country, or by discovery and settlement, the same title and dominion passed to the United States for the benefit of the whole people and in trust for the several States to be ultimately created out of the territory.

The court, in the same opinion, says again:

Such Territories are held with the object, as soon as their population and condition justifies, of being admitted into the Union as States.

So, as soon as the population and conditions of a Territory justify it, at that moment such Territory has a right to demand statehood. I will show a little further along in this argument that New Mexico does possess these requisites.

I am opposed to this jointure, Mr. Chairman, because the Congress of the United States promised single statehood to Arizona when that Territory was created in 1863. The following is part of the language of the act of Congress passed February 24, 1863, in reference to the Arizona Territory:

That said government (that is, the government of the Territory of Arizona) shall be maintained and continued until such time as the people residing in such Territory shall have the consent of Congress to form a State government, republican in form, as prescribed by the Constitution of the United States, and apply for and obtain admission into the Union as a State.

That is the distinct promise on the part of Congress—and this bill was signed by Abraham Lincoln—that when Arizona shall be admitted into the Union it shall come in as a single State and not joined to another Territory. The people of the Territory, who have gone there and irrigated her lands, made gardens of her valleys, and constructed the foundation of a great State, have acted upon this promise of Congress in good faith, and now they ask that this promise be kept. The people of that Territory say to this Congress now that, if you do not think they are at present qualified for statehood, all well and good; they will not complain, but will continue to develop it until you do think it worthy to come into the sisterhood of States. Mark you, gentlemen, Arizona is not asking for statehood. She is asking to be let alone, and only that. Each of these two Territories is capable of developing and promises to develop into a great and worthy State. There is scarcely a State in the Union whose resources are greater or more boundless and promising than those of New Mexico and Arizona. Their resources already excel the resources of several States of the Union. The wealth of Arizona is about $300,000,000. She has 10 national banks, 18 territorial banks. She has as fine schools as will be found in any State of the Union. She has 50 newspapers, a good proportion of which are dailies, and 1,500 miles of railroad. Her churches are among the best and her people are members thereof. She has valleys within her domain that would support vaster populations than we find to-day in many of the older States. The wealth of New Mexico is about $329,000,000. She has 32 banks, 3,000 miles of railroad, and coal with an estimated value of $10,000,000,000. A great State could be founded upon her timber, coal, and coke resources alone. She to-day has valleys as fertile and productive as that of the Nile, and which are capable of sustaining millions upon millions of people.

Mr. Chairman, Congress has proven over and over again that New Mexico ought to be admitted as a State separately, for bills admitting her as a separate State have passed one or the other branches of this Congress seventeen times during the last twenty-five years. A similar bill for the admission of Arizona as a separate State into the Union has passed one or the other branches of this Congress seven times. The Fifty-seventh Congress emphatically declared against joining the two Territories as one State. Mr. KNOX, of Massachusetts, who was chairman of the Committee on Territories in that Congress, presented a bill for single statehood for these two Territories with a unanimous report from the committee. While considering the bill Mr. OVERSTREET, of Indiana, offered an amendment—and it is the first time in the history of the country that such an amendment was offered—to join the two Territories as one State. After lengthy discussion upon the question the motion to join the two Territories was overwhelmingly voted down, and the bill for single statehood for each Territory passed this body by a unanimous vote.

These two Territories should not be joined as one State for another reason. The great Rocky Mountain range separates them, and presents an almost impassable barrier to the peoples of the two Territories, which will for all time prevent the commingling and intercourse necessary to make their feelings one. This great mountain chain, averaging about 7,000 feet in height, is said to be impassable except at two points, where railroads now cross it, and it is 250 miles between these two points. What would be thought of the proposition to join North Carolina and Tennessee into one State, with the Appalachian Mountains between them? Yet such a proposition is insignificant as compared to the union of Arizona and New Mexico. New Mexico alone has 33,000 square miles more territory than North Carolina and Tennessee combined. In other words, you could carve out of New Mexico a boundary the size of North Carolina and Tennessee, and still there would be room enough in New Mexico to form the States of Connecticut, New Jersey, Massachusetts, Vermont, and Rhode Island. You could carve out of Arizona a territory as large as North Carolina and Tennessee combined, and you would still have an area left in Arizona larger than Delaware, Maryland, Massachusetts, and Rhode Island combined.

If you pass this bill providing for the State capital to be located at Santa Fe, as is proposed in the bill, there are people in Arizona who will have to travel more than a thousand miles to get to the seat of government. From Bisbee, Ariz., to Santa Fe, it is 891 miles; from Douglas, Ariz., to Santa Fe, it is 917 miles; from Nogales, Ariz., to Santa Fe, it is 898 miles, and from Phoenix, the present capital of the Territory of Arizona, to Santa Fe, is 679 miles, a distance farther than from Washington, D. C., to Atlanta, Ga. You will compel many of the people of Arizona, in order to get to their capital, to travel a distance farther than that from New York to Chicago. I am therefore opposed to this bill joining these two Territories, because they are too large an area for one State, and jointly would make an empire in extent. The imagination can scarcely grasp their tremendous area. New Mexico, with an area of 123,000 square miles, and Arizona, with an area of 113,000 square miles, making a total of 236,000 square miles, constitute twice the area of England, Wales, Scotland, and Ireland combined. You could carve out of this combined territory an area equal to the Republic of France, and still there would enough remain to make three States the size of Massachusetts and keep Delaware as a good-sized farm. The total area of these two Territories is larger than the combined area of the Kingdoms of Spain and Portugal. It is more extensive than the German Empire by 27,000 square miles, and more than three-fourths the size of the Republic of Chile.

New Mexico alone is larger than Switzerland, Cuba, Denmark, and Liberia combined. It lacks only 24,000 square miles of being as large as the Kingdom of Japan. It is only 24,000 square miles less than the Republic of Paraguay, and is about equal in area to the Philippine Islands. It is larger than the Kingdom of Italy and the States of New Jersey and Connecticut

all combined, and it is larger than Austria by 8,000 square miles. It lacks but 3,000 square miles of being as large as Hungary, and it is nearly three times the size of Cuba. New Mexico is equal to fifteen States the size of Massachusetts, and equal to twelve States the size of Vermont, and thirteen States the size of New Hampshire. It is larger by one hundred and seventeen times than the State of Rhode Island. It is equal to twenty-five States the size of Connecticut, sixteen States the size of New Jersey, and nearly three States the size of Pennsylvania.

Arizona alone is larger than Korea, the Netherlands, and Belgium combined. It is equal in area to Greece, Switzerland, Denmark, the Netherlands, and Portugal combined. It is two and a half times as large as Cuba, larger than Italy, and but 3,000 square miles smaller than Austria. More than one hundred States the size of Rhode Island could be placed in her borders, and there would be enough left to make a State the size of Massachusetts.

These peoples should not be forced into becoming citizens of one State, because the two Territories are of separate races, possessing different ideas, ideals, laws, customs, aspirations, habits, and language. A large proportion of the population of New Mexico is of the Latin race, while almost the whole population of Arizona is of American blood. Arizona women rarely ever marry Mexican men, and very few Anglo-Saxon men ever marry Mexican women. There is a race antipathy between the two people which can not be eradicated by all the laws you can pass, and it is unwise in any legislation in any country to undertake to force a mixture of two separate and distinct races.

It is a well-established rule by Congress in all the past, which almost amounts to a law, in admitting Territories to statehood, that every Territory has been admitted to statehood when she had a reasonable claim from the standpoint of area, population, wealth, and intelligence. Measured by these standards, New Mexico and Arizona should not be joined, but each should be admitted to separate statehood. I have shown you that their wealth and resources are sufficient to maintain great States. There are twenty States in the Union whose populations were less at the time of their admission than that of New Mexico. There are many which at the time of their admission had only a small proportion of the wealth that New Mexico has now.

When Ohio was admitted into the Union in 1802, with 40,000 square miles of area, she had but 60,000 population, and her banking capital in 1803 was only $203,000, while in 1811 she had but four banks, with a capital of less than $1,000,000. New Mexico has thirty-two banks and Arizona twenty-eight, and each of the Territories has a banking capital of more than $1,000,000, while New Mexico has a population of 350,000 and Arizona has a population of 165,000. Take the State of Michigan, when it was admitted into the Union in 1837. She had 56,000 square miles of territory, with 135,000 people, and one year after her admission she had only eleven banks, with $1,400,000 capital stock. Measured by every standard heretofore fixed in admitting States, each of these Territories, and especially New Mexico, is entitled to separate statehood. The average population of the original thirteen States at the time of the formation of the Union was 302,000. The average population of the thirty-two States admitted since that time was at the time of their admission 129,500. The average population of the entire forty-five States of the Union at the time they came into statehood was 157,000. It will be seen that New Mexico has more population to-day than the average original thirteen States had at the time they came into the Union, nearly three times as much population as the average of the thirty-two States, and more than twice as much as the average of the forty-five States.

The average area of the thirteen original States is 24,100 square miles. The average area of the thirty-two States admitted since the Union was formed is 73,600 square miles, and the average area of the entire forty-five States is 60,000 square miles. It will thus be seen that New Mexico has five times the area of the average of the original thirteen States and twice the average area of the forty-five States.

The percentage of illiteracy in New Mexico and Arizona, and especially in Arizona, is very, very small, and is rapidly becoming less. Each of the Territories has spent millions of dollars in the last few years in erecting and maintaining their public schools. They have their universities, their normal schools, their State capitols, and their penitentiaries, and all other public buildings which are necessary to the maintenance of a State.

Mr. Chairman, let it not be forgotten that we are legislating for the future, and the argument of Senatorial representation in favor of passing this jointure bill should be the strongest argument against it and in favor of separate statehood. This vast area of United States soil is entitled to be made into two Commonwealths, if not now, yet at some future time, and represented by four Senators.

Remember that two-thirds of the area of the United States is west of the Mississippi River, and this two-thirds area has now but 38 Senators, while the other one-third, east of the Mississippi River, has 54 Senators. We should have more Senators from the West to effect a Senatorial balancing in the Senate. New Mexico is as large as Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Vermont, Rhode Island, New Jersey, Delaware, Maryland, and New York combined. If the argument as to Senatorial representation were a just one—but it is not, for Senators represent the sovereign entity of a State—it might be contended with force that Rhode Island, with only a thousand miles of area, which, as some one has said, would scarcely make a respectable cow lot for New Mexico, and with only 345,000 inhabitants, and two Senators, should be wiped from the map as a State and annexed to Massachusetts, because New York, with her 48,000 square miles of territory and 7,000,000 people, has only two Senators. The same argument could be made for the abrogation of the State of Vermont, which has but 332,000 people and possesses two Senators, while New York has twenty times as many people and five times the area and also has but two Senators. The wisdom of the fathers of this Republic never based the admission of a new State into the Union upon the ground of Senatorial representation, but upon the sovereignty of each sovereign State. It was not done when the Dakotas were divided and given four Senators instead of two, and an unjust discrimination should not now be made to the detriment of the two great Commonwealths of New Mexico and Arizona.

But no word of mine can prevent you Republican majority from committing this great offense, and it will not be the only time within the last fifty years that you have committed a political crime under the guise of party necessity.

Force this bill upon the peoples of these two Territories, ram it down their throats against their wills, refuse them the right to vote separately upon this legislation, and I tell you that you have committed the most monstrous political crime that your party has been guilty of since the days of reconstruction. [Applause.]

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and the Speaker having taken the chair, a message from the Senate, by Mr. PARKINSON, its reading clerk, announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles; in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 2481. An act granting an increase of pension to Elijah J. Wilkins;

S. 1702. An act granting a pension to Adolphus N. Pacetty;

S. 1709. An act granting a pension to Florence Greeley De Veaux;

S. 2112. An act granting an increase of pension to John Heck;

S. 2113. An act granting an increase of pension to Agnes Zentz;

S. 622. An act granting an increase of pension to Hiram Swain;

S. 238. An act granting an increase of pension to John Savage;

S. 625. An act granting an increase of pension to Phebe J. Bennett;

S. 1042. An act granting an increase of pension to Francis Piccard;

S. 1456. An act granting a pension to Joann Morris;

S. 328. An act granting an increase of pension to John W. Warner;

S. 322. An act granting an increase of pension to Isabella Workman;

S. 1841. An act granting a pension to Robert Catlin;

S. 950. An act granting a pension to Emma M. Rea;

S. 493. An act granting an increase of pension to Charles M. Wittig;

S. 142. An act granting an increase of pension to William Furlong;

S. 138. An act granting an increase of pension to Michael Linehan;

S. 943. An act granting an increase of pension to Oscar R. Arnold;

S. 206. An act granting an increase of pension to Gordon H. Shepard;

S. 209. An act granting an increase of pension to George F. Ross;

S. 210. An act granting an increase of pension to Silas P. Hall;

S. 1163. An act granting an increase of pension to Martha G. Cushing;

S. 314. An act granting a pension to Aletha E. Reynolds;
S. 315. An act granting an increase of pension to George Pike;
S. 472. An act granting an increase of pension to David F. Magee;
S. 575. An act granting an increase of pension to John Flynn;
S. 576. An act granting an increase of pension to Frederick J. Shelley;
S. 1466. An act granting an increase of pension to Philena Davis;
S. 715. An act granting a pension to Georgia A. Rollins;
S. 851. An act granting an increase of pension to Frederick Houser;
S. 74. An act granting an increase of pension to Aaron T. Currier;
S. 1828. An act granting an increase of pension to Alvin Abbott;
S. 1467. An act granting an increase of pension to Laura A. Blodgett;
S. 16. An act granting a pension to Susan H. Cutler;
S. 183. An act granting an increase of pension to Henry F. Hunt;
S. 837. An act granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth C. Dunton;
S. 707. An act granting a pension to Alice E. Gilley;
S. 1258. An act granting an increase of pension to Charles W. Paige;
S. 178. An act granting an increase of pension to Irene A. Cochrane;
S. 785. An act granting an increase of pension Franklin C. Pierce;
S. 9. An act granting an increase of pension to David P. Bolster;
S. 534. An act granting an increase of pension to Dennis A. Davis;
S. 531. An act granting an increase of pension to William H. Satterthwait;
S. 923. An act granting an increase of pension to Nathaniel L. Badger;
S. 991. An act granting a pension to Jane McMahon;
S. 96. An act granting an increase of pension to George A. Francis;
S. 193. An act granting an increase of pension to John C. Eberly;
S. 1035. An act granting an increase of pension to Andrew McClory;
S. 122. An act granting an increase of pension to Michael Stump;
S. 2825. An act granting an increase of pension to John M. Scott;
S. 2071. An act granting an increase of pension to Henry T. Anshutz;
S. 1200. An act granting a pension to Esther G. Wharton;
S. 515. An act granting an increase of pension to Dennis Buckley McCready, alias Dennis McCready, alias Thomas Buckley;
S. 509. An act granting a pension to Annie L. Fredick;
S. 564. An act granting an increase of pension to Wilson Hyatt;
S. 565. An act granting an increase of pension to Lumbard D. Aldrich;
S. 385. An act granting an increase of pension to George W. Gearey;
S. 1474. An act granting an increase of pension to Joseph Davis;
S. 1368. An act granting an increase of pension to William H. Hicks;
S. 1525. An act granting an increase of pension to Zachariah Bradfield;
S. 407. An act granting an increase of pension to George W. Purvis;
S. 596. An act granting an increase of pension to Eliza J. Harding;
S. 603. An act granting an increase of pension to Lide S. Leonard;
S. 1098. An act granting an increase of pension to William J. Grow;
S. 647. An act granting an increase of pension to Leonard Harmony;
S. 1524. An act granting an increase of pension to John M. Berkey;
S. 1517. An act granting an increase of pension to John C. Kennedy;
S. 1559. An act granting an increase of pension to Laura Clark;
S. 666. An act granting an increase of pension to Andrew Patrick;
S. 669. An act granting an increase of pension to Lawrence Mericle;
S. 670. An act granting an increase of pension to Anthony Barrett;
S. 1303. An act granting an increase of pension to Harrison Brott;
S. 727. An act granting an increase of pension to Jasper H. Keys;
S. 1015. An act granting an increase of pension to Joseph McSwain;
S. 2256. An act granting an increase of pension to Alexander F. McConnell;
S. 2486. An act for the relief of Richard C. Silence;
S. 1842. An act granting an increase of pension to Ransom O. Thayer;
S. 1987. An act granting an increase of pension to Ella T. Hapeman;
S. 145. An act granting an increase of pension to Wellington Marlatt;
S. 140. An act granting an increase of pension to Maitland J. Freeman;
S. 143. An act granting an increase of pension to James W. Calvert;
S. 3243. An act granting an increase of pension to Akey C. Johnson;
S. 2023. An act granting a pension to Amanda M. Richey;
S. 986. An act granting an increase of pension to Caroline M. Doan;
S. 1212. An act granting an increase of pension to John S. Wilcox;
S. 949. An act granting an increase of pension to Jacob Eppler;
S. 2779. An act granting an increase of pension to James J. Egan;
S. 212. An act granting an increase of pension to John T. Liddle;
S. 211. An act granting an increase of pension to Wilson J. Pool;
S. 393. An act granting an increase of pension to Lucinda Stamper;
S. 329. An act granting an increase of pension to William E. Blewitt;
S. 2415. An act granting an increase of pension to Fannie Ida Edgerton;
S. 1852. An act granting an increase of pension to Milton Marsh;
S. 2255. An act granting an increase of pension to James Thompson;
S. 2564. An act granting an increase of pension to Michael Matheney;
S. 2229. An act granting an increase of pension to William I. Hilkey;
S. 126. An act granting an increase of pension to William J. Street;
S. 120. An act granting an increase of pension to John M. Buckley;
S. 2583. An act granting an increase of pension to Thomas Robey;
S. 3180. An act granting an increase of pension to Jacob A. Geiger;
S. 508. An act granting an increase of pension to William Kress;
S. 330. An act granting an increase of pension to Kemenskio A. N. L. Collins;
S. 1432. An act granting an increase of pension to John W. Foreaker;
S. 2730. An act granting an increase of pension to James P. Ford;
S. 1838. An act granting an increase of pension to Harvey S. Harriman;
S. 644. An act granting an increase of pension to William R Hubbell;
S. 637. An act granting an increase of pension to John E O'Brien;
S. 1041. An act granting an increase of pension to Myron E. Billings;
S. 1038. An act granting an increase of pension to James Frazier;
S. 244. An act granting an increase of pension to Thomas Bramel;
S. 2552. An act granting an increase of pension to Louise J. D. Leland;

S. 1735. An act granting an increase of pension to Washington Hogans;
S. 2144. An act granting an increase of pension to James A. Brown;
S. 164. An act granting a pension to Helen A. Frederick;
S. 3244. An act granting an increase of pension to Anna F. Keith;
S. 2879. An act granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Hoge;
S. 1529. An act granting an increase of pension to James L. Small;
S. 1367. An act granting an increase of pension to Almon Foster;
S. 606. An act granting an increase of pension to John Houston Crowell;
S. 1509. An act granting an increase of pension to Thomas T. Hodges;
S. 2555. An act granting a pension to Sarah A. Bargar;
S. 2293. An act granting an increase of pension to William C. Hitchcock;
S. 1271. An act granting an increase of pension to Edward Irwin;
S. 1270. An act granting an increase of pension to John C. Barr;
S. 185. An act granting an increase of pension to Lewis H. Cate;
S. 179. An act granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Mayhew;
S. 80. An act granting an increase of pension to Julia A. Stanyan;
S. 1827. An act granting an increase of pension to George C. Chase;
S. 81. An act granting an increase of pension to David E. Everett;
S. 572. An act granting an increase of pension to Henry G. Salisbury;
S. 845. An act granting an increase of pension to Sarah A. Page;
S. 787. An act granting an increase of pension to Stephen Ernst;
S. 714. An act granting an increase of pension to Susie Place;
S. 3001. An act granting an increase of pension to Juliet A. Bainbridge Hoff;
S. 706. An act granting an increase of pension to Martha E. Saltar;
S. 11. An act granting an increase of pension to Ruth B. Gurney;
S. 850. An act granting an increase of pension to Arthur Forrester Deveraux; and
S. 279. An act granting an increase of pension to Horace E. Barker.

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

H. R. 532. An act granting an increase of pension to James T. Berry;
H. R. 1330. An act granting an increase of pension to William A. Hildreth;
H. R. 1062. An act granting an increase of pension to George E. Brickett;
H. R. 1908. An act granting an increase of pension to Emma Rowe;
H. R. 1675. An act granting an increase of pension to Melissa S. Lee;
H. R. 1653. An act granting an increase of pension to Frank W. Weeks;
H. R. 2770. An act granting an increase of pension to Ephraim Plumpton;
H. R. 3487. An act granting an increase of pension to Ferdinand Weise;
H. R. 3283. An act granting an increase of pension to Bruno Tiesler;
H. R. 3402. An act granting an increase of pension to Sidney S. Brigham;
H. R. 3427. An act granting an increase of pension to William B. Kimball;
H. R. 3451. An act granting an increase of pension to Alpheus A. Rockwell;
H. R. 3481. An act granting an increase of pension to William H. Cranston;
H. R. 3428. An act granting an increase of pension to Samuel E. Chamberlain;
H. R. 4176. An act granting an increase of pension to Michael Mohan;
H. R. 4876. An act granting an increase of pension to William L. Becks;
H. R. 1361. An act granting an increase of pension to Camillus B. Leftwich;
H. R. 7309. An act granting an increase of pension to Louis Dieckgraefe;
H. R. 7408. An act granting an increase of pension to Joseph W. Price;
H. R. 4348. An act granting an increase of pension to William McCraw;
H. R. 604. An act granting an increase of pension to Hiram F. Armstrong;
H. R. 723. An act granting an increase of pension to George W. Raigle;
H. R. 1986. An act granting an increase of pension to Morris Bennett;
H. R. 3368. An act granting an increase of pension to William McNair;
H. R. 4216. An act granting an increase of pension to Robert Boon;
H. R. 1853. An act granting an increase of pension to William J. Johnson;
H. R. 1339. An act granting an increase of pension to James Kelley;
H. R. 1686. An act granting an increase of pension to George S. McGregor;
H. R. 3573. An act granting an increase of pension to John V. Sanders;
H. R. 6518. An act granting an increase of pension to James M. Long;
H. R. 8713. An act granting an increase of pension to Payton S. Lynn;
H. R. 3716. An act granting a pension to Augustus Foss;
H. R. 3758. An act granting an increase of pension to George Nulton;
H. R. 4701. An act granting an increase of pension to Elijah Thompson Hurst, alias Elijah Thompson;
H. R. 5686. An act granting an increase of pension to Adelle Tobey;
H. R. 3606. An act granting an increase of pension to John S. Hoover;
H. R. 3575. An act granting an increase of pension to Silas B. Hovious;
H. R. 3245. An act granting an increase of pension to Robert C. Smyth;
H. R. 8550. An act granting an increase of pension to John Bierer;
H. R. 1868. An act granting an increase of pension to Perry Egge;
H. R. 1381. An act granting an increase of pension to David H. Quigg;
H. R. 486. An act granting an increase of pension to John Armstrong;
H. R. 1074. An act granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Bean;
H. R. 1772. An act granting an increase of pension to James C. Plybon;
H. R. 1766. An act granting an increase of pension to John T. Stone;
H. R. 1378. An act granting an increase of pension to Henry H. Hobart;
H. R. 1073. An act granting an increase of pension to William J. Castlow;
H. R. 3010. An act granting an increase of pension to Thomas C. Meadows;
H. R. 3006. An act granting an increase of pension to William H. Crites;
H. R. 1511. An act granting an increase of pension to Cornelius A. Hallenbeck;
H. R. 1505. An act granting an increase of pension to William Birmingham;
H. R. 1752. An act granting an increase of pension to Hugh Lokerson;
H. R. 2395. An act granting an increase of pension to Christopher Clinton;
H. R. 2435. An act granting a pension to Hilia Ann Connor;
H. R. 2011. An act granting an increase of pension to John Lezenby;
H. R. 2594. An act granting an increase of pension to Levi Bearss;
H. R. 3506. An act granting an increase of pension to George W. McCormick;
H. R. 4196. An act granting an increase of pension to James J. Winans;
H. R. 2718. An act granting an increase of pension to James F. Hare;
H. R. 1199. An act granting a pension to Lydia A. Jewell;

H. R. 3340. An act granting an increase of pension to William Moorhead;

H. R. 3405. An act granting an increase of pension to David Palmer;

H. R. 4165. An act granting an increase of pension to Henry G. Sternberg;

H. R. 3449. An act granting an increase of pension to Harvey Gaskill;

H. R. 4153. An act granting an increase of pension to Henry C. Wildy;

H. R. 1179. An act granting an increase of pension to Thomas Picket;

H. R. 1288. An act granting an increase of pension to Sterns D. Platt;

H. R. 1789. An act granting an increase of pension to Jacob Shade;

H. R. 2089. An act granting an increase of pension to Laura J. Forbes;

H. R. 2735. An act granting an increase of pension to Samuel Foster;

H. R. 5027. An act granting an increase of pension to Charles W. Knight; and

H. R. 8994. An act to provide for a land district in Yellowstone, Carbon, and Rosebud counties, in the State of Montana, to be known as the Billings land district.

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. 5023. An act granting an increase of pension to August Westfield; and

H. R. 1056. An act granting a pension to Galon S. Clevenger.

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

Senate concurrent resolution 7.

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to inform the Senate whether changed conditions necessitate a change of project for the main breakwater of the harbor of refuge at Point Judith, Rhode Island; and if so, to submit plans and estimates for such revised project.

Senate concurrent resolution 5.

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed 3,000 copies of Senate Document No. 77, Fifty-eighth Congress, second session, "Les combattants Françaises de la Guerre Américane, 1778 to 1783," of which 500 shall be for the use of the Senate, 2,000 for the use of the House of Representatives, and 500 for the use of the National Society of the Sons of the American Revolution, to be distributed under the direction of A. Howard Clark, registrar.

Senate concurrent resolution 1.

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the concurrent resolution passed February 2, 1904, providing for the publication of the proceedings on the occasion of the unveiling of the Rochambeau statue is hereby continued in force and excepted from the limitation of one year, as provided in section 80 of the act of January 12, 1895, providing for the public printing and binding and the distribution of public documents.

STATEHOOD BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. HAMILTON. I now yield five minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HIGGINS].

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Chairman, the principal argument of the gentlemen opposed to this bill is that there can be no union of the Territories of New Mexico and Arizona because there is nothing in common between their people. They are located in about the same latitude and longitude. They both came into this country from the same nationality and in the same way. Their industries are the same, their development has come from the same sources, and they are both responsible to the same governing body—this Congress. In a country such as ours, whose national life and progress have been stimulated and maintained by the fusion of different blood and the union of many nationalities, it seems idle to say that a State should not be made out of these Territories because all of the people of these Territories are not of the same nationality. The very difference which by the opponents of this measure is claimed to exist will before a new Congress comes in be a source of strength to this new State. The very diversity of population, if there is a diversity, will prevent the abuse of corporate influences and secure to this section of our country a relief from a condition of government by special interests that the people have long wanted to be rid of.

It was said in the debate upon the floor yesterday that Oklahoma and Indian Territory, instead of being one State, would prefer to be two. I daresay that is true, and would like as well to be four. This same interest moves some Arizona people to ask to be left alone.

The assumption that Arizona ought not to be subjected to a State government against her will leads to the proposition that she is not to be admitted at any time to the Union without her consent. It reverses the order of things and subjects the forty-five sovereign States of the Union to submitting to the will of the people of Arizona what the States themselves have and ought to have the right to determine. It is not for this Congress to exploit a Territory. The eighty millions of people represented in this body are to determine the fitness for statehood rather than the 200,000 of any Territory. [Applause.] The basis of admission to statehood is not mere land, but the amount of population that this land can support. Territories are merely subdivisions for convenience and expediency. It is for Congress to make or unmake them, as in its judgment seems wise. There is no inherent right in the people of Arizona to come into the Union. As a Territory she is vested with no power to say how or when she shall be admitted.

A proposition was made to your committee by the minority that the question of the admission of Arizona and New Mexico be submitted to the people and not to become a law until approved by a majority of the electors of both Territories. I believe in the general principle of a referendum, and that the people can be trusted to act wisely, and that it is safe to leave questions to them. But what would be the result if jointure depended upon getting the votes of both Territories? If, as claimed by the opponents of this bill, that Arizona is opposed to joint statehood because she hopes for single statehood, how would her vote be cast? The population of Arizona is 123,000 and of New Mexico 195,000. If just one more than a half of the electors of Arizona, or 62,000 people, vote against this proposition, it governs the will of 256,000 people. [Loud applause.]

Mr. HAMILTON. Will the gentleman from Tennessee now occupy some of his time?

Mr. MOON of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I now yield ten minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, the plainest recommendation in the President's message is far the worst. He recommends the immediate admission of Arizona and New Mexico as one State, and makes this marvelous observation:

"There is no obligation on us to treat Territorial subdivisions—which are matters of convenience only—as binding us on the question of admission to statehood."

What remarkable language! Have the people no right to a word about their own institutions? Has Congress been at last advised by the President of the United States that too much time has been consumed by Congress in considering the great question of a State's admission into the Union and no more should be consumed, but the State must be made in a way that nobody ever asked for, and which is obnoxious to the best people of both Territories and absolutely calamitous to both in its far-reaching effects?

The President could not have known the conditions or he would not have made this recommendation. I infer from the very language of the message that he obtained his information from a consideration—to use his own words—"of all that has been developed in the discussions of the questions," and that must mean speeches made in the Senate when a filibuster—if I may properly use the term—was resorted to to prevent a vote on the bill giving these two Territories separate statehood. If the President believed any of the statements made in that debate I only wonder how he could recommend statehood for those Territories, either joint or single. The distinguished junior Senator from New York and an equally justly distinguished Senator from New Jersey threw great light on the subject in that marvelous "discussion of the question," the one on the educational qualifications of the blanket Indians and the other on the dangerous present effects of the Mountain Meadow massacre on our present western civilization.

But I am not inclined to severely censure or criticise the President. The mighty responsibilities which daily crowd on him, the great questions pressing hourly for solution, would not permit him to go as fully as is his habit into the actual facts which surround this subject and on the proper understanding of which so much of good or bad to my people depends. I regret that his informants were not informed. I regret that much of his information came through channels which he believed, but which were wholly prejudiced and unreliable. I acquit the President, as the whole world acquits him, of any intentional injustice. I know, and the world knows, that he hates injustice and oppression; that he loves a square deal. I know that he desires the prosperity and happiness of every part of this great country over which he wields for weal or woe so remarkable an influence. On account of that great influence I regret that the people on whom this blight will fall could not have seen the President personally and have given

him the actual facts of the situation, and have thus obtained his potent aid in a matter of life or death to them.

I am sorry that this recommendation was made, for it is against every fiber of the President's nature to visit a wrong on the people, a wrong that can never be redressed, and which if carried out will not reach its apex until long after all of us shall have passed away and history shall have left its severest criticism of his marvelously active life upon this very recommendation. In its effect it stands so out of joint with all his writings and public utterances and so out of tune with his very nature that I know I am justified in my early assertion that the real facts were not at his hands when he wrote that part of his message. Let it be understood that whatever I shall say hereafter in this discussion which may seem a criticism is directed not at the President, but at those, and one in particular, who have been officiously and offensively active in misrepresenting the state of the case, not only to the President but to the country.

But the gentleman to whom I refer, and whose egotism is so inordinate that it will permit no pent-up Utica to contract its powers, and his native State being too small a world for his conquering spirit, has invaded Arizona and New Mexico and pretends to represent both against the will of each, and actually thinks he is the author of a joint statehood bill for these unhappy Territories—unhappy enough even before they knew him.

Long before he ever thought of the question Mr. LACEY, of Iowa, made a speech to that effect in this House, and Mr. OVERSTREET, of Indiana, moved an amendment (to the omnibus bill then pending, creating three States out of Arizona, New Mexico, and Oklahoma) making Arizona and New Mexico one State.

I acquit both those gentlemen of a serious intention to accomplish the ostensible purpose—their real intent being to defeat the omnibus bill. Their purpose was to defeat the bill, which was bad enough, not to accomplish this greater outrage, which would have been intolerable. So the one man most active in pressing this measure had nothing to do with originating it. It is with him another case of the "Onward march of Russia," which Napoleon prophesied a hundred years ago and lost his Empire in efforts to prevent. But I must not permit his gratuitous interference in our affairs to tempt me away from my purpose of convincing every fair-minded man in this House who will give me his attention of the grievous wrong and irreparable damage that the proposed statehood bill will do to both Arizona and New Mexico.

First of all, the Almighty divided them by an almost impassable mountain range, and placed His warning against this bill. There is not a hamlet of 500 people in Arizona, off the line of railroad, within 500 miles of the capital of the proposed State. There never will be. Two hundred miles of unsettled country lies between the two Territories along the great Continental Divide, and that vast area will remain forever practically unsettled and untenanted, except by the roving followers of flocks of sheep and herds of cattle, and these may never come on account of the scarcity of water and forage in that inhospitable desert mountain waste.

The waters of New Mexico flow into the Atlantic Ocean; those of Arizona into the Pacific. The people of Arizona trade with the Pacific coast, while New Mexico trades with the East. It is as far from any well-settled community in Arizona to the proposed capital of the new State as from Washington to Boston, which journey takes you through seven States.

In addition to the objection of an almost impassable boundary between these Territories, the very size of them is equally objectionable. A State of such dimensions can not be economically administered. Besides all this, we have different laws, different debts, different school systems, and a different language. Our hopes, aspirations, ideals are not harmonious. Arizona and New Mexico are as much strangers to each other as Maine is strange to Florida. The laws and customs of the latter are more homogenious than in the case of the Territories mentioned. There is so little in common between the two countries that nothing, save the almost intolerable condition of a Territorial form of government, would impel anybody in either Territory to listen with peaceful temper to a suggestion of such legislation as is here proposed.

When I landed in Arizona twenty-five years ago, without money and without friends, I never dreamed that I was working for New Mexico. There are 100,000 people in my Territory who came as I came, and who felt as I, that they were each factors in the upbuilding of a great Commonwealth, and all of whom freely gave of earnings to erect schoolhouses everywhere, churches, court-houses, asylums, normal schools, universities, penitentiaries, reform schools, and every machinery and enginery necessary to the proper and humane administration of a great State of the Federal Union. Do you think we ever dreamed that all these expenses, paid at so much cost of labor, yet gladly and with buoyant hope of the great future, that it must at last, and against our consent, be handed over to a neighbor who did not even speak our language, and to be used by him as best suited his cupidity, greed, or benevolence? The enormity of such a crime appalls me. There can be no excuse for it. No political exigency palliates it. Nothing can raise it from the calendar of crimes. As was said on this floor yesterday, such action by this House is simply a demurrer against the decalogue and a plea in bar against the Sermon on the Mount.

My countrymen, you can not afford to do this wrong. Congress is already unjustly in contempt for wrongs it has not perpetrated. It does and has perpetrated many, but I beseech you to stay your uplifted hand over the trembling flesh of the unoffending object of your sacrifice and save this House and this Congress from the crowning infamy of a century of legislation. [Applause.]

I trust you, my Republican friends, are too big and broad to permit political exigency to enter into your consideration of this question. There is nothing in that view. Do you see any cloud on the horizon that scares you? But if we did see danger to party success, can we afford to steal in order to prevent such disaster? Can we afford to oppress for all time a struggling people in order to allay a groundless fear? The man who prophesies what the political complexion of any new State will be five years hence is a fool, as crazy as any visionary prophet who ever saw the armies of Russia marching to the destruction of Japan.

I pity the man who would let political considerations dominate his action in a question so great as this. The Democratic party since my advent here admitted Washington and Montana and divided Dakota into two States, and every one went Republican. The same was true of Colorado, whose first electoral vote defeated Tilden for the Presidency. The Republican party admitted Idaho, Wyoming, and Utah. Two out of these three went Democratic, and all are now Republican. No man living can guess the politics of either Arizona or New Mexico should each be admitted as a State. It is idle to speculate. It is undignified, if not disgraceful, to speculate on conditions rooted in crime. There can be no compromise with wrong in a man's conscience, there should be none in this august body. I will not believe that my Republican friends will turn their people in my Territory over to the spoliation, exploitation, or benevolent assimilation of New Mexico. [Applause.]

The President says: "There is no obligation on us to treat Territorial subdivisions as binding us on the question of admission to statehood." That is a surprising statement when we contemplate the history of our legislation. Since the admission of Vermont and Kentucky, in 1791, up to this good hour there has not been a single Territory admitted as a State the boundary lines of which were not strictly preserved, except in cases where a less area was taken in, and that always on the consent of the Territory. Every line of our legislation regarding the territory of the United States has guaranteed, by promises as sacred as Congress could make, to each Territory when established full statehood when capable of sustaining a State government. But waiving all this, I plant myself on a promise made by Congress to Arizona when it was created. The President must not have seen the organic act which created Arizona, and which stands as our constitution in the Territory, just as a State constitution stands to the State. That organic act, that solemn Congressional promise, that guaranty on which we relied and still rely, says in so many words—I read from the act of February 24, 1863, and signed by Abraham Lincoln, which created the Territory of Arizona. It says: "That said government (Arizona) shall be maintained and continued until such time as the people residing in said Territory shall * * * apply for and obtain admission as a State on an equal footing with the original States."

Can language be plainer? Under that promise we went forth to conquer the forbidding desert, we built our homes, we reared our schools, we made great expensive public improvements, and we find ourselves confronted by a bill which provides in effect for the admission of Arizona into the Union in conjunction with New Mexico, on such terms and under such conditions as the people of New Mexico may prescribe, and providing for the payment of the debts of New Mexico out of the taxable property in Arizona, and for other hellish purposes. That's exactly what this "Arizona the Great" bill means.

In the face of that promise who in my presence can vote for this infamous measure? Can you do it and look yourself in the face without a blush of shame?

I could well rest my appeal on that solemn promise before any justice of the peace in America and get judgment in our favor.

Relying on that guaranty, can I fail in a tribunal like this—the very tribunal which gave the promise?

Contemporaneous history shows a reason for that promise. The unhappy war between the States was at the crest of its sanguinary rage. Both parties were contending for possession of the then Territory of New Mexico. If I mistake not there was a Confederate and a Federal governor within its boundaries, one bearing the commission of Abraham Lincoln, the other of Jefferson Davis, both of whom first saw the light of this earth under the smiling skies of my native State. The Territory was found too large and passage over the present dividing line too difficult, and it was wisely decided to divide them into two Territories and by the act referred to Arizona was created. There was a large population of Spanish and Mexicans in New Mexico, who naturally retained the border prejudices growing out of our recent war with Mexico. Arizona was without any population of consequence. A premium must be offered to those who would dare invade and build homes in that then forbidding and desolate waste. That premium was offered in the organic act, in the promise which I have read to you and on which we relied, and on which our pioneers went forth with superhuman courage to overcome the superhuman difficulties which beset their path to progress. No band of devoted souls in the whole history of the human race bore more pain with greater fortitude, faced more danger without flinching, and accomplished more for their posterity and benefited their common country in a greater degree than did the Arizona pioneers. [Applause.]

And for all this what have they had at the hands of the Federal Government except oppression and injustice? And now it remains for you to burden and shame their declining days by throwing over them the dirty mantle now in your hands. They deserve better treatment. Ye who have been reared amid the luxuries of wealth and have from your birth been housed and clothed and comforted by pleasant surroundings can have small appreciation of the hardships endured by the State builders of America. You can not look into the bronzed face of the road maker across the wind-swept sands of the desert and read the pathetic story of the pains, hopes, disappointments, and dangers which crowded every day of his uncomplaining courageous life. And as he looked back on the work of his hands and saw a great State growing on the foundations which he laid, in his breast there grew a love of that land, a patriotism full of pride which you, sitting at the feet of money changers and measuring your patriotism by patronage, can never realize or half appreciate.

The virile, patriotic, militant Americanism of our earlier days has its dwelling place now in the hearts of the home builders of our western shore. When these reflections beset me, how I pity the stripling statesmen who have seen fit to denounce the representatives from the West as "sage-brush Senators" and have marked their first important legislative step by the crime of supporting this miserable measure. Shame on you younger men, who come here bloated with the high hope of giving valuable and free service to your country, but now find yourselves under party lash, compelled to do it irreparable injury. If compelled to do this wrong, decency should have dictated that you be silent about it.

Mr. Chairman, there is no justice or reason in joining these unwilling Territories in an inseparable and perpetual union. No reason has yet been assigned for it, and no reason for it can be advanced. If this be an effort to forever curb the West and keep it under eastern domination, why is there not one among you game and honest enough to say so? Are you afraid that such a declaration would drive away the western support which you now unhappily have in passing this bill?

You could with as much propriety join Alaska with Porto Rico. What is your purpose in this unholy scheme? Will some one dare answer? I can see how the selfishness of long-used power might blindly lead New England and extreme eastern Representatives to the support of any bill that would secure that power for all time. I can see how New England, less in area than Arizona alone, might willingly consent to keep twelve Senators in Congress and allow only twelve from the mouth of the Mississippi to the western border line of the English possessions. But why any man in the West would willingly permit a stretch of country over 3,500 miles in length by an average of some 400 miles wide to only equal New England in the Senate is impossible of explanation, unless, indeed, the time-serving statesman from that section wants a postmaster appointed at Bull Gulch or a public building erected in his little town, and, to secure his return to Congress by such statesmanship, is willing that his children's children may rise to curse him. To think of the great States of Texas, Arizona (as proposed), California, Washington, and Oregon fifty years from this day, with their teeming millions of people, being more than offset by New England alone in legislative power!

There are, thank God, many good people in New England opposed to the pending measure—broad, patriotic men, men legislating for the future, men who love liberty too well to impose shackles on us. The press of New England is opposed to this bill by reason of its injustice. I repeat, God bless them. I can't say in this presence what I feel like saying about our western neighbors who favor this iniquity. You leaders who are forcing the union of Arizona and New Mexico voted, every one of you, to divide Dakota. Every one of you have voted for single statehood for New Mexico, or at least did not vote against it when the bill was passed. You did the same in the case of Arizona in the Fifty-seventh Congress. Why this sudden change from good to bad? Was it at the mere ipse dixit of the President? Yet the President himself seems to have likewise changed, for in a letter written by him to Mr. Twitchell, of New Mexico, in the good year of our Lord 1900, and when he was the candidate for Vice-President on the ticket with the lamented McKinley the present President, among other things, said: "I only wish that New Mexico were to vote for President this fall. It is entitled to statehood, and I need not tell you, all that I can do to get it admitted as a State I will do."

Not one word about making it a part of Arizona. It was never dreamed of at that time. Not a soul in New Mexico then favored such a scheme. Yet the President confesses that five years ago New Mexico was entitled to statehood, and he promised to do his best to make it a State—a single State—not a double hydra-headed monster, as now recommended by him and stoutly resisted by the taxpaying people of both Territories. Oh, "it is glorious to have a giant's strength, but tyrannous to use it like a giant!"

I doubt the power of Congress to pass such a bill as this. What power Congress has is derived from the Constitution. Congress, it is true, has full power to create States out of Territories when the people residing therein consent. It can not make a State without the consent of the people. The Constitution prohibits the changing of the boundaries of any State without its consent. Is the organization of a Territory a mere idle ceremony? When it thus assumes the power of local self-government it assumes a constitutional and legal status which Congress has no right against its consent to molest. What is the legal status of a Territory occupying the position that Arizona occupies and has held for forty years? The Supreme Court of the United States has held that when a Territory was organized and the Constitution extended to it by Congress it is then clothed forever (and necessarily within its boundaries) with the inchoate right of ultimate statehood. Can Congress deprive Arizona of that constitutional right? As was said by Mr. MOON of Tennessee:

"Can Congress deprive a Territory of a constitutional right? If States can not be divided under the Constitution without their consent, or increased in area, can a Territory, once clothed by the extension of the Constitution with inchoate right of statehood, be denied that right without its consent? Is it not protected within its boundaries in its constitutional guaranties? Is not the right to statehood guaranteed when it possesses the qualifications for admission in the discretion of Congress? Congress may delay the exercise of this right—it can not destroy it. If so, the extension of constitutional rights to the Territories by the solemn act of Congress is a mockery."

The reasoning strikes me with force and is worthy of the careful consideration of this House, emanating as it does from one of the best lawyers in this body.

Mr. Chairman, I will not now consume the time of the House in setting forth the wonderful resources and rapidly developing industries of Arizona, which demonstrates the ability of that Territory to easily sustain every burden of statehood alone. That has been fully set forth in the minority report of the committee having this bill in charge, which report is at the hand of every Member, and to which I invite your careful attention. The same document shows equally the right of New Mexico to immediate single statehood.

Arizona and New Mexico are not homogeneous and never can be. They are strangers to each other and always will be. They have nothing in common and never can have. They differ in language, laws, customs, government, and ideals. They have different debts, which can never be equitably adjusted. Some counties in New Mexico are said to be bankrupt, while every public obligation in Arizona sells above par. Each Territory is fully equipped with the public buildings and utilities necessary to a full State government. New Mexico has many more people and much less property than Arizona. Under a legislature dominated by the greater vote of New Mexico, Arizona at

once becomes subject to the will, caprice, or doubtful benevolence of the majority, no matter how good her population may be. Every man who has lived long in New Mexico speaks the Spanish language; a very few of Arizona's population can speak it at all. The Anglo-Saxon tongue, like the Angle-Saxon race, is by nature intolerant and aggressive. When thrown in too close contact with a different race and a different language it presses ruthlessly for domination.

It has taken thirty years of contact to bring about tolerance and harmony between the residents of New Mexico. That Territory is now fairly homogeneous. Add it to Arizona against the will of either and bitter race and religious prejudices will at once arise to curse the unholy alliance. Animosity and hate will usurp the place of justice and friendship, and our unhappy Territories, tied by a Gordian knot which neither can unloose or cut, must be retarded for ages in their onward march toward the supreme development which the God of nature designed for each. In their separation Arizona and New Mexico are happy and content enough. Unite them and the scene is changed as the brightest day is followed by the darkest night. Arizona protests against all this. She refuses to be dominated and controlled by the superior numbers in New Mexico. She knows that conflicts will come. Radical change of her entire governmental policy will ensue. Say what we may, and boast, if we please, of the humanities of modern civilization, but "Woe to the conquered" is as much a watchword to-day as when the Vandals rushed with dripping swords to the sack of Rome. It may not be bloody, but it can be equally as cruel. I beseech you, my countrymen, to avert this calamity. This may seem wild extravagance of speech to you, but the facts, to my mind, are as clear as the noonday sun.

Mr. Chairman, I have nothing to say against the people of New Mexico. If let alone for a season they will, I doubt not, work out a satisfactory destiny. For those in that Territory who are pressing, by their influence and against our will, this union of the two I can not repress the expression of my contempt. Men who would thus wrong their neighbors are unworthy to hold for one minute the reins of State government. We have a just fear of placing power in such hands.

Who is responsible for this bill, anyway? Where did it come from? Arizona did not ask it, and her Delegate here is certainly as well acquainted with her wishes and her interests as is the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HAMILTON], or any other Member of either House of Congress. New Mexico did not ask it. Her Delegate here was elected on a single-statehood platform. Who commissioned any Senator to represent either of these people. And that reminds me; the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BEVERIDGE], in a report made by him to the Senate, which is a public document though hard to find, said this of New Mexico. Mind you, I am not sanctioning the report nor giving it my indorsement:

[Senate Report No. 2206, part 1, Fifty-seventh Congress, second session.]

ANALYSIS OF NEW MEXICAN POPULATION.

The greater majority are native New Mexicans of Spanish and mixed Spanish and Indian descent, and these practically all speak Spanish in the affairs of daily life, and the majority speak nothing but Spanish.

COURTS CONDUCTED THROUGH INTERPRETERS.

Courts are conducted through the medium of an interpreter, and it is impossible to conduct the machinery of justice without this official. (Testimony of Judge W. J. Mills, p. 2; Nepomuceno Segura, p. 4; William A. Gortner, p. 6; Judge McFie, p. 29; Judge Baker, p. 46; Judge McMillan, p. 110; Judge Parker, p. 96; Jose D. Sena, p. 31, and others.)

The interpreter interprets the testimony of witnesses to the jury, the argument of counsel to the jury, and the charge of the court to the jury. (Testimony of witnesses above.)

Occasionally the interpreter must be sent by the judge to the jury room in order to enable the jury to reach a verdict, since it sometimes happens that some of the members of the jury are English speaking, some Spanish speaking, and no member of the jury can speak both languages. (Testimony of Nepomuceno Segura, p. 7; Judge McFie, p. 50; Judge Parker, p. 265; Judge McMillan, p. 293; Jose D. Sena, p. 59; Nestor Montoya, p. 90.)

In the majority of cases it is true that some member of the jury is able to speak both languages and can then act as interpreter for the others. (Testimony of witnesses above.)

JUSTICES OF THE PEACE SPANISH.

Coming to the "courts of the people"—justices of the peace—practically all of them speak Spanish and the proceedings of their courts are conducted in Spanish. The dockets of nearly all justices of the peace are kept almost exclusively in Spanish. The statutes of the Territory in the offices of practically all justices of the peace are printed in Spanish. (Testimony of Jesus Maria Tefoya, p. 12; Felipe Baca y Garcia, p. 26; Francisco Anaya, p. 39; Charles M. Conklin, p. 40; Jose Maria Garcia, p. 41; Juvenico Quintana, p. 42; Leonardo Duran, p. 43; Seferino Crollott, p. 52; Manuel Lopez, p. 98.)

POLITICAL CONVENTIONS AND SPEECHES BY INTERPRETERS.

In political campaigns almost all political speeches are made either in Spanish or in English through an interpreter, and interpreters are used in practically all (it may even be said in all) political conventions. (Testimony of C. M. Foraker, p. 74; H. S. Wooster, p. 18; Felipe Bacay Garcia, p. 26, and others.)

This is true even in the "American" town of Albuquerque. (Testimony of C. M. Foraker, p. 74.)

An interpreter was used in the last Republican Territorial convention, which nominated the present Delegate to Congress, and nominating speeches were made through that medium. (Testimony of Jose D. Sena, p. 32.)

An interpreter is used in the legislature, and both councils (senate and house) have official interpreters. (Testimony of Jose D. Sena, pp. 32–33.)

SPANISH AND ENGLISH TAUGHT IN SCHOOLS.

Until recently (historically speaking) no English was taught in the common schools. At present both Spanish and English are taught in most of the schools. (Testimony of Miss Francesca Zana, p. 9; Enrique Armijo, p. 10; J. Francisco Chavez, p. 27; Rafael Gallegos, p. 22, and others.)

Spanish is taught through the second reader and no further, because a person who has learned Spanish sufficiently to go through Manelia's Second Spanish Reader can speak and write that language fluently, and no further instruction for practical purposes is necessary. (Testimony of Enrique Armijo, p. 16.)

In some schools, as in those at Santa Fe, no Spanish is taught. (Testimony of J. Francisco Chavez, pp. 27–28.)

IN SOME SCHOOLS SPANISH IS TAUGHT EXCLUSIVELY.

In some schools Spanish is taught exclusively, and history, arithmetic, and geography are translated from American text into Spanish. (Testimony of J. Francisco Chavez, superintendent public instruction for New Mexico, pp. 27–28.)

In the elections it is necessary to print ballots in Spanish as well as in English. (Testimony of H. S. Wooster, p. 18; Pablo Ulibarri, p. 14; Martinez, Amador, p. 105.)

There are towns (some even when surrounded by heavily predominating American conditions and influences, such as at Las Vegas) where the signs at grocery stores, meat markets, and all the mercantile establishments are printed exclusively in Spanish. (Testimony of Enrique E. Salasar, p. 11.)

The above are the conditions even in the larger towns; and this is intensified, of course, in the little country settlements, where the people are usually bunched together, their occupation being principally that of herding sheep and goats and with little or practically no communication with the outer world. (Testimony of H. S. Wooster, pp. 18–19; Rafael Gallegos, p. 22, and others.)

A portion of the population, even including some justices of the peace, have little understanding of our institutions. (Testimony of Felipe Baca y Garcia, p. 25; Leonardo Duran, p. 43.)

ILLITERACY.

The remainder of the 195,310 people in New Mexico are called in that Territory "Americans," as contradistinguished from the class above spoken of, who are there termed "Mexicans." But the "Americans" are made up from every other nationality except Mexicans. Germans, Italians, French, and all other nationalities are called "Americans." And yet of the entire population of New Mexico 33.2 per cent are illiterates—that is, that portion can neither read nor write Spanish, English, or any other language. (Census of 1900.)

If the test of illiteracy were confined to the English language only, the committee is of opinion that the percentage of illiterates would be much more than doubled.

After giving Arizona a slightly less drastic dose, the report (Senate No. 2206, part 1, 57th Cong.) concludes as follows:

The committee feel that it is wiser and better for the Territories themselves, and for the nation, that they shall wait that development which the resources claimed by their advocates will justify. When that occurs, when all of the requisites for statehood shall have been supplied, the members of the committee who are against the present admission of these Territories in their present state will be as enthusiastic and earnest for their admission as their most ardent advocates.

"Consistency, thou art a jewel." This same Senator at the present session of this Congress has reported favorably a bill to unite these two Territories into one State. He proceeds, from his own argument, on the principle that one rotten egg is bad, but two rotten ones would make a fine omelet. I am not complaining of the Spanish tongue or the people of New Mexico who speak no other. A man can speak Spanish only and be just as good a citizen as you or I, my contention in this regard being that if I can not speak a word of Spanish and my partner can not speak a word of English, the business would not prosper, and dissolution would be the wisest step for such a partnership to take. We have in Arizona Mexicans, or persons of Mexican descent, of wealth, education, culture, and high standing, who would honor the citizenship of any country. A great majority of those permanently domiciled in Arizona speak English as well as you or I; their children attend the public schools with ours; they bear every burden imposed by government as willingly as we; yet I am assured that this element of our citizenship is as much opposed to this proposed union as is the balance of our population. In fact, opposition to this bill is a duty of patriotism. It is a test of State pride. If a man love not his own State, I would not give a fig for all the patriotism his little heart could hold. You can not, as I said before, fully appreciate the love the builders bear to Arizona. Few of my hearers had a hand in making the State in which they were born. It is different with us. Our love for ours is not a mere inert theory, but a living, pulsing passion. "The earth is His for He made it" is the language of Holy Writ.

It is true that for many years the bird of prey has been hovering about us, but I can find no refuge under the shield of New Mexico. It is flying from the evils of which we have plenty to a promised shelter where we will find more. No; it is not a case of our free will. We are being forced, coerced, by this bill to dance to any tune which New Mexican pipers may play. This is an anomaly in the history of statehood. On the admission of the last State Congress makes its first depar-

ture. Who before this hour ever heard of a Territory being forced into the Union against its will, either single or otherwise? The gentleman who just took his seat laid down the new doctrine that Congress had power to throw a Territory into the Union nolens volens. I would like to know when it has been done.

Mr. MANN. It has been done frequently. It has been done more than once.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Do you say that any Territory has ever been forced into the Union without the expressed consent of the people residing therein?

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. When did that remarkable case occur? Name it.

Mr. MANN. Does the gentleman desire to exhaust his time in that way?

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Yes; I want that remarkable information.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman heard the gentleman from Ohio state that about Ohio yesterday.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I don't care what the gentleman from Ohio states in that regard. We know with what recklessness history is forgotten. [Laughter.]

Mr. MANN. The gentleman may not care about what anybody says.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I only asked information when interrupted. If the gentleman can't give it, let the incident close.

Mr. MANN. I can give the gentleman information.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Not on this subject. It is enough for me to say that it never occurred in our history, and will disgrace our history when it does occur.

When I contemplate the means which have been resorted to in order to pass this bill, I tremble for the liberties of the people. A precedent like this in a just cause would be indefensible; in a bad cause it is monstrous. What are we coming to? Whither are we tending? Must we now unlearn all we have studied and revered in our form of government? Are its three great branches—the legislative, executive, and judicial—to be blended? My idea of the President's proper function toward legislation was to recommend to Congress measures which meet his approval and leave to Congress the wisdom of following or refusing to follow his suggestions.

The House of Representatives now being dominated by the Speaker, and the individual Member sunk into utter insignificance, the agreements and trades entered into by the Speaker and the President as to what laws shall pass and what shall not, furnishes to the thoughtful mind a spectacle which should call its every faculty to resentment. The prestige of the Speaker with the patronage of the President can accomplish too much in the House of Representatives. It did accomplish too much in passing the unfair rule under the operation of which this bill will pass.

We have quickly grown familiar here with the exploitation of other lands and other people. I am reminded of what I said when the Philippine Islands first fell into our hands, but my prophecy is being fulfilled much earlier than I expected and feared. In that discussion I said here, that whenever we began to govern any people anywhere under our flag by force of arms, that when the citizens' rights were to be exercised under the flashing light of the sword, we would soon forget the rights of our people at home, and look unmoved on oppressions then which would now stir our country to its foundation.

After ruling colonies for three short years by mere military force, I am shocked to see you sitting smiling and careless here when every right of our people at home is being trampled under foot of a partisan majority. Becoming used to acts like this, how long before the President and Congress will invade the sacred rights of a State and direct under force its internal affairs. [Applause on Democratic side.]

The extreme means resorted to to pass this bill is utterly indefensible under our form of government. I shall take occasion at some future time to tell the history of it on this floor and let the country see what strides we are making toward the utter overthrow of constitutional liberty in this blessed land of ours. While we of Arizona have been falsely accused of bribery and corruption in efforts to defeat this bill, the people of Arizona and New Mexico are handed out five million cash as a bribe to adopt a constitution under it. Arizona never asked for it. She stands no mendicant at your doors. Pay her what you have taken from her through fraudulent railroad bonds, made valid by act of Congress. Pay back to her what your protected wards—the Apache—have robbed them of under your very eyes, and leave her in peace for a time and she will amply care for herself. Be just to her before you take other people's money in efforts to bribe her to acts inimical to her every interest.

My health admonishes me that I must bring these remarks to a close, but I can not do so without expressing the hope that the President will withdraw his great influence from this bill, and aid in passing this bitter cup from the lips of our people, from whom he enlisted the first company in his regiment for service in the war with Spain, and on the courage of which much of his great reputation was reared. The dauntless heart of Capt. "Buckie" O'Neil poured out its life's libation on the soil of Cuba while serving under Colonel Roosevelt in the glorious effort to free an alien people from the yoke of Spain. Thus Arizona furnished as a sacrifice to the liberties of others one of her most gallant sons, a man whose presence now we so much need to implead his late colonel to save his own people from the imposition of a yoke too grievous to bear. He aided in saving others, his own he can not save, for that tuneful tongue is silent; that facile pen is still. Does his pathetic death, met in the full glory of useful life, make no appeal to you? How gladly would Captain O'Neil have laid down that life to shield Arizona from this alliance. He willingly surrendered it in a less appealing cause. Of such as him is made the mettle of our western pastures—men who would seek no substitute in time of war, would hesitate at no hardship their country's defense might impose. If, indeed, the blood of the martyrs was the seed of the church, we may hope from such sacrifices as these Arizona's appeal will be heard and strengthened. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, Arizona is ours. It belongs to her people. We belong to a race that has never yet divided sovereignty and dominion—the very Joshua of mankind, of whom it was written that "Upon whatever soil he sets his foot, it shall be his, and no man shall stand against him all the days of his life." Arizona is ours by the blood of our kinsmen and neighbors, by the ashes of our dead, and, please God, it shall be transmitted unshorn of its blessings to our descendants forever. As I contemplate what this House is about to do I am overwhelmed with fears for the future of my country. A casual glance at history will trace too close a parallel between us and those proud republics whose wreckage dots the shores of time. It is still a problem if men can remain free. A reckless and brutal majority can easily become a many-headed tyrant. When patronage and advancement of political interest can dethrone the right in this House now, what will it be able to accomplish fifty years hence? What is this patronage of which we hear and see so much in the public press and on this floor? What is it but vulgar graft, invading the realm of statesmanship and intruding its coarse and sordid face in the temple of the people's rights? If such graft is to be the aim and standard of public service, it is time for an awakened public opinion to shake like a tempest the pestilential pool in which the virtues are stagnating and restore the waters and the atmosphere to their ancient purity.

We are holding colonies under the sword while Old Glory, the emblem of the free, floats above the glistening arms of the soldiery. We have spent already about $800,000,000 on and about the Philippines and have derived less in revenues than would build one battle ship to protect those worthless islands that lie rotting in the sun. We are seeing treaties executed, in effect, without the concurrence of the Senate, treaties which the Senate had refused to ratify. We see our gunboats bristling in harbors of a sister republic and our American officers there collecting customs to pay disputed and unsettled claims set up by the countries of Europe. This may seem all right to many, but to me it seems all wrong. The conservatism of the country so needed in this hour is to be found in the West. That country should not be erected into States larger than the mighty empires of the Old World. That savoring will be needed in the fast approaching days.

Mr. Chairman, let me beseech this House to assume and preserve its ancient dignity free from all encroachments, either of its own Speaker or any department of Government. The safety of the country lies within these plain boundary lines. We can not be too watchful. The free, untrammeled voice and vote of our Representatives in Congress is the first essential of a free republic and the only guaranty of its safety and happiness. When we shall all have passed into silence our posterity will be struggling with the problems of government which we bequeath to them. Let us highly resolve that we will transmit to our sons the blessings of liberty as full and free and pure as we received them from our fathers. As was well said in a recent speech of the eloquent Senator from Tennessee [Mr. CARMACK]: "There are visible signs of an approaching Titanic struggle. Upon the one hand are the forces of greed and avarice, blown

with pride and insolent with power; on the other the spirit of a vague but vast unrest, the spirit of revolution striking with blind fury at existing conditions—a spirit which would substitute anarchy for tyranny and chaos for corruption. Woe be to him who can see no peril in this ominous activity of the spirit of unrest; woe to him who mocks at the blind Samson when he strains at the pillars of the temple."

There is likewise in the land a spirit of false commercialism, which holds every man in derision who will not, for present profit, sacrifice the truest principles of his Government. Of such are those who to-day are mortgaging Arizona's future for a present mess of poor pottage. We must not destroy reverence for the old faiths, for nothing then will be left to which you can appeal against the passions of the hour. "It is a perilous thing to shake the foundations of a nation's faith." Let me say to you who would exalt the sordid motive of patronage above devotion to principle that you are marked for obscurity when the day of purification comes.

My countrymen, if by continued acts of violence to the people's will, if by the continued suppression of their voice in legislation, if by sealing the lips of their only mouthpiece on this floor, so that no voice of theirs can invade this Chamber; if by such acts of injustice and tyranny you unchain the spirit of revolution, do not dream that you can direct its course of destruction or that it will spare some corner of the Constitution where you may find shelter.

If we would perpetuate this Republic we must preserve those high purposes which gave it life and are the very breath of its nostrils. If we would resist the forces of disorder we must preserve intact the walls our fathers reared as limitations around the three great powers of government, and stand fast by the citadel of the Constitution as by the ark of the covenant of the living God. [Continued applause.]

Mr. McGUIRE. Mr. Chairman, during the few brief moments allotted to me I shall address myself to that portion of this bill which relates to Oklahoma and the Indian Territory.

There was a portion of what is now Oklahoma opened to settlement September 16, 1889. This is what is ordinarily, in that country, known as "Original Oklahoma," and the first territory now comprised within the bounds of Oklahoma that was opened for settlement to the white man. Previous to that date, with the exception of a few scattering bands of Indians, Oklahoma was an uninhabited country. This first opening brought to Oklahoma about 100,000 people, and on June 6, 1890, Oklahoma was, by act of Congress, created a Territory and given a Territorial form of government. Other territory has been added, including the Wichita, Sac and Fox, Cheyenne and Kiowa, Comanche, and Apache reservations, and the great Cherokee Strip, until to-day we have an area of 24,000,000 acres, a little larger than the State of Indiana and a little less than the State of Ohio, populated with nearly 1,000,000 of bright, thrifty, energetic, and intelligent people from every part of the American continent. Our representation in Congress by the provisions of this bill was based largely upon the census of 1900, which gave to Oklahoma and the Indian Territory combined a population of less than 800,000 people. This would be but a fair representation for the Territory of Oklahoma to-day aside from that magnificent population of energy and thrift which inhabits the Indian Territory. The growth and advancement of Oklahoma Territory for the last sixteen years has never had a parallel, and the people of a large portion of the United States have little conception of the great diversified natural resources of that country.

The Indian Territory under its present boundaries embraces the reservations commonly known throughout the Territory as the Five Civilized Tribes—the Choctaws, Chickasaws, Cherokees, Creeks, and Seminoles—and the small reservation embraced in the Quapaw Reservation, in the northeast corner of the Territory. Indian Territory at one time included within its bounds all of the present Territory of Oklahoma except the counties of Greer and Beaver, and was by the General Government designated as the home of the American Indian. The development of the Indian Territory has not been so rapid as that of Oklahoma, for the reason that conditions were not such as to invite the white man to that Territory. The delay by the Government of the United States in breaking up tribal relations in that Territory and our policy toward the Five Civilized Tribes has largely impeded progress there. The Indian until recently could not alienate his land, and the present provisions of alienation are so limited that few persons up to this date have been able to own their land in fee simple. And it is because of this policy, which has retarded progress and civilization among the Five Civilized Tribes, that has led Oklahoma in the past to make an effort for statehood for that Territory regardless of the Indian Territory. There seems to be no difference in sentiment upon the part of the various Members of this Congress, so far as I have been advised, as to our qualifications for statehood. There has been a difference, however, as to the kind and character of statehood that we should have. But I believe that question is now settled and the people of Oklahoma and the Indian Territory are practically unanimous in their efforts to secure the passage of this bill, uniting the two Territories into one State; and to this sentiment there is very little opposition.

There has, Mr. Chairman, been urged against this statehood bill, as a reason why it should not become a law, that the people of Oklahoma and the people of Indian Territory desire another kind of statehood. There has been something said about the State of Sequoyah, and an election recently held for the purpose of adopting a constitution for the proposed State of Sequoyah, including the Indian Territory and nothing more. The real purpose of the convention which resulted in this movement and the effort for the State of Sequoyah, in my judgment, was not altogether sincere. There is a strong element in the Indian Territory, and a most dangerous element, too, to civilized tendencies, so far as the Indian is concerned, which is most strenuously opposed to any kind of statehood, whether it be single or double, whether it be statehood for Oklahoma or the Indian Territory. Sometimes the tactics pursued by these people are one thing and sometimes another. First, they contend that the Indian of the Indian Territory is not prepared for statehood; not sufficiently civilized to cope in business and other matters with his white neighbor. Other times they call a convention and inaugurate the Sequoyah movement, or some other movement, the real purpose of which it not to assist the Indian Territory to statehood, but to throw every possible obstruction and impediment in the way of statehood of any kind or character. The real purpose of these gentlemen in that Territory is not to civilize the Indian. But statehood means representation on this floor from the Indian Territory; it means honest, capable, and legitimate representation, which would foil many plans which have heretofore been fostered in that country for the purpose of individual and material gain.

If we propose to civilize the Indian, if it is the policy and purpose of the American Government to better his condition, the quickest method, the safest and surest plan to success would be immediate statehood for those people. The Indian by nature is averse to the habits of the white man. Everything that the white man has and everything he does is not looked upon by the Indian with favor, and unless the habits of the white man are forced upon him he will never accept them. They do not accept our Christianity readily and they do not accept our business methods readily, but the most civilized Indian of to-day is the one who has been thrown with white men, white society, and surrounded by civilized people where the methods of the whites predominated and prevailed as against the method of the Indian. If you would civilize the Indian you must give him a white citizen for a neighbor. If you would have him adopt the custom of the white man you should put the custom, habits, and tendencies of the white man within his reach. We have many object lessons of this kind in the two Territories. The Indian most civilized to-day in Oklahoma is the Indian who has been most with the white man. The Indian least civilized to-day in that country is the one who has been the shortest length of time with the white man. There are two or three tribes in that country that wear the blanket to this day—the Osage Indians and the Kiowa, Comanche, and Apache Indians. The reason these tribes wear the blanket is because they more than any other Indians of my country have been isolated from the white race and its influences for good.

I have in mind some individual cases of young men of Indian blood who were taken by certain churches and grew to manhood in communities where they scarcely saw an Indian, and in each of those cases they are self-sustaining and resent any proffered assistance from the General Government. They were reared, cultured, and educated where they had not the example and knew little of the tradition and history of their own race. In their habits and customs they were essentially white people. In everything but name they are genuinely our kind.

And so, Mr. Chairman, for the sake of emphasis I repeat that the Indian Territory is not only prepared at this time for statehood, but if it had been given statehood a quarter of a century ago it would have been better for the Indian and better for every refining tendency and influence of that country. If Oklahoma and Indian Territory could have been given statehood as one State on the very first day of the opening of Oklahoma in 1889 that country at this time would have been one of the very leading States of this Union, with a population of 3,000,000 people. There is no question about the necessity of statehood in that country. There is no question as to the benign influences

of such legislation. There is not one single citizen, either white, black, or red, in Oklahoma and the Indian Territory to whom statehood would bring a hardship. But, on the contrary, every person who stands for the higher order of civilization, every person who believes in promoting and advancing the Indian to a higher plane and better citizenship would indorse this act and this bill, or any other bill, or any other act, which would bring immediate statehood to these people.

But not only the Indian is to be considered. There are perhaps not to exceed 100,000 persons of Indian blood in that country. In addition to this number there are seventeen or eighteen hundred thousand white people, coming from every State of the Union, who have reason from the natural course of things to expect that they would have statehood and all its advantages even before this date. There was, according to the last report of the governor of Oklahoma, June 30, 1905, about 800,000 people in Oklahoma. There are perhaps as many or nearly as many in the Indian Territory. There are to-day at least sixteen or seventeen hundred thousand people in those Territories. They have come from every part of the United States and represent the highest possibilities of American citizenship; and there are no more patriotic, liberty-loving, energetic people in the American Republic than are found there. They are not only capable of self-government, but they are capable of the highest type of government. There is no State in the Union with an equal population which has greater advantages, and there is no State in the Union with an equal population that has more schools than has the Territory of Oklahoma. In the Indian Territory it is different, for the reason that there is no provision for school district organization. We feel that in our efforts and concessions for statehood we have done our duty. We are confident that we have done everything that could be done so far as the people of those two Territories are concerned to acquiesce in the desire of the General Government as to the kind of statehood we should have. This Congress is legislating not only for the people of Oklahoma and Indian Territory, but for 80,000,000 people.

There was a time when those of Oklahoma believed they were entitled to statehood without Indian Territory. There was also a time when the people of Indian Territory believed themselves entitled to statehood without Oklahoma; but both Territories are convinced that it is the natural tendency of the American Congress to give them ultimately one State, and whatever might have been their personal contentions and desires they have abandoned everything to the will of the majority of the people of this great Republic. Those who believed that Oklahoma should be a State alone have reconciled themselves to their fate and fallen in line and are in sympathy with this bill, because it is believed to be the most practical and probably the better statesmanship. The same is true largely of those in the Indian Territory, though they may believe that country entitled to be a State of itself. Everything has been abandoned with the hope that the American Congress will adopt the policy which has been outlined by the majority of this Congress and outlined by a majority of the last Congress as well as that of the President of the United States and the Administration in general.

Under the provisions of this bill, Mr. Chairman, we would not be a State until March 4, 1907. As I have previously stated, the last governor's report of Oklahoma indicated a population in that Territory of about 800,000 people. This report ended the fiscal year of June 30, 1905. Since that date the enormous growth which has been going on in these Territories for a number of years has continued. Our cities are building rapidly, and the rural districts are receiving their due share of this great influx of population. Judging from the growth of the past three or four years, it is but fair to say that before we become a State under the provisions of this bill Oklahoma and Indian Territory as one State will have at least 2,000,000 people and entitled upon this floor to a representation of 10 Members. This is a remarkable condition of affairs. American history has never checked upon its pages an improvement so rapid and a growth in population so enormous. And I sincerely hope that inasmuch as every Member of this House practically has expressed a sentiment that we should be a State, we should not allow any differences as to the manner of becoming a State to interfere with our admission to the Union. Two millions of people, educated and Christian, with innumerable schools and churches, happy, prosperous, and contented, as abundantly capable of self-government as any part of this great country should not be made to suffer because of the individual differences of opinion as to how statehood should come.

I have been interrogated a great many times and by a great many people upon this floor as to the kind of people that inhabit that country. And in answer to these inquiries I desire to state that there is scarcely a Member upon this floor but who has friends and former constituents in that country. However, the shortcomings of my people are ofttimes magnified. I have been somewhat impatient with those on dress parade who have advertised that as being one of the only places left where could be found the high-heeled boot, the 6-shooter, the lariat, and bucking broncho. There are no people with more refined tendencies; no place where schools are so numerous, and no place where all these things which contribute to the well-being of our race are more apparent than in those two Territories. The only people who have come without our sanction are a few cases where the ability of certain individuals was not appreciated at home and they were commissioned to that Territory with a good salary. But they are tolerable, and in proof of the statement I would suggest that almost invariably when they came they were armed with hundreds of letters and testimonials of character, containing statements of the superior ability they exhibited in the States from which they came, but it was found necessary that they migrate because of the state of their health, and that they had friends and relatives at home of great influence—and the latter statement we were always inclined to believe. But the people of that Territory have done a great missionary work, and in almost every instance such as I have just mentioned those people have become fairly good citizens and in many instances will be recognized at home, if you will only give us a State.

In June, 1905, the Press Association of America had its meeting in Oklahoma. At that time I am advised that there were represented at that association several thousand of the leading newspapers of the country. I took occasion to ascertain what was said by those various representatives of the press upon their return home, and I have yet to discover a single instance where those gentlemen failed to present our cause to the American people. One of the leading papers of the country stated in substance that they "were positively stunned at the enormous growth of that Territory; that it would be a crime for the American Congress to refuse to give us statehood at the first session, and that no State in the history of the country had ever made its case so strong as have Oklahoma and Indian Territory." In point of merit we stand alone, and the only thing we are asking at the hands of the American Congress is to allow us to pass to statehood unhampered by the demands of any other section of the country. We feel that this is a government of merit, and that the reason we are the greatest Government among the civilized nations of to-day is because we are a government of merit; and as American citizens we believe that every tub should stand upon its own bottom, and that we no longer should be required to furnish the steam to propel anybody else's vehicle.

In order that this House may have some understanding of our population, I desire to submit the vote of Oklahoma in connection with some other States at the last Presidential election. I am advised that the Republican poll of the voting population of Oklahoma, as well as the Democratic poll, at the last election showed that there were about 137,000 voters in Oklahoma, and at that election, outside of county officers, there was no one for whom a vote could be cast other than a Delegate. There was not the incentive to draw the people to the polls that there was in the States, where the Presidential campaign was on; and at that election Oklahoma cast 110,000 votes, and the following States cast a less number:

Alabama	108,845
Delaware	42,873
Florida	39,302
Idaho	72,578
Louisiana	53,908
Maine	96,027
Mississippi	58,383
Montana	64,444
Nevada	36,154
New Hampshire	90,089
North Dakota	70,175
Oregon	90,184
Rhode Island	68,856
South Carolina	56,912
South Dakota	101,995
Utah	101,624
Vermont	51,885
Wyoming	30,655

It will be observed that eighteen States cast a less number of votes than Oklahoma alone. Adding the vote of the Indian Territory to the vote of Oklahoma at that election would have easily reached the figure of 250,000 legal voters. The additional States of the Union which cast a less number of votes than 250,000 are:

Arkansas	116,411
Connecticut	191,116
Georgia	138,198
North Carolina	207,867
Virginia	130,540
Washington	128,713
Nebraska	224,708

There are a few others, which I do not recall at this time; but there were thirty-two States which cast less than 250,000 votes and less than would have been the combined vote of Oklahoma and the Indian Territory at that time, and very much less than would be their combined vote of to-day.

Oklahoma exported in the last year 13,920 carloads of wheat, 8,023 carloads of flour, 2,368 carloads of feed stuff, 4,587 carloads of grain, 3,204 carloads of cattle, and 422,092 bales of cotton.

Conceding that the exports of the Indian Territory were as heavy as those of Oklahoma, to move them would require a train reaching from Washington to New York, New York to Chicago, Chicago to St. Louis, and from St. Louis to Washington.

Oklahoma has 345 newspapers, of which there are 30 dailies, 287 weeklies, 5 semimonthlies, 19 monthlies, and 4 quarterlies. The Indian Territory has 142 newspapers, of which there are 19 dailies, 117 weeklies, and 2 semimonthlies, the total number of newspapers published in the two Territories being 487.

There are in Oklahoma 257 Territorial banks and 95 national banks; in the Indian Territory, 144 individual banks and 118 national banks—more than has the great State of Missouri, and more, in fact, than has nine-tenths of the States of the Union.

Out of 86,908 families in 1900, 60,086 owned their own homes, 50,483 of these being without mortgages or incumbrances of any kind. The percentage of families owning their own homes is greater than any State in the Union except three, and the percentage of homes free from debt is greater than any State in the Union.

Thirty-one States have a greater amount of illiteracy than Oklahoma. The percentage of illiteracy among the males of voting age is 5.9, exactly the same as the State of New York. It is less than Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, or the District of Columbia.

Manufacturing is only beginning to develop. In 1905, 637 factories had capital employed $11,074,267, and an output of $16,433,430, and 3,492 wage-earners.

Oil fields are rich, one field alone producing 11,000 barrels per day and 50,000,000 feet of gas per day.

Shawnee, Okla., is the largest potato-shipping point in the United States, 500 cars last season bringing in $100,000 clear profit.

The two Territories have 6,000 miles of railroad, and within the last six years one-third of the railroads built in the United States was in those Territories. The railroad trackage of to-day would reach twice across the American continent between New York and San Francisco.

In behalf of 2,000,000 people I earnestly advocate the passage of this bill. No person upon this floor at any time or under any circumstance has urged a single reason why we should not be admitted, and I hope that the complications which have heretofore arisen and prevented our admission will not be permitted to interfere longer to prevent statehood for that country. Our people are essentially American, as much so as is found in any other part of the country. The spirit of the Declaration of Independence and of the Constitution of the United States is manifest in every community. The love of religious liberty and universal freedom is as dear to those people as they were to the Puritan at Plymouth Rock and our forefathers at Jamestown. There is no sentiment that has contributed to the building of this nation that does not dwell there, and we are here pleading that the great Government of the United States, through the American Congress, may relieve us from the restraint, unnatural and un-American, and lift us to the plane of the States of the American Union.

I hope this bill will pass. [Loud applause.]

Mr. MOON of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield ten minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. ADAMS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, it is not very easy to crowd a two hours' speech into ten minutes. The gentlemen who are responsible for the rule under which we are acting have not been liberal in the amount of time they have granted us. I wish to commend them for their procedure in the debate upon the Philippine bill, when Members of this House, of both parties, for a week discussed a question of great public interest to the edification of each other to some extent and for the information of the people of the United States upon a great national question. They have taken this question of statehood, which is vital—in a sense involves the principles of representative government, involves the welfare of the people of a great Territory—upon which there is a marked division in this Chamber, and they have allowed us only time enough to simply touch the question.

They went into a Republican conference, and they have brought in the subject of that conference into this debate themselves, and I am therefore warranted in alluding to it. They proposed first to hold a caucus; decided not to do it. Why? Because many Republicans went to them and said that they would not go into a caucus and be bound by its action. When that conference met the question was put to its chairman by myself as to whether or not that was a conference or a caucus, and the reply came back that it was a conference. What is a conference? It is a place where members of a party meet and reason together and see if they can not convince each other that each is right. It is not a place where men are bound; and the Republican managers of this House know just as well as I know that they declined to call a caucus because Republicans declared to them they would not be bound by the action of any such caucus. When they went into conference what happened? Gentlemen on the other side of this question took an hour and a half, and they granted us who opposed them only ten minutes. Is that good Republican politics? Will the leaders of this House lecture us about Republican policies and adopt a policy like that? Is that representative government? Is it loyalty to the history and traditions and policies and legislation of the Republican party? And then bring in an ironclad rule, binding these two propositions together, so that we will be compelled to vote upon them with one vote, and then come into this House and permit us but one-tenth or one-twentieth of the time we ought to have.

Now, then, Mr. Chairman, I listened yesterday to the speech of the gentleman who is chairman of the Committee on Territories. I do not wonder that that gentleman devoted considerable time to rhetorical climaxes, that he talked about "the glistening sands of the desert" and "towering mountain peaks" and "eternal sunshine," because it is far better for him to discuss those things than to discuss the real merits of the question. When he came down to make what he calls an argument, what did he say? Let me give you a sample. He said that the corporations in New Mexico were against joint statehood because they did not want to be taxed, and he said that there were some railroads in Arizona that were exempt from taxation. Why did not the gentleman tell the whole truth about that question? Why did not the chairman of the Committee on Territories say to this House that the people of Arizona came to the Congress of the United States, in 1890 I think it was, and asked Congress to pass an enabling act so that bonds might be voted by the county of Maricopa to build a railroad through desolate regions to develop undeveloped resources in the interest of the people of that Territory? And why did he not say, in addition to that, such a bill was passed, and it was vetoed by President Harrison, that thereupon the Territorial legislature of Arizona exempted these roads from taxation in order to get capital in there to build roads that were needed and that probably would not pay for years to come?

Mr. HAMILTON. How many miles of road were there?

Mr. ADAMS of Wisconsin. I do not know; 138 in one line, I think.

Mr. HAMILTON. Why, there are a thousand miles of exempt railroad in New Mexico and 586 in Arizona.

Mr. ADAMS of Wisconsin. And I want to say further to the gentleman that that proceeding has met the approval of the people of Arizona. Why, the gentleman went on to say that railroads are not taxed as they should be; that mines are not taxed as they should be. Concede it all, concede every word of it, and does that prove that we ought to have a joint State of Arizona and New Mexico? He says public sentiment is weak; that legislative judgment is weak in New Mexico, that it is weak in Arizona. Are you going to make it strong by putting two weak things together and outraging the judgment and the wishes of the people of Arizona? You say that when the railroad goes out of Arizona into California the assessment is increased and taxation is increased; that when it goes out of New Mexico into Texas the assessment is increased and taxation is increased. That is probably true. But why are we to infer that when these people are bound together who have made these laws and administered them that you are going to have a different order of things?

The gentleman says that mining property is under assessed and under taxed, and he proposes to take Arizona and unite it with New Mexico for the purpose of improving those conditions. Let me read to the gentleman from the report of the Secretary of the Interior about the character of assessments and taxation in the Territory of New Mexico.

The Secretary of the Interior says as to Arizona, taking into consideration the entire Territory and the property in the Territory with the exception of mines and railroads, it is stated that

the assessments will average 35 or 40 per cent of the fair market value of the property. The Secretary of the Interior states the total valuation of property in New Mexico, including railroads and mines, to be $364,500,000, and the assessed valuation is only 15 per cent of this amount. In order to improve the conditions as to taxation in Arizona he proposes to join with that Territory New Mexico, which, according to the report of the Secretary of the Interior, only assesses its property 15 per cent of its valuation.

Let me say to the gentleman further what all of us know, that it does not make any difference what your percentage of assessment is as long as it is uniform. Make it 10 per cent, 20 per cent, 30 per cent, or 100 per cent, the thing that gives justice in assessment and taxation is uniformity.

The gentleman is horrified because some of the mines are unquestionably under assessed in the Territory of Arizona. Undoubtedly.

Mr. HAMILTON. The governor of Arizona says that they are not uniformly assessed.

Mr. ADAMS of Wisconsin. Wait a moment. The gentleman will have all the time he wants, and he can ask me all the questions he desires if he will extend my time. The gentleman says mining property in Arizona is under assessed. That is undoubtedly true, but the gentleman knows that the value of a mine is one of the most indefinite things upon earth. It may be worth nothing and it may have a value of millions. Nothing is more difficult of actual ascertainment than the value of a mine unless it be the value of a patent.

No sane and honest man advocates under assessment of any kind of property. The chairman of the Committee on Territories criticises severly the mining assessments of Arizona and New Mexico. The inference is that he believes that when these Territories are made a single State under assessments will case. The chairman of the Committee on Territories knows perfectly well that unfair and inequitable assessments of property are common and a subject of constant complaint in every State in the Union, that the evil is not confined to Territories, and that it runs rampant in some of the States.

It was stated as a fact by Senator Clarke in a hearing before the Committee on Territories that the great Calumet-Hecla copper mine in the State of Michigan was assessed a less amount in proportion to its real value than the copper mines of Arizona. The copper mines of the Lake Superior region have been the leading copper mines of the world for many years, and Michigan has been a State for many years. And it is undoubtedly true that the assessments upon the comparatively new and less known copper mining properties of Arizona are closer to their real value than similar assessments in the gentleman's own State.

The people of Arizona, like the people of all mining States, have unquestionably very low taxation for their mining properties for the purpose of inducing capital to open up their mineral resources.

In 1900 Arizona had 113 producing mines and 381 mines in process of development. At the beginning of that year 1,085 patents and applications for mining patents had been filed in the land office.

On November 15, 1905, the record shows 1,620 patents and applications, or 50 per cent more than all that had been applied for previous to 1900. This indicates the rapid development of the mining interests of the Territory.

In ten years the production of copper in Arizona has increased 300 per cent. The total output of Arizona mines has doubled in three years, and it is believed that the Territory, within two years, will become first in production of copper.

The charge that the railroad and mining interests of Arizona are opposing joint statehood is true. The charge that they are using improper means in this opposition is not true. The men interested in the mines and railroads of Arizona would not have intelligence enough to run their mines and railroads if they favored the joint statehood scheme. The opposition to joint statehood does include the corporations of Arizona, but it also includes every business interest and also almost the entire population of the Territory of every class. The owners of mines and railroads necessarily have the same interest in the development of that Territory that all its people have. It is cheap partisanship to endeavor to prejudice the entire population of a great Territory by innuendo and false charges which excite the popular prejudice that exists everywhere against the exercise of corporation influence in matters of legislation.

Last October I visited Arizona and spent eight days in constant travel and observation in the Territory. I visited sixteen of the principal towns of the Territory and met many of its people. Outside of the public meetings I had many opportunities to talk with men of different classes in their places of business and as I met them in the streets, in the hotels, in the mining camps, and upon the railroads. I have never seen the people of any State or Territory more thoroughly united and more determined in their opposition to any measure of legislation than are the people of Arizona against the union of that Territory with New Mexico in a single State. From one end of the Territory to the other there is a whirlwind of indignant protest against the violation of the pledge made by the United States Government in the organic act which created the Territory in 1863, promising that Arizona should be made a State when the proper time came, upon the application of its people. The people of Arizona have not applied for joint statehood. They prefer to remain a Territory rather than lose the autonomy which they have had for nearly half a century—to be blotted from the map and made subordinate to the greater voting power of the Territory of New Mexico.

In round numbers, the assessed valuation of Arizona in 1905 was $58,000,000. The assessed valuation of New Mexico in 1905 was $42,600,000. Yet the joint statehood bill proposes to take Arizona with its assessed valuation of nearly fourteen millions greater than that of New Mexico and subject its property and its people to the domination of the New Mexican vote, which is nearly double that of Arizona and 50 per cent of which is Mexican.

Arizona has a school system which would do honor to any State in the Union. A strong compulsory education law is upon the statute books of that Territory. New Mexico has no compulsory education law and its people do not favor one. The school population of Arizona is 29,290, of which 23,766 are enrolled. New Mexico has a total school population of 68,193, with an enrollment of 36,111 and an average attendance of only 17,301.

The joint statehood bill provides that appropriations shall be continued to the agricultural colleges and experiment stations of each Territory, but this continuance is not likely to be permanent. No other State in the Union gets a double proportion of the Federal appropriation for agricultural colleges and experiment stations, and sooner or later Federal aid would be withdrawn from the college and station in one Territory or the other.

It is claimed that agriculture can never be very greatly developed in Arizona, yet the Indian and forest reservations include 26,000,000 acres.

It is estimated that the reclaimable grazing lands of the public domain include 13,000,000 acres, and the board of equalization reports state that there had been located and were taxed in Arizona in 1905 11,257,385 acres. In 1895 the taxable acreage was 3,862,282. In ten years the increase had been 291.5 per cent. In ten years the valuation of this property, with improvements, had increased 161.5 per cent. The railroad and other properties had increased 179 per cent. In ten years the school census indicated an increase of 126 per cent. The vote in 1904 had increased in ten years 59.4 per cent. The population, according to the governor's estimate, in that time had increased 120 per cent. The wealth per capita had increased 82 per cent. The banking capital, surplus, and money on deposit had increased 729 per cent.

These figures indicate beyond question the rapid development of Arizona in recent years.

The Secretary of the Interior, in his report, states:

> Arizona has a great wealth of forests, one of the largest unbroken forests in the world lying between San Francisco Mountain and the Black Mesa Forest Reservation, aggregating 600,000 square miles.

The Secretary states further that the completion of systems of irrigation now in progress and contemplated would increase the area of irrigated land in the Territory to nearly a million acres, and that at the present time there are 250,000 acres under irrigation.

During my visit to the Territory I spent several days in the company of Mr. Louis C. Hill, the Government engineer in charge of the construction of the famous Tonto dam, at Roosevelt. He told me that the water which would be held by that dam would be sufficient to irrigate more land than is now irrigated in southern California. Mr. F. R. Newell, of the United States Geological Survey, who designed the Tonto dam, is authority for the statement that there are 800,000 acres of land in Arizona which can be reclaimed by irrigation.

The pine forests of the Territory cover 12,000 square miles, and the value of the timber is estimated at $300,000,000.

It is absurd to claim that there is not enough agricultural land in Arizona to support a population which would warrant independent statehood. There is no place in the world where an acre of land under irrigation and proper treatment will be more productive than in Arizona. The climate and the soil are admirably adapted to the raising of fruit, including pears, peaches,

grapes, oranges, and nearly every other fruit which is produced anywhere in the United States. Arizona can raise everything that is produced in that wonderful garden, southern California. It has agricultural land enough, when irrigated and properly handled, to support a population more than twice as great as the State of Rhode Island and greater than that of 25 per cent of the States now in the Union.

But if the agricultural possibilities of Arizona were as limited as is claimed by the friends of joint statehood, her mining resources would be great enough to support a population large enough to entitle that Territory to admission to the Union at some future day as an independent State. While agriculture is a great and important interest, it is not the only one. Pennsylvania, with her 6,000,000 of people, has only 1,000,000 upon the farms of that State. Only a small proportion of some of the Eastern States, like New Jersey, Delaware, and Rhode Island, which are insisting upon joint statehood for Arizona and New Mexico, have a very large proportion of their people engaged in agriculture. If the claim were true that there is very little agricultural land in Arizona, it would not be a sufficient reason for the outrage upon public sentiment in that Territory in combining it with New Mexico. The people of Arizona are not asking for independent statehood at this time. They know enough to know that the development which is now going on in that Territory through the building of railroads, the increase in manufactures, the development of mines, and the growth of her cities because of climatic advantages, which are attracting many from Eastern States, are certain in the course of years to give her a population large enough to demand and obtain entrance into the Union of States.

Why can not these people be let alone? What extreme necessity exists for outraging the unanimous sentiment of the people of a great Territory?

It is claimed that this is a clear question of politics. It is claimed that the Republican party has been committed to the joint statehood scheme.

There is but one way in which the Republican party can be committed to anything in a certain and authoritative manner and that is by the platform declarations of a national Republican convention.

In 1896 the national Republican platform declared in favor of immediate statehood for New Mexico, Arizona, and Oklahoma. It did not declare for joint statehood for any of these Territories.

The Republican platform of 1900 again declared that New Mexico and Arizona should be made States.

In the Fifty-eighth Congress a measure was suddenly brought out of the Committee on Territories providing that Arizona and New Mexico be joined in a single State, and within three days a bill for this purpose passed the lower House. It failed in the Senate, defeated largely through Republican votes.

Joint statehood has been recommended in a brief paragraph in the message of the President to the Fifty-ninth Congress. A conference of the Members of the House of Representatives, and not a caucus, was held to consider it. An effort has been made to stamp the bill with a party label. It is not and can not be a party measure in defiance of the platforms of the party.

Very little effort has been made in this discussion upon the part of the friends of joint statehood to make a real argument for it. There has simply been an appeal to the Republicans of the House to stand together and make it a thoroughly political question. Considered from even that standpoint, the joint statehood bill is distinctly prejudicial to Republican interests. In the course of time Arizona will certainly be a Republican State if it is fairly treated. The influx of capital to that Territory is from the North. The increased population comes from the North. Originally the Territory was settled by people from the Southern States who were largely of Democratic origin and belief, but conditions have changed and every year increases the Republican vote. If the House of Representatives had not passed the joint statehood bill at the last session of Congress, and thereby indicated its unfriendliness to Arizona, there would be a Republican Representative from that Territory on the floor of this Chamber instead of a Democrat. Even in the face of this record, and with MARK SMITH running on the Democratic ticket, one of the strongest and most popular men in the Territory, who, as I have occasion to know, is greeted as "MARK" all over the Territory by people of all classes and parties, and who is a friend of everybody, warm-hearted and enthusiastic in his love for his Territory and his people, the Democratic majority was less than 800. Not only this, but it is not good Republican policy to commit a wrong or to disregard public sentiment.

Even accepting the mistaken theory that Arizona would send Democrats to the United States Senate, what particular necessity exists for the use of such extraordinary means as this for guarding and maintaining the Republican majority in that last citadel of a defeated party, the United States Senate? Is the Republican party in any special danger? Is it likely to enter upon a course of action which will jeopardize its hold upon the American people? Is it not the purpose of the leaders of the party to make it worthy of public support, and do they fear to go to the people of the Territory of Arizona upon the merits of their party principles and the cleanness of their political record?

Even conceding what will not happen, if Arizona is made an independent State and two more Democrats sent to the United States Senate, do these gentlemen imagine that the foundations of the Republic would be shaken and the heavens roll away like a scroll?

When did it become a crime to be a Democrat? There are about six or seven millions of men in this country who usually follow the Democratic flag and vote for Democratic candidates for office. They form a considerable part of the citizenship of this Republic. They pay their taxes and support the laws of the land. They are just about as ready to fight in defense of the national honor as the men who vote the Republican ticket. They are built just about as we are. They want order in society and honesty and wisdom in government. We differ radically with them upon some great public questions, but it is an honest difference of judgment. We must concede to the great body of the Democratic party the same integrity of purpose which we claim for ourselves. The evils which might follow the admission of two more Democrats to the United States Senate do not compare with the harm which would be done to the Republican party if this Congress consummated the outrage of passing the joint-statehood bill in defiance of the wishes of nearly all the people and of every material interest in the Territory of Arizona. When a great political party undertakes to do a wrong, it should think up some other excuse than the plea of political expediency.

In the discussions in the House of Representatives and out of it the people and the interests of Arizona have been misrepresented, and the Members of Congress who objected to joint statehood have been misrepresented and maligned by reports circulated that a mining and railroad lobby are in Washington using corrupt means to prevent the passage of this bill. There is not a shadow of truth in these reports. Not a shred of evidence can be found by all the detectives in Washington. These reports have been circulated, and circulated until they have reached the ears of many honest men, unconscious of their source and unconscious of their malignity, and have been believed to the prejudice of men who are fighting loyally and sincerely and honestly for the interests of the people of Arizona.

A distinguished citizen of Indiana seems to have had a curious misapprehension of the facts about Arizona, and the character of the contest which has been carried on to preserve her political independence. The character of his investigation of the conditions in the Territory by personal contact with the people of Arizona is described in a letter of Mr. William E. Curtis to the Chicago Record-Herald, dated Prescott, Ariz., August 11, 1905, from which the following is an extract:

> The people down here can not understand why Senator BEVERIDGE and others should be so determined to unite the two Territories. They see no reason why he and other outsiders should be so keen to place them under the domination of the Mexicans, and assert that no person who has any interest whatever in Arizona has ever asked for or approves of the amalgamation of the two Territories. Senator BEVERIDGE is even more unpopular down here than he is in New Mexico, and amusing stories are told of the manner in which he made his recent tour of investigation. When they first learned that he was coming, the governor and other officials of Arizona arranged a programme and itinerary over the different railroads, so that the committee, by special train, would be enabled to see all of the principal towns and mining districts and meet the representative citizens of each section. In the meantime, the boards of trade and other local organizations proceeded to prepare information bearing upon the resources, development, and conditions of the Territory, so that the committee might be fully posted as to its qualifications for statehood. A great deal of trouble was taken in making preparations for the instruction and entertainment of the party, and the programme required fifteen or sixteen days of travel and inspection.
>
> Imagine the disappointment and chagrin of the Territorial officials and the committees when Senator BEVERIDGE and his companions rejected their hospitality, repudiated their plans, and spent only three days in the investigation of the merits of Arizona for statehood. They reached Prescott a little before sundown, were driven around the city for half an hour, spent the evening at the residence of one of the leading citizens, and left the next morning at 11 o'clock. They stopped at Congress mine and went down about 3,000 feet into the earth. They arrived at Phoenix after dark, where several citizens called upon them at the hotel. The next morning they attended the opening of Justice Kent's court, took a drive of two hours, and authorized Governor Brodie to select two representative citizens to furnish the information desired. A good part of the afternnon was spent in the cross-examination of the gentlemen selected. A social reception was given the distinguished strangers at the Adams Hotel until midnight,

when they left by special train for Tucson. There they spent an hour an a half in the investigation of the conditions and resources of that part of the Territory. They were then taken by special train via Benson to Bisbee, where they arrived at dark. After looking hastily over the town they resumed their train and rushed on to Deming in the night, and the investigation of Arizona was completed.

The committee was furnished with a good deal of written and printed information, but it is evident that little of it was examined, because of the frequent misstatements in their report. Altogether, the so-called investigation was a ridiculous farce, and Senator BEVERIDGE and his associates must have behaved in a very undignified and childish manner.

The statesman from Indiana, upon the basis of such an investigation as described by Mr. Curtis, professes to know more about the wishes and interests of the people of Arizona than the people themselves know. He endeavors to discredit as entirely untrustworthy the experience of men who have taken some pains and have spent much more time than he, with just as much sincerity as he can possibly possess, to find out the exact truth. The innuendos and the slanders about the people of Arizona and their representatives who are before Congress seeking to make Congress know the facts about that Territory have had some effect, and there are Members of this House who will vote against their convictions and their judgment, fearing that if they vote as they know they ought they will be charged with unworthy motives. In other words, men are doing wrong for fear somebody will think they have been bought to do right. Insinuations have been made upon this floor that the men who oppose this bill have been animated either by personal pique, by disappointed ambitions, or because of some direct or indirect connection with the mining and railroad interests of the Territory, which, it is charged, are endeavoring to escape taxation. It is a common practice with lawyers who have a weak case to abuse the parties on the other side. It is a practice common in justice courts, but is hardly to be expected in the Congress of the United States.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania taunted the Republicans in the House who are opposed to this bill with being compelled to go to the Democratic leader to obtain time in this discussion. The gentleman from Mississippi immediately interrupted him and inquired if he would have granted these gentlemen time upon such requests to him. The gentleman from Pennsylvania immediately and emphatically said, "No; not one minute." This is the spirit in which this bill is being pushed in the House, and it is done in the name of republicanism.

It is claimed that Arizona does not have people enough to warrant independent statehood. Twenty States have been admitted into this House at a time when their average population was far less than Arizona now has.

It is a novel proposition to advance, either directly of indirectly, that the capacity and efficiency of United States Senators is in direct ratio to the size of the States from which they come. A Senator from the small State of Rhode Island has more power in the highest legislative body of the nation than both Senators from the greatest State in the Union. It is absurd and unfair to claim that Senators from the smaller Western States are any more of a menace to the national well-being than the Senators from New Jersey, Delaware, Rhode Island, or Vermont.

What is the basis of the statement of the gentleman from Pennsylvania that in this question there is to be considered on one side the interests of 80,000,000 people and on the other side the interests of less than 200,000 in the Territory of Arizona? Have the people of Arizona any interests that are not common to the people of the United States? Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania expect that in the event Arizona becomes a State her two Senators will swoop down upon the ninety other Senators and make a successful assault upon righteous law and just government? Does he not know that the people of Arizona have fought the battles of frontier life as bravely as any of the splendid army of pioneers who, beginning with the landing on Plymouth Rock, have built up the enlightened States of New England, the magnificent Commonwealths of New York and Pennsylvania, have made the Mississippi Valley the garden of the world, and have established great States upon the Pacific coast? Does he imagine that the men who own the hundreds of millions of property now being developed in Arizona through the best forms of American genius and the best examples of American industry, who have built up a civilization there which would be a credit to any State upon the globe, who have the same devotion to the Constitution of the United States and its flag as the people of any other State, will suddenly, upon the admission of Arizona, reverse the principles of their lives and the order of their action and become a menace to the welfare of the nation? Does he think that Navahos and bandits still dominate at Tombstone and Tucson, at Flagstaff and Prescott, at Bisbee, with its 15,000 busy people, at Phoenix, the beautiful capital, and in the many thriving cities of the Territory? A population which had its basis in brave men and braver women, who dared dangers from hostile savages, who reclaimed deserts amid innumerable dangers, and opened up the vast sources of inexhaustible wealth in the jeweled hearts of Arizona's mighty mountains are a people who will know enough to appreciate the wisdom of Washington, the splendid patience and charity of Lincoln, the statesmanship of McKinley, the lofty character and high purposes of Theodore Roosevelt, and those principles of liberty, justice, and equality which permeate American law and inspire those men who have been the great leaders of every party and the honored representatives of every section.

Arizona and New Mexico should not be joined in a single State—

Because each is entitled to independent statehood;

Because this country needs more western representation in the Senate;

Because the people of Arizona regard joint statehood as an outrageous abuse of Federal power;

Because, that being the sentiment of Arizona people, it would be an abuse of Federal power;

Because the faith of the nation was pledged in the act of 1863 to give the Territory of Arizona statehood at the proper time upon the application of her people;

Because her people have not applied for jointure, but have protested against it;

Because Jefferson was right when he said governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed;

Because Lincoln's plea for a government of the people, for the people, and by the people will be disregarded if this bill becomes a law;

Because the Republican party has declared for independent statehood for these Territories in its platforms and because platform promises should be kept: and

Because it is the height of political wisdom to be right and the depth of political folly to be wrong.

If New Mexico has people enough to warrant statehood now, make her a State. If she has not, do not repeat the old Roman crime against the Sabine women by forcing Arizona into the arms of New Mexico in order that a quorum may be counted.

If Arizona has not people enough to warrant statehood now, wait until she has people enough.

Her people have committed no crime in failing to multiply to the required standard. Many of them have fought the battles of the Republic on bloody fields. Most of them are now fighting honorably the battles of peace in the many activities of Arizona's religious, educational, professional, business, political, and industrial life.

Let them alone.

Mr. HAMILTON. I yield ten minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. KLEPPER].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. KLEPPER] is recognized.

Mr. KLEPPER. Mr. Chairman, if it were not for the fact that I represent one of the best districts in one of the best States in the Union, containing 200,000 law-abiding, intelligent, God-fearing people, and for the further fact that I have in the committee room voted for this bill, I would hesitate to speak on this measure, not because I do not favor it, for I do, but because of the fact that I am advised that the "kids" of the House are to be seen and not heard. The President, in his message to this Congress, made this recommendation:

I recommend that the Indian Territory and Oklahoma be admitted as one State, and that New Mexico and Arizona be admitted as one State. There is no obligation upon us to treat Territorial subdivisions, which are matters of convenience only, as binding us on the question of admission to statehood. Nothing has taken up more time in the Congress during the past few years than the question as to the statehood to be granted to the four Territories above mentioned, and after careful consideration of all that has been developed in the discussions of the question, I recommend that they be immediately admitted as two States. There is no justification for further delay, and the advisability of making the four Territories into two States has been clearly established.

That the Constitution gives to Congress the absolute power to fix boundaries, impose conditions not expressly prohibited by the Constitution in the admission of Territories as States into the Union, I believe is fundamental and can not be questioned. We have heard much said about the Continental Divide, running along between these Territories—New Mexico and Arizona—and our friends who oppose this measure would have us believe that there is a rugged chain of mountains running along the line that separates them; that the Creator, when He spoke this continent into existence, formed a natural barrier between the Territories which makes intercommunication inconvenient if not impracticable, while the facts are that the first bill introduced, the first proposition to divide the Territory, did not divide it on a merid-

ian of longitude, but divided upon a degree of latitude. From the best information I have been able to gather this so-called "range of mountains" is in fact and reality a high plateau, with an occasional mountain peak raising its head above the surrounding country. The most of it is so level on the top that pools and lakelets of water form, there to stay until the water is evaporated. There is not a point on the boundary line that touches the Continental Divide. In fact, it is from 25 to 145 miles distant from the boundary line to points on this so-called "Continental Divide." Four railroads cross this so-called "insurmountable barrier"—the Santa Fe, Lordsburg and Clifton, Southern Pacific, Phelps-Dodge Company's road, and the Santa Fe is now projecting a branch which will run into Phoenix.

It is true, as stated by the President, that nothing has taken up more time during the past few years than the question of statehood to be granted these Territories. In fact, New Mexico and Arizona have been a part of this domain for nearly sixty years, and it seems they have been putting in a good deal of their time knocking on the door, seeking admission into the Union of States, but without success. A bill for the admission of New Mexico has passed one House or the other of Congress seventeen times, and has passed both Houses of Congress twice but failed in conference. Arizona has applied for admission about a dozen times, and so the experience of the past with these Territories would lead to but one conclusion, and that is this: That the sentiment of this country is against the admission of either of the Territories as a single State. There are a few things that should be carefully considered in approaching the subject of the admission of these Territories. The welfare of the nation and the welfare of the Territories. In discussing this it is pertinent to suggest this question: First, the preparedness of the Territories for statehood. Have they a citizenship sufficiently enlightened, capable, and worthy of having extended to them the full right granted other citizens of the nation? Second, have they territory sufficient to support a population large enough to make a respectable State?

On the first proposition I believe it will be admitted that the people of these Territories are capable and worthy of having accorded to them the full rights of citizenship. There are many States in the Union that have a greater percentage of illiterates than have the Territories of New Mexico and Arizona, so I believe it is not even a debatable question that the people of these Territories are entitled to the blessings of statehood. It is true that their numbers are small as compared with many of the other States, for by the most liberal estimates there is less than one-half million in both the Territories.

The governor's report only claims for Arizona 140,000 people, while Mr. Rodey, ex-Delegate from New Mexico, admits she has 175,000 population, and the last census gives to her 122,931. So according to these figures the population of Arizona, at the most liberal estimate, is less than that of the average Congressional district from the various States of the Union. This is her present condition as regards population; but now as to her possibilities, and in this connection I desire to say that, in my humble opinion, the Territory of Arizona has not, nor will she ever have, sufficient population to make a respectable State as compared with the other States of the Union. To-day, according to the Reclamation Service, 247,000 acres of the lands of Arizona are under irrigation, while, according to the estimates of the Geological Survey, this area can only be increased 500,000 acres, which will make a total of approximately 747,000 acres. The total area in acres is 72,332,800, while, as you see from these figures, and they should be accepted as authority, the total possible irrigable lands is just about 1 per cent of the area of the Territory. Now, to emphasize this argument that the Territory of Arizona has not sufficient natural resources to maintain a population to make a respectable State, but she of necessity must submit to a merger with her sister Territory, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. LLOYD], on the committee, may be surprised when I tell him that in his splendid district he has nearly five times as many acres of productive land as by the most liberal estimates can ever be irrigated in the Territory of Arizona alone, for his district contains 3,376,640 acres, while the assessed valuation of the land in the gentleman's district in 1902 is $58,791,463, as against $42,000,000 for the entire Territory of Arizona, while the crops growing in 1902 in this gentleman's district amounted to $15,623,965, while the live stock for the same year was assessed at $27,578,822; and his is not the only good district in the State of Missouri, for the ten counties that I have the honor to represent have lands that were in 1902 assessed at $72,013,687, of crops she produced $19,067,676, while of live stock she produced $34,652,435. In this connection, Mr. Chairman, I would like to call your attention to the fact that the total assessed taxable wealth of New Mexico, according to the governor's report, is at the present time not to exceed $42,000,000, while out of a total area of over 78,000,000 acres of land only 250,000 are in cultivation under irrigation, and, according to Government experts, it will only be possible at the most liberal estimates to reclaim by irrigation 1,000,000 acres.

It will thus be seen, Mr. Chairman, that according to these reports and according to the estimates of the Geological Survey these two vast Territories when combined will not have to exceed one and three-quarter million acres under cultivation or irrigation. Land in the semiarid region without irrigation is in most instances as cropless as rocks. Gentlemen must never forget when considering this question that the average population per State of this Union is at the present time a little over 1,500,000 people, and the majority of American opinion is that we have too many States now far below that reasonable average in population, and even the one we are now considering will have but about one-third of the one and a half million of population. Statistics show that the great States of this nation are in recent years increasing proportionately quite as fast as the smaller States, and this average of population for statehood will in the future increase rather than diminish, and therefore it may well be said that at no time in the future will the condition of these Territories as to population in comparison with the rest of the nation warrant their admission separately. Then, as the President has well said, there is no reason for further delay.

Oklahoma and Indian Territory combined at this time just about come up to the full requirements. But one of the principal arguments advanced on the floor of this House as against the merger of these western Territories is that you unite two peoples dissimilar in educational attainments, national character, and race; that it is a great injustice to the people of the Territory of Arizona to be forced into an unholy wedlock with the people of New Mexico. The pharisaical phrase of "I am holier than thou" has been dinned into the ears of the committee, and the same spirit is manifest here on the floor of the House. In this connection, Mr. Chairman, I will call the committee's attention to the testimony of the Reverend Shields, who is before the committee from Arizona protesting against the jointure. I think his testimony should carry great weight, as he spoke from a knowledge of conditions obtained by actual contact with the people of New Mexico and those of Arizona, as he has lived for a number of years in each of the Territories. This question was asked by Mr. KLEPPER:

Q. I believe you stated you lived in New Mexico a while?—A. I was there four years.

Q. You had occasion, I suppose, to get pretty well acquainted with the Mexican people over there?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What class of citizens are they, in a general way? What are their leading characteristics?—A. I think as a rule the Mexicans are an exceedingly conservative people, and a people who prefer to live according to long-time traditions. I think they are a quiet, pastoral people, inclined to obey the laws, and yet a people with whom the Anglo-Saxon people does not amalgamate very much. I think the fact that a child born of a union between an American white man and a Mexican woman being called a "coyote" indicates the feeling.

Q. Is it not a fact that the Mexicans do not attempt to dominate in politics?—A. Yes.

Mr. COLE, of the committee, asked this question of this same witness:

Q. What is the standard of morality among the New Mexicans—the people of Spanish extraction there?—A. I have no reason to believe but what a majority of the people are true to their marital vows; nearly all of them are Roman Catholics, and we know that the priests in the Roman Catholic Church try to hold up a high standard to them.

Mr. HAMILTON, the chairman of the committee, asked the same witness this question:

Q. And they are otherwise a moral people, are they not?—A. I say they are a quiet, orderly people—law-abiding.

Q. (By Mr. COLE.) Not difficult to govern, are they?—A. No; not difficult to govern, and yet not difficult to handle.

In this connection I would call the committee's attention to a statement made by Mr. ANDREWS, present Delegate from New Mexico:

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, a few days ago I was here at a meeting of the committee, and my friend Mr. MOON was present, and some others here, and I made a statement that I thought the native population of the State of New Mexico, which I have the honor to represent, would be 70 per cent native and 30 per cent American. There are twelve counties in the State of New Mexico which are American by a good majority. There are eight native counties and five that are divided—that is, part American and part native. I would say to Mr. MOON and others who were here that day that I think 50 per cent would be a fair average. I wish to somewhat change my statement made the other day. Mr. Rodey, who was my predecessor here, thinks that it would be less than 50 per cent native, but that would be my judgment.

Q. (By the chairman.) What proportion of these are English-speaking people?—A. I presume four-fifths of the natives speak English.

You might travel through the Territory everywhere—I have traveled all over it—and very seldom would you meet a native who could not talk to you in English. Of course, they have interpreters in the courts, as they have them in all the States. They have them in Pennsylvania, the State that I was born and raised in. There is hardly any State

where they have any foreign population in which they do not have interpreters, but the educational clause is very strict in New Mexico and English is taught in the public schools.

Attention was called during these hearings before the committee to the fact that in many eastern cities there is a population of foreign extraction that in some instances amounts to almost half the residents; for instance, the great city of Chicago has 34.6 per cent of foreign-born citizens; Boston, the center of culture on this continent, which has an aristocracy of brains, has a foreign population of 35 per cent; Lowell, Mass., a foreign population of 43 per cent. And so I might go on with many other places with large percentages of foreigners—and remember these are real foreigners—people born in other countries, while these native New Mexicans are every one born on the soil of New Mexico, and are no more to be classed as foreigners than are the Acadians of Louisiana, who are of French extraction, or the Penn colonists of Pennsylvania.

I submit that these New Mexicans, the vast majority of whom are of pure Castilian extraction, the highest type of the original Americans, of the Caucasian race, and the people who blazed the way for all European nations on this continent. (The few thousands of New Mexicans who are mixed with the Pueblo Indians do not in a sense detract from the truth of this general statement.) I say these people are vastly superior to some of the elements that come through Castle Garden annually to scatter over the country and who are now and have for these many years helped to govern the people in these Territories, for last year we received from foreign lands a million immigrants to dilute our civilization. Evidence was submitted to the committee that the natives of New Mexico of Spanish extraction are lawyers, doctors, clergymen, educators, and editors in about the same proportion to their numbers as are those of the other races inhabiting the Southwest, and we are assured that as to this class there is practically no difference between them and others of the community save that they possess the accomplishment of being thoroughly conversant with two modern languages instead of one. I might add that one of the principal good things that can be said about them is that as a class the entire native population of New Mexico has sense enough to be intensely Republican in politics. And as I have for the first time in the course of my remarks mentioned politics, I may say that the opposition, coming from the minority side of the House, is, in my judgment, not so much because they wish to sever the provisions of this bill as to these western Territories, as the opportunity it has offered them to sever on the floor of this House the membership of the majority. As a type of the much-abused native New Mexican, I would call your attention to the late governor, Mr. Otero. I am informed that his father, though a native-born New Mexican, was a type of the high citizenship of that country and was a professor of Greek in Poughkeepsie College, New York, in his younger days, and his mother was a Miss Blackwood, of St. Louis, Mo.

The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. REID] stated yesterday on the floor of this House that there was no evidence submitted before the committee showing that the great interests of Arizona were interested in the question of statehood or in opposing it; but I would remind the gentleman that if he will refer to the published hearing before our committee he will, on page 78, find a letter submitted by Mr. Fowler, of which Mr. Douglass, head of the Phelps-Dodge enterprises, an Englishman by birth, is the author:

I have in my hand something I think will be of special interest to the chairman and some of the members of the committee, because they have inquired particularly in regard to the Copper Queen mine and the owners and what their attitude is upon this question of statehood. I want to read this article (reading from newspaper):

The New York Tribune last week interviewed Prof. James Douglas on the subject of statehood legislation, and said:

"Dr. James Douglas, who is the executive head of the mining enterprise in Arizona grouped as the Phelps, Dodge & Co. interests, was seen in his office, No. 99 John street, yesterday afternoon and gave his views upon the proposed joint statehood of Arizona. Doctor Douglas said:

"It seems almost futile for one identified with corporate interests in either of the Territories to voice his views in opposition to joint statehood. Those who favor the proposition charge us with selfish and ulterior motives. My answer is that we are merely reflecting the sentiment of practically every intelligent citizen of Arizona in our opposition, and to the charge that those interested in mining operations in the Territory are maintaining a lobby at large expense in Washington to promote separate statehood, I am able truthfully to assert that Phelps, Dodge & Co. are not spending a dollar for that purpose. The only thing we have done was on the occasion of the visit of the Territorial Committee of the House to Arizona last summer, when we afforded the Congressional party the facilities of our railroad and accorded them the usual courtesies of ordinary hospitality when they visited any of the points where our mines or smelting plants are situated. The Congressmen were under the escort of F. M. Murphy, who, with his brother, ex-Governor N. O. Murphy, has mining interests in another part of the Territory.

"'To force Arizona into a union with New Mexico is to do a great wrong to the people of the former Territory, who, in racial antecedents, religious preferences, and industrial interests, are wholly unlike the inhabitants of New Mexico. New Mexico has a population sufficient to justify her admission as a single State, and the people of Arizona, among whom I have spent more than twenty-five years of my life, would rather wait twenty years for statehood than be joined to New Mexico.

"'In the event of joint statehood the vast interests in Arizona would be outvoted and so controlled in the matter of taxation by the greater population of the present Territory of New Mexico, which is vastly less important in the value of its taxable property. The various interests of Phelps, Dodge & Co., including railroads and mines and smelters, employ fully 10,000 men, about three-fourths of that number in Arizona and the balance on the railroads and in the coal mines in New Mexico; and since more than 10 per cent of the population of Arizona is either employed in or dependent upon our various enterprises, we may fairly entertain the opinion that it is scarcely an impertinence for us to express views on questions that bear on the welfare of the people or of the great mining industry there.

"'I can well understand that it may seem desirable to substitute a State government for the Territorial form wherever it can be wisely accomplished, and I can also appreciate the political considerations that are involved in the contention for joint statehood, but neither should outweigh the injustice that would be involved in such an unfit alliance as that of Arizona and New Mexico.

"'Finally, I want it clearly understood that Phelps, Dodge & Co. have never been in politics and do not desire to enter that field, and that the insinuation that we are spending money to influence separate statehood or defeat joint statehood is a foundationless falsehood.'"

If he searches the record further, he will find that ex-Governor Murphy, of Arizona, testified before the committee, and he will recollect that it was stated that Mr. Murphy and his brother Frank, both of whom are at present in this city, are among the largest mine owners and railroad officials in the Territory of Arizona; further, the reports of the respective governors of these two Territories are before the committee, and references made in these reports, in no uncertain terms, to tax questions and Congressional laws existing in favor of these great interests and from which they reap tremendous benefit, that leave plenty of room for inference by the committee that the beneficiaries must inspire some of the strenuous opposition to this merger. Mr. Rodey, ex-Delegate from New Mexico, painted a picture in his three-hour statement before our committee of the thraldom in which these Territories are held by the railroad, mine owners, cattle interests, and officeholders that not only astonished many of us, but was positively appalling as a description of conditions. The gentleman from Arkansas has also forgotten the testimony submitted by the head of the Cattle Growers' Association of Arizona, Mr. Sturgis, who testified that the cattle interests of Arizona were opposed to this merger, and he submitted the following resolution:

Mr. Sturgis read the following resolution:

"*Resolved by the Arizona Cattle Growers' Association in meeting assembled at Phoenix, Ariz., on the 29th day of December, 1905:*

"First. That we are earnestly opposed to the jointure of Arizona and New Mexico as one State, as is proposed by the bill now pending in the United States Congress.

"Second. That we are as earnestly opposed to the jointure of Arizona and New Mexico under any proposition.

"Third. That we deem the bills now pending in Congress in the light of an attempt to force the people of Arizona—who hitherto have had for nearly half a century, and for a period covering all its growth and development, a separate political autonomy—to be subjected to the domination of a more numerous people of another country. The reasons for our opposition to the proposed jointure are numerous and, to us, controlling.

"That the proposed union is distasteful to us, that it would delay and hamper our further progress, that it would result in confusion of laws and consequent disastrous disturbance of business are among the many reasons completely obvious to us, who, by reason of residence, are familiar with conditions. It may be conceded that a Territorial form of government—in practice, at least—affords some just grounds to our people for complaint; but these evils are purely temporary, and with the lapse of time will be remedied. But we submit that if, as we sincerely believe would be the result, the proposed union would prove disastrous to and destructive of the future prosperity of our Territory to a very considerable extent, the great evil would be permanent and irremediable.

"We can and will submit to the evils of continued Territorial government rather than assume those incomparably greater evils which we fear will follow jointure.

"Whether our fears are justified or not, they exist. We are American citizens none the less than are the citizens of the States, and we claim that we have the right as such to dissent from the proposal of a State government to the constitution and establishment of which we do not consent.

"We can not resist the declaration that the proposed bills are in violation of the first principles of our American institutions—that the just powers of government are derived from the consent of the governed.

"The proposition is un-American. We accordingly respectfully but earnestly protest against it.

"Passed unanimously, December 29, 1905.

[SEAL.] "ARIZONA CATTLE GROWERS' ASSOCIATION.
"JAS. E. BARK, *President*."

The CHAIRMAN. The only specification of possible injury growing out of the joining of New Mexico and Arizona in those resolutions is the statement that it would result in confusion of laws and consequently injury to business, is it not?

Mr. STURGIS. In those resolutions? Yes, sir. I do not know what their laws in New Mexico are, but I know they want to revise them and they have sent over to us for our sanitary and cattle laws.

The CHAIRMAN. And have they used them?

Mr. STURGIS. They have sent to us for them.

In addition to what has been said about the taxation of the railroads of New Mexico and Arizona, for it has been con-

clusively shown that they are inadequately taxed, I have been reliably informed that there is not in either of the Territories a single line of law on their statute books restricting, limiting, or controlling in any sense passenger or freight rates upon the railroads, and you may search the Supreme Court Reports of New Mexico, from lid to lid, through the entire set, in vain to find a single decision in a personal damage case against the railroads, and I am informed that the same is practically true in Arizona. Thus is added another reason why the railway interests of these Territories are not hunting for statehood. Gentlemen will easily appreciate that it is of vast importance to these great railroad interests to have the small empire of country embraced in the area of these two Territories so completely free from what they denominate annoying regulations of the people. According to the testimony of Mr. W. S. Sturgis, president of the Cattle Growers' Association of Arizona, she has, grazing over her broad domain, by his own admission, 750,000 head of cattle. These cattle are raised without expense to the owners, so far as rent goes, and they, with other live-stock interests, are strenuously opposed to statehood, for as soon as this bill becomes a law these cattle barons will be called upon to pay a small rental for the privileges they now enjoy, which will be turned into the school funds for the support of the public schools of Arizona. I am also informed that probably twice as many cattle as that, or nearly a million and a half head, graze over the public domain of New Mexico without paying a cent of rental for the use of the grass, and, of course, under statehood these cattle barons would also have to pay a similar small rental that would go to the schools. Statehood for the Territories may seem a little harsh to the live-stock interests of the Territories, but will be a blessing to the children of those jurisdictions who will attend the public schools; and there are those in this nation who can see greater wisdom in laws that will turn a revenue into the common schools of these Territories, than the want of laws, which permits free grass to be donated to cattle barons and the beef trust. As between free grass for the cattle barons of these Territories and free schools for the children of the Territories there certainly can be no difference in the minds of the membership of this Congress. But it has been insisted that the merger of these Territories will make a State so large as to work great inconvenience to the people, and yet the combined Territory, while large in area, is comparatively compact in form, and lacks more than 30,000 square miles of being as large as Texas. Another important fact is that the combined Territories are but about 650 miles across, while from several points in Texas it is but little greater than that distance to the capital of that State, which is somewhere near the center of Texas—perhaps somewhat east of it. The lower end of California is quite densely populated, and yet to reach the capital of that State, Sacramento, they must travel 620 miles, or just about 200 miles farther than it is from Phoenix to Santa Fe, and just about 200 miles farther than it is from Prescott to Santa Fe. The capital of Montana, Helena, is 420 miles from the east boundary of that State, while the people of western Nebraska must travel 430 miles to reach the capital, Lincoln. It is 420 miles from the north boundary of Idaho to the State capital, Boise City, while it is 580 miles from El Paso to Austin, Tex., and from the north end of Texas to Austin is 560 miles. It is 480 miles from Key West to Tallahassee, Fla., while it is 380 miles from Richmond to the southwest corner of Virginia; while the people of Houghton, in northern Michigan, travel 600 miles to reach the capital city, Lansing.

In some of the instances here cited the distances mentioned mean vastly more inconvenience in travel than do equal distances in the sunshiny Southwest, but at most these distances mean vastly less in these modern days of rapid transit, wireless telegraphy, telephonic communication, and improved postal facilities than they did in the early days of this Republic, when such things did not exist in the same degree. If these little distances are to be urged as a reason for opposition to this bill, then one wonders why the gentlemen who are so strenuously urging this objection did not embrace the same opportunity to suggest the removal of this capital city of the nation to somewhere in the vicinity of Kansas City, in my own State, and in this project I am sure it would be conceded there would be more unanimity than there is on their objections to this bill.

In conclusion, gentlemen, it might be well to call attention to the blessings that will come to the new State from the passage of this bill. The bill carries a donation of four sections of land per township, which, over the vast area, will amount, with that already donated in previous legislation, to something more than 20,000,000 acres to the new State. It has been calculated that the rentals from this land will bring a million of dollars per year to the schools, and with the interest on the donation of $5,000,000, which the bill also carries, and with a few licenses and fines thrown in, that the school fund will be almost from the start in the new great State a million and a half dollars per year. It has also been calculated that a moderate franchise tax ought to come very nearly sustaining the entire State government, and if this can be brought about, and there is no State tax and no school tax in the new State, then, indeed, will it be blessed! It has also been calculated that there is easily in the two Territories, subject to taxation, $500,000,000 worth of property, now grossly underassessed. When there is nothing but fixed charges, municipal and county taxes to raise, the argument which has been made before the committee that the tax levy can be limited in the very organic law of the new State to one-half of 1 per cent, is certainly well founded. If this can be brought about, how vast will be the changes in a few years! What blessings will this Congress have conferred upon the people of these Territories; how ridiculous, in a few years, will appear the arguments of the opposition, which are so strenuously made here at this time! How money will flow into such a country! How progress will take a jump forward! How immigration will flow in to enjoy such blessings! And when these things shall have been brought about, then indeed will it be in truth, as well as in name, Arizona the Great!

I respectfully submit, gentlemen, that the bill ought to pass. [Loud applause.]

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, it shall not be my purpose to occupy at any length the time of the House to-day.

My opposition to this bill is not bounded by the outlines of the Territories that we are considering for statehood. That in itself, however, would be a sufficient reason.

I am strongly opposed to forcing these four Territories to come into our Union as two States. If Indian Territory and Oklahoma want to be united, well and good, but a union should not be forced upon Arizona and New Mexico. Each of them should be permitted to assume the responsibility of separate statehood by every reason that is fair and just.

Indian Territory, Oklahoma, Arizona, and New Mexico, all of them are rich, and the years to come will develop their resources, multiply their wealth, and increase their population. To-day the smallest population of any of them is almost 200,000 people—the population of Arizona. The population of New Mexico is far greater than that, and the population of Oklahoma or Indian Territory more than two times as great. Measured by the standard of population numerically considered, the smallest of the Territories has a larger number of people living within its area than had any State at the time of its admission, except probably eight, admitted since the thirteen colonies bound themselves together in a union never to be dissolved. Aye, the population of those Territories is to-day equal to one-third the total population of the United States at the birth of our Republic, and yet they are denied representation in our national legislative body.

I am opposed to this bill, sirs, most of all on the broad ground that it is in direct conflict with the future welfare of the entire West. To-day the center of population is in the State of Indiana. Could a line be drawn directly from north to south through that center it would pass through the States of Michigan, Indiana, Kentucky, Tennessee, Alabama, and Florida. West of the tier of States just mentioned are to-day twenty-two States, represented by forty-four Senators; east of and including that tier are twenty-three States, represented by forty-six Senators.

The States east of and including that tier represent in area less than one-fourth of the United States, not including Alaska, while they have more than one-half of the Senators. Not only this, but the center of population will move still farther west, not east, and with the vast expanse of territory in the Central States that will support many times its present population, and with the great Pacific coast scarcely more than fifty years known as a home for the white race, who can grasp the tremendous population that must in a few more years find homes west of the line which divides in halves to-day the population of the United States? Suppose the center of population should be crowded west, even to the Mississippi River. One-third of the area of our country would still be on the east of that line, two-thirds would be west. The East would then be represented by fifty-two Senators, while the West, if no new States be added, would be represented by thirty-eight.

If you should admit every Territory that to-day asks for statehood, you would have added then but eight Senators to the thirty-eight, and still the East would have six more Senators than would be her fair proportion.

The West to-day has her share of representation in the United States Senate as nearly as Senators may be apportioned. It is the future that I look to when I contemplate this bill.

If some of the Western States to-day have not as large population as Eastern States, let me say that that defect will cure itself as the years go by. Not so with the Eastern States whose population is small.

Take, if you will, all the New England States—there are six of them—add to their area Delaware, then add New Jersey, and then you could add most of Maryland, and the combined area of them all—nine States—would only equal the approximate area of Idaho alone. Those States will be represented forever by eighteen Senators in the United States Senate, while Idaho forever will have but two. No matter what our population may be, and for years we have been growing at the rate of 10 per cent per year, and no matter if our population approaches that of the States I have just mentioned, it will make no difference; we still must be limited to two Senators. Take, if you please, the Atlantic seaboard. From Canada on the north to Florida on the south fifteen States border upon the ocean or have ocean harbors. Go, then, to the Pacific seaboard, and from Canada to Mexico three States extend. These States have six members in the United States Senate to represent their interests, while thirty Senators, one-third of the Senate of the United States to-day, represent the States bordering upon the Atlantic Ocean.

There will come a time when the Pacific Ocean will be as great a commercial factor as is the Atlantic Ocean. There will come a time when our cities will be as great cities as the cities of the East. There will come a time when our valleys and our hills, our vast expanse of land, will be as thickly settled as are the valleys of Massachusetts and Connecticut. Then will be the time that our representation will be unequal, unless that shall come which I do not expect, the division of the Western States into smaller Commonwealths.

I believe in the West and I have confidence in her future, and, sirs, to us is given the power of meting out justice and equality to succeeding generations. To place the limit which you propose in this bill upon the West for all time is not right. It is not justice. It is contrary to the spirit of the fathers who framed the Constitution. They desired equity. They wanted our National Legislature to represent the people in as equal proportion as might be possible. Only upon that foundation can greatest stability and greatest strength obtain. You are not passing this bill for to-day or for to-morrow, but for the great future. You are not legislating for the people for this year, but for the people of succeeding years.

Upon you rests the responsibility of doing that by legislation which our fathers did by hard warfare, and I appeal to you to stand by your judgment and by your conscience and vote in such a way as will bring credit upon yourselves and the great boon of equal and just representation to the generations yet unborn.

Mr. MOON of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I now yield five minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TOWNE].

Mr. TOWNE. Mr. Chairman, I feel like extending my congratulations to that unfortunately small but relatively very heroic body of men that had the temerity to stand up on yesterday and be counted, notwithstanding the edict of an alleged party leadership against this bill. I am somewhat of an expert, sir, on the subject of party rebellion [laughter], and it gave me a feeling of infinite pride to listen to the eloquent gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BEDE] in his valorous denunciation of the methods of this proposed legislation. He occupies the seat once occupied by myself from that great Commonwealth. It would seem, sir, as if rebellion were inheritable with that seat. I myself rebelled in it so hard ten years ago that I finally found myself entirely outside of the party breastworks. [Laughter.] My successor, the Hon. Page Morris, led a revolution in the last Congress but one on the beet-sugar proposition, and now one of the most eloquent and forcible champions of the rebellion upon this occasion is the gentleman who succeeded him in the same place.

I think I may venture to commend this example to other gentlemen upon the Republican side of the House. The very worst thing, gentlemen, that could possibly happen to you would be to follow your opinions at some time into a more congenial political association. [Laughter and applause.]

I am aware, Mr. Chairman, that discussion of the merits of this proposition at this time is merely academic and destined to be futile. I shall therefore not spend any of the little time that has been assigned to me in the discussion of the provisions of this bill, provocative of discussion as many of them are; but I think the attention of the country ought to be called, Mr. Chairman, to the methods by which this legislation is to be accomplished and to the reasons that have been assigned in support of this procedure.

It was stated upon the other side of this Chamber repeatedly yesterday that this rule raises a party question, and the party whip was swung most vigorously and relentlessly by the expert wielders of discipline on that side of the Chamber with, unfortunately, its customary results. Now, sir, what is it that makes a question a party question? I read for the moment on this occasion from the remarks of that distinguished Athenian, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR], the whilom and universal champion of Republican policies, who rushed to the indefensible defense of this rule yesterday.

> It is enough for me to know, and it ought to be enough for any Republican to know, that the responsibility of the passage of this bill, if it shall pass, does not rest upon me or him. He will not be selected as an individual to be assaulted and assailed, but the responsibility will rest upon the great party of this country, headed by the great President of the United States, that, after a full consideration, has decided that this is the proper thing to do.

It will be noticed, Mr. Chairman, that throughout the discussion of this proposition on the other side there has not been advanced a single affirmative argument.

By the edict of a coterie temporarily invested with the autocratic power of deciding the legislative programme for the majority of this House, a proposition, indefensible in itself—and admittedly so or it never would have been brought in in this shape—the effect of which has been to shift the burden of proof, and ingenuity is exercised in defense of a position that it never could have occupied on its merits——

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. TOWNE. I did not hear the observation of the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. TOWNE. I was not aware that I had started. I was under the impression that I had ten minutes instead of five. [Applause and laughter.]

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield twenty minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRICK.]

Mr. BRICK. Mr. Chairman, it may be needless to talk more about statehood at this time. It is a subject that has absorbed the attention of most if not all of the Members of the House for four years—yes, for six years—and perhaps the verdict is all rendered as to what we will do and as to what we ought to do in reference to this question. I have listened with admiring sympathy to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. SMITH] in his impassioned and surpassing vindication of the rights of his Territory, which he so ably represents, and I wish to say here and now that, although of diverse interests and of changeable opinions, of all the men I have met I have been as much or more impressed by the genial nature, the virile manhood, and enthusiastic loyalty of the gentleman from Arizona and of the former Representative from New Mexico, Mr. Rodey, as to any other men in the House. For years these gentlemen have been before this House in splendid eloquence pleading for the statehood of their respective Territories.

I regret not having had the opportunity to adequately know our Territorial possessions at first hand.

I do not mean by that the impressions photographed on the mind by a bird's-eye view of them taken from the platform of an observation car on a flying special train. That would contribute something, but not much, to a thorough appreciation of the situation.

Without being able to fully understand the breadth and depth of this statehood subject and divine the destiny of these lands beyond the hour of our action, I do share, in common with the majority of the Members of the House, the unprejudiced and disinterested desire to give the inhabitants of these Territories the fullest privilege of their citizenship commensurate with fairness toward all the other governmental divisions of the United States.

The gentleman from Arizona [Mr. SMITH] says that we have been talking this matter for days. Yes, for years; "and yet," he thunders, "no one has given a single reason why there should be a jointure of Arizona and New Mexico." Now, without being able perhaps to enter into this discussion with the same warmth and overpowering mastery of feeling that animates my friend from Arizona, I have, as I conceive, the very best of reasons why there should be a jointure. In the first place, the admission of new States into the Union has always been a grave responsibility; one of the most important, perhaps, that could possibly engage the attention of Congress.

Important and responsible to the extremest degree, because it involves, first, the inalienable right of every American citizen to govern himself in the largest possible measure consistent with the rights of all, and I would not want to make a mistake as to that.

And then, again, important beyond the power of conjecture to meet, because whatever is done becomes at once a fact irrevocable and changeless for weal or woe through all the length of years and fate of time.

We may overcome many grievous errors by subsequent correcting legislation.

But when we admit a Territory into the sisterhood of States and a mistake is made, we have closed the door of reformation forever, and the Republic must bear the burden, even to its undoing, if that should happen.

And should we fail in this responsibility to rise to the occasion it will not be the first and only load of inequity and care that we have placed upon the shoulders of a representative form of government to tax its endurance and perpetuity.

It will not be rational to say, "This one act will be trivial, whatever the result;" and to invoke former acts as a precedent is simply emphasizing the clear call of duty, to lend discretion to our reason, forethought to our judgment.

Already necessity of expedient, or the arbitrary will and power of politics, has jangled out of tune the harmony of our State relations in representative capacity, many times reiterated, affecting the equities of countless millions and the coherent strength of our Government.

When our Constitution was adopted and a new nation born to the world, it was necessary to have the concerted action of every original settlement that it might gain all the forces which dwell in perfect unity.

Some of the States were small, but that fact sunk into apparent insignificance compared with the tremendous event of a compact Union, the only real Republic that had ever raised its flag to cheer the skies.

At that time we had a population of less than 4,000,000 of people, and thirteen States were bound together into a fledgling nation, now peerless among the powers of earth.

And because some of those States which were admitted under the stress and strife of that magnificent undertaking have equal representation in the Senate, far beyond the relative proportions of their territory, does not fortify a precedent or justify a repetition of such an event, unsanctified by any grounds of necessity or reason.

And then, again, there is no law of God or man that can evolve a multiplicity of evil into a virtue. Now, I want to give the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. SMITH] some of the reasons why I say this jointure should be made.

To-day we have forty-five States, each represented in the upper House by two Senators.

Each one of them standing on absolute terms of equality, each one of them having more or less diverse interests and opinions, with equal opportunity to direct, forestall, obstruct, and fashion the legislation that covers all.

To-day the standard of representation in the House of Representatives provides a Representative for every 192,000 inhabitants.

And yet there are five States exercising the full force and effect of every other State, which have ten Senators and only five Representatives direct from the people.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Then would it not be wise, if the gentleman will permit me, to listen to our prayer and leave us out? Would not that answer the gentleman's argument? Leave us out of the Union. That is all we ask.

Mr. BRICK. I will come to that later on; but that is only talking to the ear to deny the hope. I know what it means. I know that for years you have been asking to come in as a separate State. I know that the only reason you say "leave us out" is for the purpose of coming in as a separate State some day later on, and I say that, from all of the present knowledge we have of it, and from all that human judgment can foretell, it is now and will be forever unjust to the other 80,000,000 people. Think of it. Five States with ten Senators and five Representatives, four of them not having enough population to justify a Representative alone.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. But, if the gentleman will permit, here is the point that we make. Thinking that we have rights that ought to be respected, why would you pass a bill providing for the admission of Arizona into the Union on such terms as New Mexico might prescribe and providing for the payment of the bonds of New Mexico out of the funds of the Territory of Arizona and for other hellish purposes? What argument is that against the fact? Is it fair that we might come in some day later? Is that the whole drift of the gentleman's speech?

Mr. BRICK. Well, I will answer that. To the best of my belief, as I have said before, Mr. Chairman, for years, so long that the memory of man hardly runneth to the contrary, these Territories have asked to be admitted as a State. Away down in their hearts they want to be a State; the average man, the inhabitant——

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. That is not reprehensible, is it?

Mr. BRICK. As I was about to finish when you cut me off, the average man, the good-faith inhabitant of Arizona, away down in his heart is willing and glad to have a State on such conditions; but it is the mine owners and railroads who do not want it to become a State, because they fear it will raise their taxes, because they apprehend they will have to pay a more just proportion of taxation. If they would only let them alone, the common people of the State of Arizona will join with the people of New Mexico in accepting the provisions of this bill and become one of the sisterhood of States.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. One further question. Will the gentleman give the source of that information?

Mr. BRICK. The source of my information is found in the well-known and uncontroverted fact that these corporate influences have been used with powerful effect against statehood in any form.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Now that they oppose single statehood, and to prevent further interruption, will the gentleman please tell the Members of this House that with the present Arizona and New Mexico legislatures, having all the powers as far as taxes are concerned that they would have as a State, individually or collectively—how with the same people elected, the same class of men, the effect of joint statehood is going to relieve the question? And if it be true—and I deny the assertion of the gentleman—but if it be true, will you suggest some way of relief this is going to make in the new combined two corrupt States, according to your statement, and how it will be any easier or harder for these corrupt influences to dominate than they can do now? How is the statehood bill going to effect that; and would it not have the effect, if it were true, to make it easier?

Mr. BRICK. It has been known ever since the dawn of time that whenever you place an officer upon his responsibility to his constituents and to his people at their very doors that he will then look after the duties of his position with greater integrity, accuracy, and honesty than if the creating power of his destiny lies far away.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Why, what you say is just as true in a Territory with existing Territorial government.

Mr. BRICK. It is not true of all officers there.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. It is true of all the business of Territorial taxation just exactly the same as the States; not a particle of difference.

Mr. BRICK. Well, Mr. Chairman, I know as well as I can from the workings of human nature, from the testimony, and from all the surrounding circumstances of this bill that these people—these great corporate interests—for some reason or other, not filled to overflowing with charity, do not want to become a State under any conditions. And I am equally certain that they have no question but that they are better off as to taxation now than under statehood. They admit it privately.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Not a man in Arizona.

Mr. BRICK. And there can not be, I say to the gentleman from Arizona, any other logical inference than that they are doing it for their own purposes.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Now, will the gentleman pardon me once more?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair begs to remind Members that it is not in order to interrupt a speaker without obtaining permission first.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I am asking the gentleman's permission as plain as I can. The Chair must not have heard me.

The CHAIRMAN. But permission must be obtained through the Chair.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I am sorry, Mr. Chairman, but it is violated so constantly and there have been so few objections and——

Mr. BRICK. Mr. Chairman, my time is limited, and I have answered the question twice.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. But you have not answered the inference you make about legislation being subject to these railroads.

Mr. BRICK. Now, I want to continue to give my reasons why the joint statehood provision of this bill is the only one in justice to the people of the country. Gentlemen, Mr. Chairman, I have said there are already five States that have ten representatives in the Senate with only five Congressmen in the House.

It matters not who perpetrated the act. Both parties have fostered it and both have drawn political sustenance from it.

And the fact still remains to stare us in the face, to guide and warn us not to repeat the mistake.

Five States with ten Senators, making up one-ninth of the entire Senatorial body, who might or might not, depending somewhat upon their ability, desire, and surrounding circum-

stances, control the legislation of the nation. In any event, they would powerfully affect it, beyond the realization of persons unacquainted with legislative affairs.

Now, it becomes still more significant when we come to know that these States having only five Representatives who do not stand for a constituency of 192,000 each, although they are the sole representative of a whole State.

These States have, respectively, the largest, of which I speak first, and the others, following in their order, 243,329, 184,735, 161,772, 92,531, 42,335, with a total population of 734,702, an average for each Representative of 146,940—about 45,000 less than the support of every other one of the great body of Representatives in the lower House.

Think of it! Five States, with ten Senators and five Representatives, four of them not having enough population to justify a Representative alone; one of them having but little more than one-fifth the requisite number, another not half enough, and the whole five on an average falling 45,000 each below the standard.

Compare this with other States, and I'll draw your attention to the smallest one of the Union in area—Rhode Island. It has a population of 428,556; Indiana, with 2,516,462; Texas, 3,048,710; Pennsylvania, 6,302,115; New York, 7,268,894; Illinois, 4,821,550; Wisconsin, 2,069,042; Ohio, 4,157,545; Missouri, 3,106,665; Minnesota, 1,751,394.

And still they all fare alike in point of representation in the Senate.

Yes, under our form of government, States are represented in the Senate as States, and I make no quarrel with the idea, even though it will always be impossible to make them of equal importance.

But before admitting them into that dignity and power they should possess the several qualities that will in a reasonable degree preserve and maintain an equilibrium of States in the Senate.

If they fall below that, it is unjust and unfair to all the other States.

Area alone can not control.

The greatness of a State or nation does not lie in the extent of its territory, but in the number and character of its people.

Therefore, area can only be considered in the light of the kind and number of people it will support in advancing growth and civilization.

For instance, Nevada was admitted as a State in the year 1864, with a population of about 42,491 and an area of 109,901 square miles—three times as large as Indiana. By the census of 1900 its population was 42,335, about one-fifth of a Congressional district under the last apportionment, while Indiana has grandly risen to 2,516,462, which entitled her to thirteen Representatives in the House. Yet Nevada, with only one-fifth enough people to grant her one Congressman, wields the same power in the Senate.

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

Mr. BRICK. Certainly.

Mr. BEDE. Was not Nevada admitted into the Union for no other purpose than to help carry certain amendments to the Constitution? And was it nothing but a mining gulch, and everybody knew it at the time, and that it is not an example for any other State in the Union?

Mr. BRICK. I will say to the gentleman from Minnesota that I do not care who committed the act or perpetrated the wrong, if it was wrong. Both political parties and all the people have sustained it, and abused it since then, and drawn undue political advantage from it; but it is no reason why they should do it again.

Mr. BEDE. I am not complaining of its admission; I am only complaining that the gentleman used it as an example. No other State has declined in population. Arizona and New Mexico are multiplying their population, and Oklahoma has two millions of population, and yet you refuse to let it in.

Mr. BRICK. I will answer that. I will draw one more illustration as to why we should not admit the Territories of Arizona and New Mexico to separate statehood now or at any other time.

Mr. BEDE. I am voting against admitting them at all. The gentleman wants to let them in; I want to keep them out.

Mr. BRICK. Let me give the gentleman this illustration. I know why you want them kept out. We all know what will happen some time in the future. They will either be admitted now in joint statehood or in the future in a separate statehood. Now is the time to settle it, and settle it right and settle it for once and forever, Mr. Chairman. [Applause.]

Now, let me illustrate in another way the manifest unfairness of such a condition as it actually exists by the following table:

State.	Senators.	Representatives.	Population.	Assessed valuation.
Delaware	2	1	184,735	$58,000,000
Idaho	2	1	161,772	31,000,000
Montana	2	1	243,329	186,000,000
Nevada	2	1	42,335	30,000,000
North Dakota	2	2	319,146	134,000,000
South Dakota	2	2	401,570	187,000,000
Utah	2	1	276,749	118,000,000
Vermont	2	2	343,641	2,000,000
Wyoming	2	1	92,531	43,000,000
Colorado	2	3	539,700	354,000,000
New Hampshire	2	2	411,588	286,000,000
Oregon	2	2	413,536	150,000,000
Rhode Island	2	2	428,556	413,000,000
Washington	2	3	518,103	261,000,000

We find that there are 14 States, with a representation of 28 in the Senate, composed of 90 Members, and not having sufficient population to warrant a representation of 24 in the House of Representatives.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes more to the gentleman.

Mr. BRICK. New York alone has 37 Representatives in the House, voicing a population far greater than the 14 States mentioned, with only 2 in the Senate to meet the 28 sent there by the other 14 States.

Are there any compensating qualifications that justify the situation?

It may be that the material wealth of the 14 States will aid in maintaining an equilibrium.

But no; New York has more than two and a half times as much assessed wealth as the combined valuation of the entire 14 States.

This is not a solitary exception, however, standing alone to relieve the comparison.

Pennsylvania has a population large enough to maintain 32 Representatives, and over one and one-half as much assessed wealth.

Ohio has 21 Representatives and property valued at about $2,000,000,000, as compared with $2,254,000,000 in the 14 States referred to.

Indiana and Massachusetts command 27 Representatives, with almost twice as great an assessed valuation.

Missouri and Michigan far exceed them in both population and values.

The same can be said of California and Illinois, Wisconsin and Texas.

They may wax stronger and grow greater in the future, it is suggested.

Mr. BEDE. May I ask the gentleman what he thinks the population west of the Mississippi River will be in a hundred years or a thousand years, and we are legislating for all time?

Mr. BRICK. Well——

Mr. BEDE. Is it not for a thousand years, and not for our generation?

Mr. BRICK. I believe, and hope, and pray that the population in the next five hundred years and during a thousand years will flourish and grow great in every State in the Union east and west of the Mississippi. I am for all the United States; my heart is with every corner of American soil.

Mr. FREDERICK LANDIS. Does not the gentleman think the disparity of population will be maintained by the increase in population in the States east of the Mississippi River?

Mr. BRICK. I certainly do.

Mr. BEDE. Never.

Mr. KAHN. Will the gentleman allow me?

Mr. BEDE. History does not show that.

Mr. BRICK. If gentlemen will excuse me, I can not yield any more. I have only two or three minutes left.

Now, I say in common fairness it must be conceded that these Territories will grow.

Mr. BEDE. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. BRICK. I can not yield any further, Mr. Chairman. But in all reason no one in his most hopeful dreams could imagine anything like an adjustment of their unequal relations.

With these suggestions fairly in mind, we are met by the claims and controversies, the hopes and fears, involved in the bill under consideration, which by a single title and enacting clause enables two States to join the Union, and disposes in one clean sweep of all our remaining contiguous Territorial possessions.

It proposes to join Oklahoma and Indian Territory into a State to be called Oklahoma, and the Territories of Arizona and New Mexico into another, called Arizona.

All of these Territories have for many years been clamoring for the privileges of statehood, and the time has now arrived when this demand will be fulfilled if enough of us can agree upon the conditions of their admission.

A number of considerations present themselves in solving the problem as to what should be done, which have provoked serious conflicts of opinion and interests.

But in all good faith the ultimate results should encompass the real questions involved; fitness of the people morally, intellectually, and numerically to strengthen and dignify the Union.

Is the Territory seeking admission so developed in material wealth and the right kind of population as to entitle it to statehood and representation in Congress on a footing of equality with all the other States?

What are its prospects in the future?

Has it such reasonable hope of further development that will enable it to walk abreast with the average State, or will it lag behind in the march of progress?

All these questions can be settled without controversy in the case of Oklahoma and Indian Territory.

The people residing there are practically unanimous in wanting the two Territories combined into one exultant, splendid State. It will have an area of 69,830 square miles of arable land, or 44,691,200 acres, all of it capable of development to support homes and produce untold wealth.

Its population has increased and will continue to do so with marvelous rapidity.

In 1900, as shown by the census of that date, they together had a population of 790,391 people, most of them white, intelligent, sturdy, self-reliant, industrious citizens, of the best type of American manhood.

And it is now estimated by everyone whose judgment is worthy of belief that their aggregate population will amount to something like a million and a half.

There is no better farming land anywhere, and lately the products of the farm have been augmented by vast stores of mineral treasure.

Oklahoma bids fair to become one of the proudest States in the Union, and should be admitted immediately in every instinct of political honor.

But now comes the bone of conflicting emotion—Arizona and New Mexico.

Opinion, influenced by various interests, is divided into contrary ideas upon both sides of the House.

Some believe that they should not be transformed into statehood under any circumstances, neither singly nor jointly, earnestly contending that they are unfitted at the present time, at least, to become worthy of a place in the Union.

Others think they ought to be admitted separately, warmly advocating that they are each eminently qualified to stand side by side with the greatest of the United States.

And then there are others, it may be, who ostensibly make that argument, but whose predominating motive is to give that part of the country enhanced political advantage through the four Senators the two States would become entitled to upon admission, and the two sets of officers incident to separate statehood.

While the majority believe that neither one of them are now fit alone, and, further, that they have not the natural resources to ever become fit for separate statehood.

But on the other hand, taken together, they may develop enough of the qualifications of statehood in all that vast expanse of territory which is theirs to fairly entitle them to admission.

Your committee believes that, and hence this bill has been reported with such a provision.

Somebody says it is wrong; that the Republican party, through its platforms, has pledged itself to separate statehood for Arizona and New Mexico.

Well, it may be that in some platform of the party sometime in the past, when there was no issue upon the subject and no interest in it anywhere save perhaps in the political mind of a resident of the Territory who happened to know the platform builder at the right moment, it was inadvisedly and indefinitely mentioned in a Republican declaration of things that should happen.

It may have been that such a platform was promulgated without anyone knowing of that particular clause in it, except the industrious person who incited it, and without the voting public in any national election ever having thought of it, favorably or unfavorably.

A glittering nimbus of silver haze, under just such circumstances as I have mentioned, insinuated itself into the platforms of both parties more than once in the history of this country, long before gold and silver became an issue upon which the people actually voted and the parties really pledged themselves.

Yet who would be rash enough to say that we should change our standard now, because somebody we don't know talked loosely or foolishly about it in a convention years ago.

Who will dare to tell me, acting upon my solemn oath to do my duty here and now, that I must forswear my word to keep faith with an inadvertent statement, launched without reason into a sea of mist, and which never reached any port of political consideration.

But, after all, we are carrying out the substance of what ever was said in those days by these political promoters.

Suppose they did declare that these Territories should be converted into States. In no platform did they ever say just how. That was left for time to solve, for legislators to unravel.

In the light of six years of most careful investigation and the experience we have had in Nevada and some other States whose history is somewhat analogous to the situation presented, we find that Arizona and New Mexico might make one fair State taken together, but that they would utterly fail to fill the niche separate and alone.

Now, if this be true, no matter what has been said or done in the past, I for one refuse to stultify the dawning future with a legacy of folly that has come down to me from the archives of the dead.

Indian Territory and Oklahoma ask to become one State. It is their will and wish.

New Mexico, after years of turmoil, now comes to us in contrite prayer, pleading to be taken back to her first love, Arizona, in the holy wedlock of a reunion.

Arizona would be willing if certain interested parties would keep hands off.

The mine owners, railroads, and other capitalists of Arizona, to avoid State taxation, have been crafty enough to play the rôle of Iago, even to the eternal political undoing of both the Territories.

They don't want statehood at all; they can't use it in their business.

I believe the time has arrived when this question should be settled once and for all; settled without regard to the wiles of grasping capital or the finesse of selfish politicians.

After six years of information upon the subject joint statehood seems to be the only safe and fair solution of the problem.

It is indeed true that these Territories embrace within their bosom the realms of an empire in arid distances.

But land alone can not justify a State; it must be sufficient to support a civilized people in a reasonable relative proportion to other States.

This proposed legislation is no startling and cruel innovation.

Arizona and New Mexico were joined and lived and loved and worked together in peace and harmony from the year 1851 to 1863.

At that time they were divided on account of the distances they had to travel without adequate means of transport, making two governments more convenient, and incidentally giving them two Delegates instead of one, and multiplied United States officers.

Now they are traversed by a score of railroads. Distance has been minimized, and their State government, with a capitol near the center, can be reached much easier by all the inhabitants than in California, Texas, and many other States.

After all, great and vast, however, beyond the ken of men who have never viewed it. And yet only one-fourth as large in actual land capable of supporting homes as the proposed State of Oklahoma. But in all our wanderings and devious travail of hopeful plans we always round up to the inevitable.

They want statehood. The politician wants it for the offices; the speculator for the boom; the surrounding neighbors for the Southwestern Senators they will give, and last of all, the average man, the good-faith resident, wants it for the crown of full American manhood it will place upon his brow. I want it for that reason and that alone, and the only way they can ever have it in justice to 80,000,000 people is by the jointure of this bill. [Great applause.]

APPENDIX.

State.	Population, 1900.	Land area.	Density.	Assessed valuation, 1902.
		Sq. miles.		
United States	76,303,387	2,970,230	25.6	$34,343,281,775
Alabama	1,828,697	51,540	35.5	296,125,540
Alaska	63,592	590,884	.1	
Arizona	122,931	112,920	1.1	38,853,831
Arkansas	1,311,564	53,045	24.7	225,267,681
California	1,485,053	156,172	9.5	1,290,238,964

State.	Population, 1900.	Land area.	Density.	Assessed valuation, 1902.
		Sq. miles.		
Colorado	539,700	103,645	5.2	354,002,501
Connecticut	908,420	4,845	187.5	665,094,301
Delaware	184,735	1,960	94.3	58,556,146
District of Columbia	278,718	60	4,645.3	a 265,858,808
Florida	528,542	54,240	9.7	103,047,937
Georgia	2,216,331	58,980	37.6	410,417,180
Hawaii	154,001	6,449	23.9	110,388,578
Idaho	161,772	84,290	1.9	31,160,066
Illinois	4,821,550	56,000	86.1	1,032,792,848
Indiana	2,516,462	35,910	70.1	1,360,445,139
Indian Territory	392,060	31,000	12.6	----------
Iowa	2,231,853	55,475	40.2	558,462,618
Kansas	1,470,495	81,700	18.0	356,399,449
Kentucky	2,147,174	40,000	53.7	581,156,820
Louisiana	1,381,625	45,420	30.4	250,045,503
Maine	694,466	29,895	23.2	300,550,250
Maryland	1,188,044	9,860	120.5	666,857,883
Massachusetts	2,805,346	8,040	348.9	3,115,426,287
Michigan	2,420,982	57,430	42.2	1,418,251,858
Minnesota	1,751,394	79,205	22.1	662,435,291
Mississippi	1,551,270	46,340	33.5	222,847,523
Missouri	3,106,665	68,735	45.2	1,167,338,342
Montana	243,329	145,310	1.7	185,725,657
Nebraska	1,066,300	76,840	13.9	179,976,568
Nevada	42,335	109,740	.4	29,831,377
New Hampshire	411,588	9,005	45.7	286,487,655
New Jersey	1,883,669	7,525	250.3	980,733,594
New Mexico	195,310	122,460	1.6	36,364,761
New York	7,268,894	47,620	152.6	5,847,992,233
North Carolina	1,893,810	48,580	39.0	285,344,879
North Dakota	319,146	70,195	4.5	133,880,414
Ohio	4,157,545	40,760	102.0	1,968,280,000
Oklahoma	398,331	38,830	10.3	49,338,661
Oregon	413,536	94,560	4.4	149,743,882
Pennsylvania	6,302,115	44,985	140.1	3,824,995,951
Rhode Island	428,556	1,053	407.0	413,209,603
South Carolina	1,340,316	30,170	44.4	192,357,582
South Dakota	401,570	76,850	5.2	187,531,381
Tennessee	2,020,616	41,750	48.4	406,216,243
Texas	3,048,710	262,290	11.6	1,017,571,732
Utah	276,749	82,190	3.4	118,019,462
Vermont	343,641	9,135	37.6	1,790,150
Virginia	1,854,184	40,125	46.2	440,474,459
Washington	518,103	66,880	7.7	260,940,138
West Virginia	958,800	24,645	38.9	248,749,693
Wisconsin	2,069,042	54,450	38.0	1,504,346,000
Wyoming	92,531	97,575	.9	43,348,356

a Estimated.

Mr. HAMILTON. I ask the gentleman from Tennessee to use the rest of his time.

Mr. MOON of Tennessee. How much time is there remaining?

Mr. HAMILTON. I have remaining twenty-six minutes, as I have it, and I think the gentleman from Tennessee has forty-one minutes to his credit, or something like that.

Mr. MANN. That makes more time than you have between you if debate is to close at 3 o'clock.

Mr. MOON of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, so many questions have been presented in the discussion of this bill that it is impossible for one to review all the collateral issues which some gentlemen seem to be of opinion are pertinent in the determination of the main question now before the House for its consideration. I was much interested in the splendid presentation on the part of the majority by the gentleman from Michigan. His speech in some respects was ornate; in others it was semi-classical. All the way through it was semitruthful because of the poetic license he assumed in delivering it. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. Chairman, a proper approach to the first question under consideration, in my judgment, involves the consideration of the constitutional or legal questions that are presented at the very threshold of this inquiry for the determination of the House, and next the moral considerations that ought to influence the conscience and judgment of the representatives of the people. Next, those local conditions or economic questions that ought to appeal to the sense of propriety and good judgment of the House. I can not fully discuss all of these questions.

I repudiate, sir, the suggestion that this is merely a partisan contest, though gentlemen may have risen upon the floor of this House and elsewhere and declared that it was only a partisan controversy, that States had always been admitted as a matter of partisanship. Political the question may be in one sense, but partisan it never ought to be. I will not believe a gentleman who makes the statement that he casts his vote from purely party motives upon this floor on so great a question as this, because to believe him sincere would forfeit respect for his personal integrity and establish his unfitness to represent a great people in the consideration of a great national question. [Applause.] I decline, therefore, to discuss the purely partisan features of a bill that involves the rights, principles, and privileges of 2,000,000 of American citizens. If we have authority to act, that authority comes to us delegated through the Constitution of the Republic. We are clothed with the right and power to erect new commonwealths and place them in the Union upon the same footing as the old States, by the terms of the Constitution. That same Constitution prohibits the division of the Territory of any State in the Union without its consent. Is it an idle ceremony when any Territory of the United States is organized into a government for local purposes? It is then that it assumes a constitutional and legal status. If gentlemen proposed to unite the Territories of New Mexico and Arizona against their will, they ought to have done it before constitutional rights for those Territories attached. It is true that a Territory can not come into the Union of its own accord. It must receive the invitation of Congress. That must be extended, under the Constitution, when the Territory is fit for admission.

When is a Territory fit for admission? That is not an open question in this Republic. It has long since been determined by judicial decision that when an organized Territory is sufficient in area, sufficient in population, and sufficient in resources it is entitled to take its place among the sisterhood of States in the discretion of Congress. The power of Congress then is a discretionary one, legislative and not arbitrary in its character, to be exercised when this condition arrives. What, then, is the legal status of a Territory occupying this position? In the opinion of the Supreme Court of the United States, when a Territory is organized and the Constitution extended to it by Congress it is clothed forever (and necessarily within its boundaries) with the inchoate right of ultimate statehood. Can Congress deprive a Territory of a constitutional right? If States can not be divided under the Constitution without their consent, or increased in area, can a Territory, once clothed by the extension of the Constitution with inchoate right of statehood, be denied that right without its consent? Is it not protected within its boundaries in its constitutional guaranties? Is not the right to statehood guaranteed when it possesses the qualifications for admission in the discretion of Congress? Congress may delay the exercise of this right—it can not destroy it. If so, the extension of constitutional rights to the Territories by the solemn act of Congress is a mockery.

But assuming, in the exercise of the legislative power of this body, that you have the right to force the union of the Territories, are there no moral considerations that would preclude it? Will you set aside the long-established policy of the Republic? Will you make a new example? Will you unite people different in customs, laws, and religion? Not, I hope, in the interest of a party merely.

Let no man be deceived as to where the issue in this controversy rests. It is not merely a Republican party policy; it is the policy of that great and powerful East (a sectional policy), which proposes, with her grasp upon the Republic, never to yield it, whatever the population of the West may be. [Applause.] Ah, men of the West, the day shall come when those of you who have been charged upon this floor and in the lobby as being traitors to your party will be thrice honored, for honest history will declare that the men who support this bill are the real traitors to liberty, to the Constitution, and the sacred rights of an inchoate Commonwealth. [Applause.]

What are our moral obligations as to Arizona? Arizona has the plighted faith of the Republic, by the Congress, that no part of her territory shall be taken or united to another without her consent. This is not a legal obligation, but it is a moral obligation that ought to appeal to the sense of honor and integrity of every patriot on the floor of the House of Representatives.

Are her resources sufficient to sustain a State? Look at the proofs. I will not enumerate the facts. They appear in the appendix of the report to the House. If there be a man upon this floor who denies that that great Territory is possessed of the resources that constitute a State, let him rise and make the denial.

Has she the population? I answer that we can only look to the population of other Commonwealths when admitted into the Union to determine by comparison the rights of admission in the discretion of Congress of this Territory.

She has more population than twenty Commonwealths that constitute a part of the Union to-day had when they were admitted into the Union. Has she the area? Yes; she has a vast and majestic domain. Shall she be coerced? Shall the Constitution be trampled down by the advocates of the sectional question upon this floor? Shall the policy of this Government be reversed? I have never believed, sir, that the Territories of Oklahoma and Indian Territory ought to be united. They are each entitled to statehood. The only reason I would concede for a moment the union of these two Territories is that it appears to be the desire and consent of those people. Yielding my own judgment to the will of the people of these great Territories,

I would vote to unite them in one if they desired it; but so long as Arizona protests in the name of the Constitution she has supported and the flag she has defended, so long will I protest as a Representative against the unmerciful coercion of that Territory into an unhallowed union with New Mexico. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, it is a question of the consent of the governed. Who says that there is any reason for the union of these Territories? What imbecility presents itself here when any gentleman says that because some railroad in the Territory is not properly taxed that therefore two great Territories shall be united in order to enforce just taxation? Who was responsible for the law that taxes and fixes that tax upon the Territory—the railroad or the Territory? The Federal Congress, in which their is a Republican majority, determined the question for the Territory. Correct this evil here. You have the full power to reverse this order of things. You can nullify a law of a Territory. But how illogical such an assumption is. If all of that evil exists there, and it were a paramount question in this case—insignificant and immaterial as I insist it is—if it were one of importance, what kind of logic does that man possess who tells us that by bringing together the forces of corruption in the two Territories you weaken the power of the corruption-its? It rather strengthens it. Union is strength and division is weakness. If there be anything in the position, it demands that the Territories shall forever be disunited. Could joint statehood make conditions better than single statehood?

They say that the States will be small in population though great and vast in area. Look at Missouri and other majestic Commonwealths that lie beyond the Mississippi. Behold the great States in the Central West—Ohio, Illinois, and Indiana—and yet when these great political entities were admitted into the Union it was said, by reason of the paucity of their population, that they were unfit for statehood. To-day they are ten times greater in population and more wealthy and powerful than many of the original States. Why should the seat of power in this great Republic remain in the little States of the East and vast Territories in the West be consolidated to maintain it? Why shall they have dominion? Shall Delaware and Rhode Island and Connecticut and Maine and New Hampshire have the power in the Senate that Illinois, Missouri, and Ohio, and other great States have? May I not ask this misleading question, when the advocates of this bill continually suggest that New York and Pennsylvania ought to have more power in the Senate than the new States? Gentlemen misconceive the purpose of the Federal Government who make these suggestions. If not forbidden by the Constitution, would you consolidate the New England States to equalize power between sections or States? The small States and the large ones were each given two Senators for the very purpose of equalizing the power of the States in the Senate of the United States.

It was deemed inimical to liberty to permit the large States on the basis of population to dominate both branches of the law-making power. The Senate does not represent the people; the Senators are the representatives of the sovereignty of the State. The people of the States are represented on the basis of population in the House of Representatives. The truth is that the East does not favor the growing power of the West, and would consolidate the Territories to lessen the number of States and Senators from the West.

Mr. STANLEY. May I interrupt the gentleman with a suggestion?

Mr. MOON of Tennessee. Certainly.

Mr. STANLEY. Is it not true that it was to protect the small States against the larger population of the large States that that very provision of two Senators was incorporated into the Constitution, and was it not after that provision was put in that the smaller States agreed to come in?

Mr. MOON of Tennessee. The gentleman is correct. But, Mr. Chairman, we have a most anomalous condition here. Arizona does not ask admission. She came to the bar of this House long years ago. She appeared before you clothed in the habiliments of the Federal Constitution. She was as fair as any American maiden whose cheeks were ever kissed by the gentle breezes of a May morning. She asked you to admit her. She said, "I have fulfilled its behests and have a right under the Constitution of the country to come into the sisterhood of States. I am the last born; are you ready to receive me among my sisters?" The Congress said to her, "Though you have the inchoate right of statehood, though you come with the guaranties of the Constitution, yet by that Constitution itself our discretion and judgment must be exercised before you are admitted."

They bid her bide a wee. There she stands, still protected under the same flag and the same Constitution. She asks nothing of you. She abides your judgment. She awaits the hour when in your sound judgment she is entitled to admission under the Constitution, within her borders. Will you let her rest, or will you lay the hands of the despoiler upon her? She is silent before you. Dare you rob her of the robes of the Constitution. Dare you place her back to the earth and commit her to the embrace of the Mexican. Will you despoil Arizona?

In the speech of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HAMILTON] he asked that the star of Arizona be added to the flag of our country. If it shall represent the union of unwilling Territories, call it not Arizona. Let that proud name perish with the rights and privileges denied to her citizenship. Ah, methinks if you fix the star there, cold and inanimate as it may be, it will forever dim the blue of the flag, weeping for her lost civilization. How long shall Congress forget its obedience to the Constitution and its duty to the Republic? [Applause on the Democratic side.]

When shall you cease to justify wrong by party necessity? When can you behold with undimmed vision those immortal words that may ever be seen burning in every star on the flag by the eye of the patriot, but never visible to the partisan, words that can not be stricken from it until the end of the Republic has come—the Constitution, the law, liberty, and eternal justice! [Prolonged applause.]

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Chairman, how much time has the gentleman on the other side remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee has twelve minutes remaining.

Mr. HAMILTON. Does the gentleman from Tennessee desire to use the remainder of his time?

Mr. MOON of Tennessee. Oh, yes.

Mr. HAMILTON. Will the gentleman kindly use some of it now?

Mr. MOON of Tennessee. I prefer not now.

Mr. HAMILTON. But we have the closing.

Mr. MOON of Tennessee. How many speeches does the gentleman think will be made upon that side?

Mr. HAMILTON. One more speech.

Mr. MOON of Tennessee. If the gentleman has only one more speech, then I shall ask the Chair to recognize the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. LLOYD].

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Chairman, before that is done I wish to have recognized for a moment the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FULLER].

Mr. FULLER. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of the passage of this bill, and I will briefly state some of my reasons for so being in favor of its passage. I believe the time has come for completing the Union of the States and doing away with Territorial government within the borders of the United States. Aside from our outlying possessions we now have forty-five sovereign States and these four Territories upon which it is now proposed to confer statehood. I desire to see the Union of States completed by creating what I believe will be two great States in the West—the State of Oklahoma and the State of Arizona—as proposed by this bill. We shall then have forty-seven States in the completed Union, all sovereign, but under one flag, the flag of a great and mighty nation. It is said that we should not join New Mexico and Arizona in one State; that some of the people of Arizona are opposed to such action, and that nothing should be done in opposition to their wishes. Well, there are people in Indian Territory and people in Oklahoma Territory who are opposed to joining those two Territories in one State. Why should not some one rise up and protest against this contemplated outrage? But not a voice is raised against joining Oklahoma and Indian Territory, whether the people or some of the people of those Territories want such action taken or not. Yet either Oklahoma or Indian Territory is much better fitted for and much better entitled to separate statehood than either New Mexico or Arizona. Oklahoma and Indian Territory have each a population, an intelligent, hustling, vigorous American population, of more than three-quarters of a million people, or jointly of more than a million and a half people. With some apparent show of justice they might each claim the right, if there were any such right, to separate statehood. With New Mexico and Arizona it is very different.

Including Indians, Mexicans, and all, New Mexico has only about 200,000 people, and Arizona possibly a hundred and fifty thousand. Neither of them has as many inhabitants as the Congressional district which I have the honor to represent. Yet our Democratic friends would give each of them two United States Senators, and a Representative in Congress besides. I, for one, protest against giving them any such advantage over the people I represent. Both political parties have declared in favor of admitting these Territories to the Union as States. Both parties have made it a political question. It is idle to say it is not a political question. The only difference between the

parties is as to how they should be admitted. The Democratic party has declared in its national platform in favor of their admission as States, but as separate States, at least so far as Arizona and New Mexico are concerned. The Republican party, by its action in Congress, in caucus, and conference, has declared in favor of the admission of all these Territories as provided in this bill. If I did not believe the Republican position was the right position, the only reasonable and justifiable position, which I do, I should yet hesitate long before I would take the responsibility of setting up my individual judgment against that of my party, and deliberately bolt my own party caucus and render aid and comfort to the common enemy by voting with the Democratic party—the solid Democratic party—in this House. Why, Mr. Chairman, the fact that the Democratic national convention declared for separate statehood for New Mexico and Arizona is proof conclusive that separate statehood ought not to be granted them, for the Democratic party can always be trusted to do the wrong thing and take the wrong side of all great questions. I represent upon this floor a great Republican district—one of the greatest in the United States—a district that gave President Roosevelt a majority in the last election of more than 25,000 votes. Those same voters, when they sent me here, did not expect me to be a free lance; did not expect me to bolt the action of a Republican caucus; did not expect me to set up my individual judgment against the decrees of my party; did not expect me to refuse to aid in carrying out the policies of our great Republican leader, Theodore Roosevelt. But they did expect me, and they had the right to expect me, to support the Republican President and to stand for whatever the majority of the Republicans decreed to be for the best interest of the party and of the nation, for one is synonymous with the other.

It has been said here, and it is true, that this Government of ours is a government by party. By organization and concerted action alone can any party hope to accomplish results. We are all sent here by the votes of our party to carry out the principles and decrees of the party whose representatives we are. No man is better than his party, and when he gets the idea that he is, then it is time for his party to retire him. Our whole Government is based on the idea of majority rule expressed through political parties. When the members of the party meet in caucus, or primary, or convention, or conference, and its members or delegates or representatives decide by majority vote, then that is the law of the party and every man claiming membership in that party is bound thereby. That is one thing I admire about the Democratic party. Always, whether in the majority or the minority, they stand and do battle as a compact mass, a well-drilled army. Time and again, in perfect unison, we have heard from the other side of this Chamber, during this debate, the assertion that this is not a political or a partisan question. Wait until the final vote is taken, and like a well-drilled and seasoned army, with one accord, every man of them will vote against this bill. They invite Republicans to vote for a plank of their political platform, and I regret to say some, in a spirit of what they think is independence, will do so. I do not believe in that kind of republicanism. I think my party is right on this question. If I did not think so, I should fear that possibly I was wrong and that, after all, it was just possible that the combined wisdom of the Republican party was more apt to be right than my own individual judgment.

The Republican majority declared for this bill in the Fifty-eighth Congress; they have again declared for it in this Congress. Our great President, nearer to the hearts of the people of this country than any other man who ever lived, has, in his message to this Congress, declared for this bill in the following words:

> I recommend that Indian Territory and Oklahoma be admitted as one State and that New Mexico and Arizona be admitted as one State. There is no obligation upon us to treat territorial subdivisions, which are matters of convenience only, as binding us on the question of admission to statehood. Nothing has taken up more time in the Congress during the past few years than the question as to the statehood to be granted to the four Territories above mentioned, and after careful consideration of all that has been developed in the discussions of the question I recommend that they be immediately admitted as two States. There is no justification for further delay; and the advisability of making the four Territories into two States has been clearly established.

I am the keeper of no other man's conscience, but I, for one, am willing to follow the President and cast my vote in accordance with his recommendation; I for one am willing to follow in the path marked out by the leaders of the Republican party and sanctioned in caucus by an overwhelming majority of my party as represented in this House; I, for one, decline to follow the leader of the Democratic minority in this House, much as I admire him as a man, and much as I respect him for his political astuteness; I, for one, decline to shape my political course by the declarations of Democratic platforms. In casting my vote upon this bill I decline to be guided only by what is claimed to be the wishes of the people, or a part of the people, of Arizona Territory. There are more than 80,000,000 people in this country who are interested in this question as well as the 150,000 people of Arizona. It is said that the people of Arizona and New Mexico are so different that they can not get along together. I doubt that statement. If it were true, I should doubt their getting along well with the other States in this Union. Again, Mr. Chairman, it should be remembered that even after the passage of this bill, unless a majority of the people vote to adopt a constitution and thus accept the privilege of statehood which this bill offers, there will be no statehood. Nothing will be forced upon them unless the people—a majority of them—accept the benefits offered them by this bill. I have no fears but that they will accept. The terms we offer them are too liberal to be refused. We give them sovereign statehood. We admit them—350,000 people only—to full statehood; to an equality in the Senate of the United States with the 8,000,000 people of the State of New York, with the 5,000,000 people of my own State of Illinois. They will accept the offer, and I hope and believe that the new State of Arizona will become a great and prosperous State of this Union. Oklahoma will at once assume that position. No one doubts that. It is a great Territory with a great people, and it will be at once a great State. I hope no Republican, in his spirit of independence, or with his "better than his party" notions, will vote to longer keep them out of the Union and under a Territorial form of government. And Arizona, the land of eternal sunshine, whose pure air brings health to all, whose mountains yield untold wealth, whose natural beauty and scenic effects will for all time command the admiration of all who visit its domain; Arizona, with its Grand Canyon, not one of the Seven Wonders of the World, but the wonder of the world, so grand, so awe inspiring, so terrible in its wondrous extent and magnificent beauty that tongue of man never has and never can describe it. This great domain by this bill is granted sovereign statehood in this glorious Union of States, an honor never again to be granted to any Territory or any land, the last link in the indissoluble chain completing the great United States of America.

Fifty years ago New Mexico, of which the present Territory of Arizona was then a part, was clamoring for statehood. It should never have been divided. Its soil and climate and resources are identical. The natural union of the two will, by this bill, be again effected, but instead of Arizona being a part of the Territory of New Mexico the Territory of New Mexico will become a part of the State of Arizona. Magnificent as will be the domain of the new State, it will still be smaller by more than 25,000 square miles than the State of Texas. It has numerous lines of railroad, and means of communication will be comparatively easy and quick for so sparsely settled a region. Its future development and greatness none can with accuracy predict. But its resources are great, its population energetic and ambitious, and under sovereign statehood I predict for it a glorious future. Republicans need not hestitate to vote for this bill; it is in the interest of the people of those Territories and of the people of the rest of the Union. Time has often demonstrated the wisdom of the Republican party on many great questions. It will demonstrate again its wisdom in this. The greatness of the Republican party rests upon the fact that it has always been the party that did things; the party that has never been afraid to meet conditions as they arise, to assume every necessary responsibility, in spite of doubts and warnings and the fears of the weak and timid. The day this bill receives the signature of the President and becomes a law will mark a new milestone in the glorious history of this great party, for all our territory between the oceans will be upon an equal footing, united in forty-seven American commonwealths, each sovereign, and all under one flag, whose forty-seven stars shall be as fixed and permanent as the stars that shine in the firmanent above.

Let us pass this bill; pass it because it is right; pass it because of the greatest good to the greatest number; pass it as a Republican measure by Republican votes. The responsibility is ours; the credit will also be ours, and when the history of the great party is written this action will mark one of its bright pages that citizens of the future great State of Arizona will turn to with pride and thankfulness.

Mr. HAMILTON. I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Mr. Chairman, I voted for the rule and shall vote for the bill. In determining my course I permitted the more important questions involved in the statehood proposition to overcome my objections to what must be regarded, in comparison with the main issue, as a minor detail. But I would be unfaithful to my convictions and unmindful of the

principles I have cherished all my life if I failed to enter my emphatic protest against the provision which puts Indian Territory under the ban of prohibition. To my mind prohibition is slavery. It is subversive of recognized individual rights, and therefore undemocratic and un-American. Indeed, the question may be fairly asked, Which is the more objectionable, an arrangement which places a man's person under another man's control, or a device by which the exercise of inalienable individual rights is prevented by State authority? The right to eat and drink what you please is not one of those natural rights which the individual is called upon to surrender on becoming a member of civilized society, because its exercise involves neither a moral wrong nor an injury to his neighbor, and this is the reason why those who are ever bent on interfering with the personal habits of their neighbors have never dared to advocate laws prohibiting these habits directly or to deny their rightful exercise. They try to accomplish their purpose by indirection. Therefore prohibition means nothing more and nothing less than to prevent citizens from exercising a privilege which in itself is both legal and moral, and must hence be regarded as an undeniable and inalienable human right. I hold this to be a violation of every sound American doctrine of government and am certain that this House or Congress would never sanction it as an independent proposition.

It is needless to repeat here that prohibition never prohibits. Wherever it has been tried practical experience has demonstrated it to be a lamentable failure. It is because you can not correct human habits and change human nature by legislation, because you can not by invoking the physical power of the State do what education and refinement alone can accomplish. Take the Indian Territory for an example. The excesses committed there, so far as they are traceable to the excessive use of intoxicants, were a direct result of prohibition, which renders the use of the light and healthful beverages, such as wine and beer, impossible and induces people clandestinely to procure the strong drinks that can easily be concealed. This is the case wherever prohibition is in vogue. It proves conclusively that prohibition does not mean temperance, that instead of promoting the cause of temperance it invites and encourages intemperance and excesses. I believe in temperance, Mr. Chairman, and those who have known me here for thirteen years know that I live up to that belief. Moreover, I sympathize with any movement which has the promotion of temperate habits for its object and with all good people who honestly strive to uphold the cause of moderation. But prohibition and prohibitionists do not belong in that category. They may mean well, but the movement long ago proved abortive and the people engaged in it are misled. Their remedy is wrong and vicious in principle and has proved ineffective in practice.

In the short time allotted to me it is impossible to go more fully into this subject, but let me say just a word in regard to the pending bill. If the provision to which I have called attention became a law, the white citizens of Indian Territory, as well as the Indians, would for the next twenty-one years be denied the opportunity of securing even the lightest kind of beverage for their family tables. Their personal rights would be curtailed to this intolerable extent by a mandate of Congress. Is there a single man within the sound of my voice who does not see the absurdity of such a proposition? While granting them the independence and sovereignty of statehood with one hand, are we not putting the chains of slavery around their necks with the other? Is this not erecting the gallows alongside of the liberty we feign to grant them? Surely it would be a repetition of the amusing demonstration in 1848 of which history tells us, when the unsophisticated peasant subjects of the Grand Duke of Hesse shouted: "Long live the Republic! Long live the Grand Duke!" in the same breath. If the good people of Indian Territory should not rebel against this tyrannical attempt on the part of Congress to dictate to them in a matter which is and should be their own affair, then I am greatly mistaken in their character and manhood. It was Abraham Lincoln who said, "You can not create a State half slave and half free," and if ever an American Congress or the people themselves should so far forget American traditions as to ignore the injunction handed down to us in these truthful words, then the Supreme Court of the United States will no doubt give them renewed force and effect. [Loud applause.]

Mr. HAMILTON. Will the gentleman from Tennessee now use the remainder of his time?

Mr. MOON of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I believe we have twelve minutes remaining. I desire to yield two minutes of that time to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. SMITH] and the remainder of the time to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. LLOYD].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arizona [Mr. SMITH] is recognized for two minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I intrude myself on the committee only for a few moments for the purpose of denying a statement that has been suggested more than once on this floor, circulated through the press of this country, charging that railroad and mining influences were here attempting to corrupt the legislation of Congress in the defeat of this measure. I want to say once for all, emanating from where it pleases, that whoever suggested it is either ignorant of the facts and ought not to make that statement, or else knowing the facts he falsifies them. [Applause.] It is true, as I have said before, that the railroads in the West are exactly like the railroads in the East, that the mines in the West pay as much as the mines in the East in taxation, and none pay enough, but this argument has been used to scare Members on this floor. I have seen letters myself, and read them, where it was charged that a man voting against this measure would rest under the suspicion of having been bribed by somebody. There has not been one cent or one dollar used; and if this is pressed further, and I can get a resolution passed, I shall have the very last particle of it investigated by this House, if my friends on the Republican side will stay by me on that proposition. It is unfair to the men who appeared before that committee, as fine a body of men as ever appeared before a committee of Congress. Every man paid his own expenses, and they came as citizens protesting against this measure. They were willing to pay and did pay their own way; and I want once for all to give that report this emphatic denial that the man who repeats it, at least after this statement, should know forever that he repeats an absolute falsehood. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. LLOYD] is recognized for ten minutes.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Chairman, the pending bill provides statehood for four Territories. It unites into one State the Territories of Oklahoma and Indian Territory, and to this, so far as I have information, there is not a dissenting voice on this floor. Every Member of this body, as far as I know, if he had an opportunity to vote would take pleasure in voting for the admission of Oklahoma and Indian Territory as one State. As far as I am personally concerned, and I think that is the view usually of this side, we would prefer that those two Territories be admitted as two States, but, as has been explained, these people are now willing to take joint statehood rather than no statehood at all. If there ever was a Territory that was entitled of its own right to admission, that Territory is Oklahoma, and this Congress, if it fails to give it statehood, will commit a crime against the people of that great Territory. But another proposition is found in the latter part of this bill which unites in one State Arizona and New Mexico, and to that proposition a very large majority on the floor of this House, if they had the opportunity to vote their own convictions to-day, would vote "No." In this connection I am constrained to call attention to that which has been discussed by various individuals on the floor as to who is responsible for existing conditions.

It has been charged that this is the policy of the President, and it has been intimated by Members who are insisting upon supporting this bill that they do it because it is an Administration measure. I wish to call attention now to an article which was written for last Sunday's Star by the well-known writer, Mr. William E. Curtis, in which he gives the views of the President on this particular matter:

> While the President has taken an active part in the joint statehood bill, he is not much concerned personally as to its fate. He regards it as a political measure proposed by Republican committees and indorsed by a Republican caucus, and for that reason he wants it to pass. He does not believe that either Arizona or New Mexico is fit for admission into the Union, and he does not think either will be for a quarter of a century. He fears, however, that the Democrats may get control of Congress and admit them separately, which will make two more "rotten boroughs" and four more "sage-brush" Senators. Therefore he thinks it good policy for the Republicans to admit the two Territories as one State, on the theory that one "rotten borough" is better than two and that two "sage-brush" Senators are better than four.

You will observe from this that the President of the United States, if Mr. Curtis is correct, is acting at the suggestion of the committees of this House and the caucus of the party, which is doubtless brought about by the same committees. The responsibility for this legislation rests upon the committees of this House and the Senate, and the individual on the committee who disclaims, privately or publicly, that he is not responsible, and undertakes to hide behind the statement that it is an Administration measure, seems to be deceiving himself and the public. We have heard a good deal said about New York and Illinois—two wonderful States. It is said that it is

unwise, it is unjust, to admit Arizona and allow it to have two Senators, or to admit New Mexico and allow it to have two Senators, who will have as much representation at the other end of this Capitol as the State of New York. What does that mean? That means that population ought to control in the selection of United States Senators. If population ought to control in the United States Senate, have you ever thought about what would be the representation there?

Do you know that according to the rule that obtains here, giving every State one Senator, you would have twenty-two States of the forty-five with one Senator? You would have seven States with two Senators; you would have five States with three Senators; and the chairman of this committee and myself are fortunately living in States that would be increased in membership in the Senate if that rule should be followed. But in the State of Illinois and the State of Ohio there would be five. In Pennsylvania there would be seven. In New York there would be eight. Now, have you ever realized about what that would mean? Do you not know that if Illinois had five Senators that one of them would be the distinguished Speaker of this House? If Ohio had five United States Senators, one of them would be the distinguished Representative from Ohio, Mr. GROSVENOR. If Pennsylvania had seven United States Senators, one of them would be the distinguished Representative from that State, Mr. DALZELL. If New York had eight United States Senators, one of them would be the distinguished Representative from New York, Mr. PAYNE. If Indiana had three Senators, of course the third would be the distinguished whip of this House, Mr. WATSON, and then what would you do for leadership? [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Very much has been said about the Territory of Arizona. It has been attempted on the part of those who have addressed this committee to give the impression that Arizona was corrupt; that Arizona failed to assess its property; that Arizona of all the States and Territories of the American Union was most corrupt in the management of its local affairs. But what is the situation? Oh, they say, the railroads have not been assessed sufficiently. Why not? Because of the action of the Congress of the United States. But notwithstanding that action, do you know that Arizona pays more tax per mile for its railroads than does New Mexico or Oklahoma? It is said that the railroads running through those Territories when reaching over into Texas are immediately assessed for a large sum per mile. As soon as they get across into Nevada and California again they are assessed for a large sum per mile. But what is the truth? In the State of Texas the railroads in 1904 paid $110 per mile, and in Arizona $135 per mile.

The State of Illinois, about which we have heard so much in the last few days, with its hundreds of miles of side track and millions invested in terminals, paid only $418 per mile of line, Ohio paid $468, Pennsylvania $482, and New York $581 per mile of line. According to Poor's Railway Manual, 1905, there are 213,828 miles of railway, worth $15,422,873,305. They paid last year $54,325,856 for taxes in the United States, or $254 per mile. It is patent from these statistics that while Arizona may not receive as much taxes from its railroads as it should, it has received, when real value is considered, about as much as is paid in the States of the Union.

The chairman of the committee, in his excellent address yesterday, spoke very disparagingly of the assessment of the mines in Arizona, and quoted extensively from the report of the governor of that Territory to maintain his position. In 1901 the mines were assessed at less than $2,000,000; in 1904 they were assessed at $4,440,000; in 1905, at $5,325,000, and increased by the board of equalization to $14,440,000. Yet it is proposed to join Arizona with New Mexico to remedy the evil, when the report of the governor of New Mexico shows that the Territory has $38,500,000 invested in mines, with an output last year of over $5,000,000, and not one dollar assessed. The reflection on Arizona about its alleged corrupt assessments of mines and property, when compared with other States and Territories, is not well founded. Especially is that true so far as New Mexico is concerned, as the following quotation from the governor's report plainly shows:

> The real value of property in New Mexico is as follows: Railroads, $86,000,000; farm and buildings, $44,000,000; stock, $42,000,000; mines and equipment, $38,000,000; city and town lots and improvements, $30,000,000; business and manufacturing, $50,000,000; personal property, stocks, and bonds, $40,000,000; a total of $330,000,000.
>
> The assessment, by classes of property, for 1904 was as follows: Real estate, $17,321,795; railroads, $8,511,539; cattle, $5,870,824; sheep and goats, $2,703,644; horses and mules, $1,059,683; personal and other property, $6,268,035.

It may be well to recur to recent legislative history to refresh the memories of gentlemen. In 1902 there was presented to this House what was then known as the "Omnibus bill," which provided for the admission of Oklahoma, Arizona, and New Mexico as three separate States. It came to this body with a unanimous report from the Committee on Territories, was considered, without any rule, and was passed without division or roll call. During its consideration, Mr. OVERSTREET, of Indiana, offered an amendment providing for the jointure of Arizona and New Mexico. This amendment was discussed and was defeated by a vote of 103 to 26.

The report of the committee in its conclusion as to the right of Arizona to statehood was summed up as follows:

> The foregoing is merely a summary of the many facts presented to your committee, from which it is concluded that no valid objection to Arizona's admission to statehood now exists. Many of the greatest States of the Union have been admitted with much less population and half the resources that Arizona possesses. Peace and quiet are everywhere supreme. The law is respected and enforced. Life and property are as safe there as in the capital of the nation. The population of Arizona, by every rule of virtue, education, property, patriotism, and industry, fills to the fullest measure every requirement of citizenship.

Then, as to New Mexico, the committee said:

> If population determines her right, then by nearly every precedent heretofore made her claim is established. If area is to be a factor in its determination, then no question can arise as to her right to statehood. If natural resources and material development are to be the criterion of action, then, upon investigation, she can safely rely upon statehood. If education, integrity, and devotion to American institutions make the bulwark that insures recognition, then Congress, in our judgment, should by legal enactment admit her to the sisterhood of States. If patriotism and a burning desire to enjoy the full benefits of citizenship and to control their own domestic affairs should guide the action of Congress, then the bill enabling her to enjoy these rights should be passed at once.

If Arizona and New Mexico were entitled to separate statehood, then why should they be refused that recognition now?

Why should the majority of the committee having statehood bills in charge now say that separately they are not entitled to enjoy the rights and privileges of independent States, and combined are not entitled to it except as a matter of favor? Why should this House reverse itself on its record of 1902?

It is alleged that they have not singly sufficient population; but according to the precedent they have each more population than twenty States had at admission, and can not be denied on that account.

In 1890 Wyoming was admitted when it had a population of 62,555. In the same year Idaho was accepted as a State, with a population of 88,548. In looking over the record of the vote on those enabling acts it is interesting to observe that the following well-known gentlemen voted "aye:" CANNON, DALZELL, GROSVENOR, HITT, LACEY, PAYNE, Henderson, and McKinley.

Arizona had a population, according to census of 1900, of 122,931, and New Mexico, 195,310. If population is to be considered, why deny them separate statehood, when Wyoming and Idaho were admitted with so much less?

To-day an anomalous position is presented. Less than half of the people's Representatives on this floor are seeking to force a union of the Territories of Arizona and New Mexico, while a large majority are in sentiment against it. Coerced by the leaders of the majority and urged by the Executive, numerous individuals have buried their convictions and answered to the party lash by agreeing to vote for this union. An unusual spectacle of independent manhood was presented yesterday when forty-three Members dared to vote for what they conceived to be right, in opposition to the rule which shut off the right of amendment to the pending bill and precluded the offering of any motion of any kind in regard to it, but required a "yes" or "no" vote on the bill to-day at 3 o'clock.

If the Democratic minority had the opportunity to do so, it would have two votes on the bill. One on that part admitting Oklahoma and Indian Territory, the other on the admission of Arizona and New Mexico. On the first proposition every Democrat would vote "aye."

Then an amendment would be offered to the latter proposition, requiring the consent of each of the Territories to the ratification of the constitution. If this amendment were accepted, the Democrats would vote for the bill.

But, sir, with the bill in its present form we are obliged to vote against it, because of the intense and determined opposition of Arizona to union with New Mexico, and because of what we believe is a prevailing sentiment in New Mexico as well.

I quote here the concluding statements of a very forceful presentation of the views of the people of Arizona in the report of the Territorial governor, Mr. Kibbe:

> For more than forty years citizens of other States have migrated to Arizona, attracted either by its promise of self-government, its wealth of undeveloped resources, or the salubrity of its climate. They have laboriously built up a Commonwealth, and whether it be great or contemptible, it has their allegiance, their loyalty, and their affection, and in it they have an abounding self-pride. A more patriotic people, a people more intensely American, or more devoted to the great Union than are Arizonians, inhabits no State or Territory within its confines.
>
> They ask most respectfully, but most earnestly, that no law shall be passed by Congress which shall make Arizona a component part of any

State without the consent of her people. Do not force a union upon her.

The solution of the situation is easy, in consonance with every principle of justice. If Arizona possesses the qualities necessary to the establishment and maintenance of a State government, she should be admitted. If she does not, then she should not be admitted, and her right should be held in abeyance until she does acquire them; and the question ought not to be determined by the question of the admission or exclusion of the other Territories, or any of them, any more than in 1850 the admission of California should have been made to depend upon the organization of the Territories of New Mexico and Utah. If, again, it seems to Congress that the welfare of the nation would be better promoted by the jointure of New Mexico and Arizona and the creation of one State out of the two Territories, the simplest and the only just plan is to provide for procuring the assent of the two peoples, if they in fact do assent. If either dissents, no interest of the nation will be jeopardized.

Arizona would be inhabited by a strange people if they did not want statehood, and want it earnestly, and strive for it zealously. If they did not want it then Arizona would not make a good State of the Union. But they want statehood for that Commonwealth which they have built up, in which their hopes are bound. They want it as their reward for their conquest of the desert, their searching of the mountains and disclosing the fabulous wealth of her mines. They want it for the protection and for the fostering of all her varied industries. As all their hopes, their ambition, and their pride are bound up in that State, they insist that they should be its designer and its builder.

A bill similar to the one pending passed the House in the last Congress and was afterwards defeated in conference between the two Houses. In speaking of that action Governor Kibbs says in his official report:

The defeat of the bill enabling New Mexico and Arizona to jointly form a State constitution, and providing for their ultimate admission to the Union as one State, was received by the people of the Territory with universal gratification. The small margin by which the defeat was effected in the Senate and the prompt avowal by the friends and advocates of that measure of their purpose to renew their efforts at the next ensuing session of Congress has, however, excited general alarm.

The proposed union is regarded by our people as a menace to the prosperity and progress of the Territory.

There appeared before the Committee on Territories sixteen as bright and intelligent gentlemen as have appeared before any committee and protested most strongly against the merger of the Territories into one. These came from nearly all the walks of life and represented the people of every locality in the Territory. They declare that not 2 per cent of the people favor the jointure, but that more than 98 per cent are unalterably opposed to the union of Arizona with New Mexico. They desire single statehood for Arizona, but prefer now to be let alone rather than to be joined to New Mexico. They protest in the strongest possible way to the union. The people of Arizona are Caucasian; those of New Mexico are of Mexican ancestry. The people of Arizona speak English; a very large per cent in New Mexico speak Spanish. All business and court proceedings in Arizona are carried on in English, while in New Mexico interpreters are used everywhere. The people of Arizona have the habits and customs of the people of the States, while the inhabitants of New Mexico are largely Mexican in their ideas of life. The people are wholly dissimilar in religion, ancestry, and progress, and are separated by the Continental Divide, an almost impassable barrier.

There are three things to be considered in statehood—the character and ability of the citizenship to maintain a stable government, their application for admission to the sisterhood of States, and the consent of the Congress of the United States.

There can be no question that each of the Territories of Oklahoma, Indian Territory, Arizona, and New Mexico is capable of maintaining a stable government and has a patriotic and progressive citizenship, and by every rule of right and justice is entitled to statehood at once. Nothing would please the people of each more than to accord to them this separate statehood, in my judgment, and wisdom and honor dictates that their wishes should be observed.

Oklahoma and Indian Territory have asked to be admitted together, not because they prefer it, but for the reason that they would rather have joint statehood than no statehood. New Mexico, through her Delegate, asks for statehood alone, and Arizona has presented no request for recognition, but at this time prays to be let alone, so that the request of neither of the Territories of Arizona and New Mexico for jointure is asked. Since there is no request from them, Congress ought not in justice to them attempt to coerce their union. No Territory should be forced into the Union of States. The pending bill, if it should become a law, might bring about this state of affairs: Practically every vote in Arizona might be against a constitution, and a sufficient majority be obtained in New Mexico to make a majority of both Territories, and if this should occur under this bill Arizona would then be a part of New Mexico and in the Union against its will and in violation of the spirit of the Constitution and the genius of our institutions.

Such a condition is wrong, as I see it, the pending bill is violative of the teachings of the fathers, is subversive of the doctrine of the rule of the people, and contrary to the principles of ethics by which all men should be controlled. Because this bill is wrong in its provisions and contrary to my conception of the autonomy of States I must vote against it, notwithstanding I am anxious that these Territories shall be States in the Union. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. POWERS].

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, in closing the discussion upon the Republican side, it is my purpose to appeal, not to the fictions of an hysterical imagination, but to facts, figures, and records; not to party fealty or prejudices, but I would advocate what, in my judgment, is wisest and, under the circumstances, most equitable and just to every section and all the people of this great country of ours; what will best subserve the interests of the grandest, freest Republic upon which the sun ever shone or the world ever knew. I am opposed to every attempt to arouse sectional prejudice in discussing this bill, and can see no reason why anything of a sectional character should be dragged into this debate to coerce or to influence the votes of Members of this House. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BEDE] has referred twice to the Mississippi River as a dividing line, contrasting the States east and west of it. I do not believe in any divisions in this country—by the Mississippi River, by the Rocky Mountains, by the Mason and Dixon line, or by any other line, real or imaginary. We have in the past seen enough of the bitter fruits that have been gathered from sectional prejudice and sectional division.

Whatever may advance the interests or increase the power and wealth of the Pacific coast I would gladly and earnestly advocate and support. I would not oppose the admission of a State into this Union from the southwestern part of our country for any reason that would not be equally potent with me against its admission from my own section of the country. Whatever of progress, whatever of prosperity California and the other States upon the Pacific coast have had in the past or are now enjoying in this era of universal prosperity which rules and blesses our land, have been and are beneficial to us all, for we are so united that we all must to a certain extent share in whatever of weal or woe, good or evil, prosperity or adversity may come to any section of this great Republic. I have heard the term "Pacific coast Senators" used, and the inquiry, "Why are you afraid of Pacific coast Senators?" I have made no statements nor have I heard any from the advocates of this bill that should lead gentlemen to make this inquiry. The term has not been used by me. I believe this broad land of ours is a common country under a common flag, the birthright and home of a patriotic and free people, and that the question to be considered here and now is, What, under all the circumstances, taking the history of these Territories, their progress in the past and their prospects for the future, carefully considering our rights and duties under the Constitution of the United States, both as to them and the nearly eighty millions more that live within our borders, is it proper and just for us to do?

I know something of the people of Arizona and New Mexico; I have spent at least four weeks of my life in those two Territories; I have visited them twice; I know that they have in both Territories good school systems—universities, normal schools, and other institutions of learning; school buildings that will compare favorably with those in my own State and, I believe, with those in any other State. I know that many of their people have emigrated from different States in the Union. I might say that all the States have representatives there. In Arizona the chief justice of the Territory is from my own district; his father was a governor of my State; in Arizona also are two able gentlemen, one a former governor of the Territory and the other a distinguished and able man largely interested in mines and railroads, whose names I need not mention. They emigrated there from my own State years ago. I say I know something of these people. I have been well received by them, have been treated kindly by them, and I do not intend to utter one unkind word with reference to them. But I do believe, and I base that belief upon their history and conditions, upon the census returns and upon personal observation, that, in justice to the other States of this Union, in justice to the 80,000,000 of people outside of these two Territories, you should not make two States of those Territories containing by the last census, including Indians on the reservations, less than 320,000, and containing less than 200,000 to-day, in my deliberate judgment, of Caucasian descent, if you exclude Mexicans, as the people of Spanish descent are called.

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

Mr. POWERS. Yes, sir.

Mr. WEBB. I will ask you if three and a half years ago, when Mr. Knox, of Massachusetts, was chairman of the Committee on Territories, if you did not sign a unanimous report from that committee, and report a bill to this House in favor of single statehood for Arizona and New Mexico; and, if you did, what has changed your mind on that subject?

Mr. POWERS. I would state in reply to that question, that I do not think I ever saw the report; I was opposed to single statehood in the committee. I was new upon the committee; I had never been in those Territories at that time; I had never investigated the subject very thoroughly, and might possibly have relied too much upon the statements of interested parties as to the limitless future prospects of the Territories.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. POWERS. One at a time. It may have been that as the majority of the Republicans upon that committee desired to introduce the bill that I acquiesced in that measure.

Mr. LLOYD. Were you not on the subcommittee that framed the bill?

Mr. POWERS. I am not aware that I was.

Mr. LLOYD. Do you not remember that you were on the subcommittee and that you suggested a change with reference to the admission of the Indian Territory?

Mr. POWERS. Possibly it may have been so. A subcommittee has principally to do with the details of a bill of this character.

Mr. WEBB. And then became an enthusiastic advocate of the bill?

Mr. POWERS. I never said a word on the floor of this House or elsewhere advocating single statehood.

Mr. WEBB. Now, one more question. I yielded you the same courtesy.

Mr. POWERS. Certainly.

Mr. WEBB. Did not you lend your influence in favor of single statehood for those Territories?

Mr. POWERS. I did not, sir.

Mr. WEBB. Did you object to it?

Mr. POWERS. I did not say anything about it.

Mr. WEBB. All right, then. That is the way you answer the question?

Mr. POWERS. Yes, sir.

Now, let us look dispassionately at the conditions existing in those two Territories. And in the first place I want to meet in limine the statement that I have heard upon the floor of this House, which was printed near half a dozen times in the report in the Post this morning as to the conditions in the two Territories being so unlike that the people of one had nothing in common with those living in the other; that they were unlike in race, in language, in religion, in laws; so utterly unlike in everything that one gentleman said in opposing this measure since this debate began, it would be miscegenation to unite these two Territories into one State. In the committee I listened to various witnesses produced to show that those conditions were so unlike as to be unbearable. The statement was freely made. I did not hear a scintilla of evidence sustaining the assertions, and it is not in any of the reports. I say to you that the conditions in those two Territories are substantially as much alike as they are in Maine and Massachusetts, and I will prove that statement, too. There was one witness, an attorney, called to prove that the courts' method of procedure and laws were all unlike, and when we asked for a concrete example, and in what the dissimilarity consisted, it turned out that the codes were made from the same sources in both Territories. There was not brought before our committee a single concrete instance showing that conditions were unlike. Let me point out some similarity.

Both Territories were acquired from Mexico; both are arid Territories; both have mines, Arizona has the more; both are grazing countries; both have mixed populations of Mexicans, other Caucasians, and Indians; both Territories were under one government from the earliest settlement in the country down to 1863. There are more people of Mexican or Spanish descent in New Mexico than in Arizona. It has more population, and the ratio is somewhat larger. I will quote some statistics from the recent report of the governor of Arizona. How many Mexicans does the gentleman suppose there are to-day in Arizona? One would naturally infer from the arguments of gentlemen upon the other side that a person of Mexican or Spanish descent was unknown to Arizona, and that there was nothing therein but a type of Caucasian blood much purer than New Mexico could hope to attain to.

Mr. SLAYDEN. I am unable to state from memory. I have not the figures, but the percentage of Mexicans in Arizona is comparatively insignificant when you contrast them with the number in New Mexico.

Mr. POWERS. I will give the gentleman a statement compiled in 1905, in the report of the governor of Arizona, from which gentlemen opposed to this bill have quoted so liberally. There were in Arizona by the last census, of white persons 92,903. That includes all persons of Mexican and every other Caucasian descent, and excludes Indians on the reservations. When Arizona was organized into a Territory in 1863 there were some seven or eight thousand people there, nearly all Mexicans. Now, here is the language of the governor of Arizonia as to the population now. He says that of those 92,000 people, 38,137 are of foreign parentage, not even born in the Territory. He says of those of foreign parentage, not including the Mexicans born in the Territory, there are of Mexican parentage (born in old Mexico) 14,172, without having any reference to the Mexicans born in Arizona, without any reference to the Mexicans who were there when we acquired the Territory. Gentlemen should remember that Arizona was settled before the landing of the Pilgrim Fathers. There are, not taking into consideration these others, between fourteen and fifteen thousand Mexicans there who were born in Mexico. A careful and conservative estimate of the 92,000 people living in Arizona classed as white or Caucasian shows more than 20,000 Mexicans are persons of Mexican descent—more than one-fifth of all. Add to these some 27,000 Indians and you will have some idea of the mixed population over which gentlemen have shed tears because they are to be outraged by a union with New Mexico.

Mr. WEBB. Will the gentleman allow me one more interruption, to read three lines of what Governor Otero says about the difference in these populations, while you are on that line?

Mr. POWERS. On what page?

Mr. WEBB. I do not know what page.

Mr. POWERS. You read that before.

Mr. WEBB. No; I did not read it before.

Mr. POWERS. I beg the gentleman not to interrupt me any further. If he did not read it, some other gentleman did.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maine declines to yield.

Mr. POWERS. Now, sir, if there is any difference, so far as my observation goes, between the Mexicans in Arizona and the Mexicans in New Mexico, it is in favor of the Mexicans in New Mexico, for a larger percentage of those in Arizona—as that is nearer to old Mexico—have immigrated into that Territory from Mexico recently; so much so that there are between fourteen and fifteen thousand there now out of the 92,000 who are of foreign Mexican parentage.

Mr. SLAYDEN. If the gentleman will pardon me, about 15 per cent of the population are of Mexican birth or descent.

Mr. POWERS. Twenty thousand would be about one-fourth of the population denominated as white.

Mr. SLAYDEN. About 15 or 16 per cent.

Mr. POWERS. More than that—20 per cent.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Is it not true that, calling as Mexicans those born in the Territory of Mexican parentage and Mexican blood, that the percentage is enormously greater in New Mexico than in Arizona?

Mr. POWERS. The percentage of Indians and Mexicans in Arizona is at least one-third of the population, and the percentage of the same people in New Mexico is less than one-half of the population.

Now, under these circumstances, what becomes of this cry about forcing unwilling portions of the country together, unlike in everything? There isn't a scintilla of evidence for it to stand upon—not one. The gentleman from Wyoming says they had 100 per cent increase in population in those Territories in the last decade. That is not true. The population of Arizona and New Mexico in the last decade increased somewhere from 68,000 to 70,000. The population of both Territories by the census of 1890 was, in round numbers, 242,000; the percentage of increase, some 27 per cent. The census will show it. The percentage throughout the entire country at the same time was a little less. Both Territories were developed very largely during this decade by the opening of mines and the building of railroads. They have to-day in both Territories, counting Indians, Mexicans, negroes, Mongolians, and everything else, according to the last census, 318,000—not one-fifth part of the average number of persons throughout the other States in the Union.

Gentlemen talk about the number of population when other States were admitted. They had splendid prospects; they had vast fertile areas. Down there the governor only claims that about 1 per cent of the land can be reclaimed by irrigation.

Volcanic rocks, cactus deserts, and irreclaimable wastes make the principal part of those Territories.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Will the gentleman allow me another interruption?

Mr. POWERS. Yes; I have only a short time.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Does not the gentleman know that Arizona has grown with phenomenal rapidity within the last five or six years?

Mr. POWERS. I do not know anything of the kind.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Does not the gentleman know—as a matter of fact, isn't it public knowledge—that the people who go there to engage in mining and railroad building are Americans—Anglo-Americans?

Mr. POWERS. Yes; many of them—not all, by any means. They are enumerated in the ninety-two thousand. An entirely different rule should be applied to the admission of States under the Constitution from that which governed the formation of the Union by the thirteen original States. Then thirteen distinct sovereignties were forming a general government. Now the General Government, under the Constitution, should admit States only when by so doing it is fair to the people of the whole country. The thirteen original States were separate sovereignties forming a union, and they prescribed in their Constitution that this nation might admit other Territories. I believe that in fairness to other portions of this country it is right, if we are to admit this vast area of cactus and rocks and some fertile valleys and mines—which Senator CLARK says are liable to go out at any time—we should make one State of the three hundred and eighteen thousand. But to make two States of them and give them four Senators would be an injustice to many other States. It would not be an injustice to Wyoming, with 92,000 people; it would not be an injustice to Nevada, if you want to make any more like her, with 42,000 people, having decreased from sixty-six thousand in the last fifteen or twenty years to forty-two thousand, but it would be a crying injustice to the great mass of the people of this country. It would do violence to representative government and would give an unfair preponderance in the Senate of the United States, which is not like the House of Lords, a mere brake upon legislation, but a very potent factor in the legislation of this country.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman allow me?

Mr. POWERS. I have very few moments left.

Mr. LLOYD. I want to ask the gentleman if it isn't true that the State of Maine would be represented in Congress by three Representatives instead of four if it had not been for the Representatives from the Western States on this floor?

Mr. POWERS. The State of Maine has no more Representatives than she is entitled to under the law, and the child isn't born that will ever see in both of these Territories put together a population, to say nothing about everything else that constitutes greatness and worth, that will equal the numbers of population that there are or will be in the State of Maine during its lifetime. [Laughter.]

I have no apology to make, as I said, for this Republican measure. There is not a gentleman supporting this bill who desires to shield himself behind any Executive order or Executive support. This measure is right, it is Republican, it is just, and therefore I expect gentlemen on the other side to oppose it. To do otherwise would falsify the history of their party. The history of our country for the last fifty years shows that the gentlemen on the other side have opposed all of these great measures which have made our country what we now are and under which we have prospered in an unprecedented degree, as no other nation has ever prospered.

Go back for a moment in the history of the country and you will find that persistently and always in your platforms and speeches and by your votes you gentlemen have opposed every important measure. You opposed the issue of the greenback when its issue was to save the life of the nation. You wanted to set the printing presses running when to issue more was to destroy and dishonor the nation.

On this floor thirty years ago I heard your leaders, for you had a majority here then, denounce the resumption act as a wicked act in the interest of the capitalist and bondholder as badly as you denounce this measure, and you passed a bill through this House repealing it. All along the line of march of your party we find monuments erected to abandoned positions. But the Republican party, which has generally guided and governed this great country for a half a century, has made a record that it may well be proud of, and the Republican party to-day desires to do equal and exact justice to all parts of our country. It has never pledged itself in any of its platforms to grant statehood to these Territories separately. It has pledged itself to give the right of statehood to the Territories and have them become States, and is now offering to redeem that promise and pledge, notwithstanding the small amount of population and disparity of numbers, and to make these four Territories into two sovereign States. I trust and hope and believe that action to that end will be taken by this Congress. [Loud applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time for debate of the pending measure having expired, the committee will rise and report the bill to the House for its consideration.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. CRUMPACKER, 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. 12707, the time fixed for debate by special order of the House having expired, the committee had instructed him to report the bill back to the House for its consideration.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The question was taken; and the bill was ordered to be engrossed and read the third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. MOON of Tennessee. On that, Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 195, nays 150, answered "present" 8, not voting 33, as follows:

YEAS—195.

Acheson	Denby	Keifer	Powers
Adams, Pa.	Dickson, Ill.	Kennedy, Nebr.	Reynolds
Alexander	Dixon, Mont.	Kinkaid	Rhodes
Allen, Me.	Dovener	Klepper	Rives
Allen, N. J.	Draper	Knapp	Roberts
Ames	Dresser	Knopf	Rodenberg
Bannon	Driscoll	Lacey	Samuel
Barchfeld	Dunwell	Lafean	Schneebell
Bartholdt	Dwight	Landis, Chas. B.	Scott
Bates	Edwards	Landis, Frederick	Scroggy
Bennet, N. Y.	Ellis	Law	Shartel
Bennett, Ky.	Fassett	Lawrence	Sherman
Bingham	Flack	Le Fevre	Sibley
Birdsall	Fletcher	Lilley, Conn.	Smith, Ill.
Bishop	Foss	Littauer	Smith, Iowa
Blackburn	Foster, Ind.	Littlefield	Smith, Wm. Alden
Boutell	Foster, Vt.	Longworth	Smith, Pa.
Bowersock	Fowler	Lorimer	Smyser
Bradley	Fulkerson	Loudenslager	Snapp
Brick	Fuller	Lovering	Southard
Brownlow	Gaines, W. Va.	McCall	Southwick
Buckman	Gardner, Mass.	McCarthy	Sperry
Burke, Pa.	Gardner, Mich.	McCleary, Minn.	Stafford
Burke, S. Dak.	Gardner, N. J.	McGavin	Steenerson
Burleigh	Gilbert, Ind.	McKinley, Ill.	Sterling
Burton, Ohio	Gillett, Mass.	McKinney	Stevens, Minn.
Butler, Pa.	Graff	Madden	Sulloway
Calder	Greene	Mahon	Tawney
Campbell, Kans.	Gronna	Mann	Taylor, Ohio
Campbell, Ohio	Grosvenor	Martin	Tirrell
Capron	Hale	Michalek	Townsend
Cassel	Hamilton	Miller	Tyndall
Chaney	Haskins	Moon, Pa.	Van Winkle
Chapman	Haugen	Morrell	Volstead
Cocks	Hedge	Mouser	Vreeland
Cole	Henry, Conn.	Murdock	Waldo
Conner	Hepburn	Nevin	Wanger
Cooper, Pa.	Higgins	Norris	Watson
Cooper, Wis.	Hill, Conn.	Olcott	Webber
Cousins	Hinshaw	Olmsted	Weeks
Currier	Hoar	Overstreet	Weems
Curtis	Hogg	Palmer	Welborn
Dale	Holliday	Parker	Wharton
Dalzell	Howell, N. J.	Parsons	Wiley, N. J.
Darragh	Hubbard	Patterson, Pa.	Wilson
Davis, Minn.	Huff	Payne	Wood, N. J.
Dawes	Hughes	Pearre	Woodyard
Dawson	Hull	Perkins	The Speaker
Deemer	Jenkins	Pollard	

NAYS—150.

Adams, Wis.	Davis, W. Va.	Hay	Lever
Adamson	De Armond	Hayes	Lewis
Aiken	Dixon, Ind.	Heflin	Lindsay
Babcock	Ellerbe	Henry, Tex.	Livingston
Bankhead	Esch	Hermann	Lloyd
Bartlett	Field	Hopkins	Loud
Beall, Tex.	Finley	Houston	McCreary, Pa.
Bede	Fitzgerald	Howard	McKinlay, Cal.
Beidler	Flood	Howell, Utah	McLain
Bonynge	Floyd	Humphrey, Wash.	McNary
Bowers	French	Humphreys, Miss.	Macon
Brantley	Gaines, Tenn.	Hunt	Marshall
Broocks, Tex.	Garner	James	Maynard
Brown	Garrett	Johnson	Meyer
Brundidge	Gilbert, Ky.	Jones, Va	Minor
Burgess	Gill	Jones, Wash.	Mondell
Burleson	Gillespie	Kahn	Moon, Tenn.
Burnett	Gillett, Cal.	Keliher	Moore
Butler, Tenn.	Glass	Kitchin, Claude	Mudd
Calderhead	Goebel	Kitchin, Wm. W.	Murphy
Candler	Goldfogle	Kline	Needham
Clark, Mo.	Goulden	Knowland	Padgett
Clayton	Granger	Lamb	Page
Cushman	Gregg	Lee	Patterson, N. C.
Davey, La.	Griggs	Legare	Pou
Davidson	Gudger	Lester	Pujo

Rainey	Ruppert	Smith, Tex.	Trimble
Randell, Tex.	Russell	Sparkman	Underwood
Ransdell, La.	Ryan	Spight	Wachter
Reeder	Shackleford	Stanley	Wallace
Reid	Sheppard	Stephens, Tex.	Watkins
Rhinock	Sherley	Sullivan, Mass.	Webb
Richardson, Ala.	Sims	Swanson	Weisse
Richardson, Ky.	Slayden	Talbott	Wiley, Ala.
Rixey	Small	Taylor, Ala.	Williams
Robertson, La.	Smith, Cal.	Thomas, N. C.	Wood, Mo.
Robinson, Ark.	Smith, Ky.	Thomas, Ohio	
Rucker	Smith, Md.	Towne	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—8.

Andrus	Clark, Fla.	McMorran	Patterson, S. C.
Brooks, Colo.	Crumpacker	Otjen	Wadsworth

NOT VOTING—33.

Bell, Ga.	Garber	Lilley, Pa.	Sullivan, N. Y.
Bowie	Graham	Little	Sulzer
Broussard	Hardwick	McDermott	Van Duzer
Burton, Del.	Hearst	McLachlan	Williamson
Byrd	Hill, Miss.	Patterson, Tenn.	Young
Castor	Hitt	Prince	Zenor
Cockran	Kennedy, Ohio	Slemp	
Cromer	Ketcham	Smith, Samuel W.	
Fordney	Lamar	Southall	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. CROMER with Mr. PATTERSON of South Carolina.

Mr. BURTON of Delaware with Mr. BELL of Georgia.

Mr. CRUMPACKER with Mr. ZENOR.

Mr. SCOTT with Mr. HARDWICK.

For one week:

Mr. KETCHAM with Mr. GARBER.

Mr. WADSWORTH with Mr. BOWIE.

For the day:

Mr. PRINCE with Mr. SOUTHALL.

Mr. SLEMP with Mr. LITTLE.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH with Mr. BYRD.

Mr. LILLEY of Pennsylvania with Mr. CLARK of Florida.

For the vote:

Mr. HITT with Mr. HILL of Mississippi.

Mr. ANDRUS with Mr. SULZER.

Mr. GRAHAM with Mr. VAN DUZER.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

On motion of Mr. HAMILTON, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

RESIGNATION.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication; which was read, and ordered to lie on the table:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *January 24, 1906.*

To the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

SIR: I have this day transmitted to the governor of the Commonwealth of Virginia my resignation as a Member of the House of Representatives of the Fifty-ninth Congress for the Fifth district of Virginia, to take effect January 30, 1906.

Respectfully, yours, CLAUDE A. SWANSON.

ENROLLED RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT FOR HIS APPROVAL.

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

H. J. Res. 87. Joint resolution to authorize use of transport *Sumner* to convey members of Santiago Battlefield Commission and others to Cuba and return.

PENSION BILL.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 13103) making appropriations for the payment of invalid and other pensions of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1907, and for other purposes; which was read the first and second time, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and, with accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I reserve all points of order on the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York reserves all points of order on the bill.

PHILIPPINE TARIFF LAWS.

Mr. PAYNE, from the Committee on Ways and Means, reported the bill H. R. 13104 in lieu of the bill (H. R. 9978) to amend an act entitled "An act to revise and amend the tariff laws of the Philippine Islands, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1905; which was read the first and second time, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

REORGANIZATION OF CUSTOMS COLLECTION DISTRICTS.

Mr. PAYNE, from the Committee on Ways and Means, reported the bill (H. R. 7114) to provide for the consolidation and reorganization of customs collection districts; which was read the first and second time, referred to the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

HOUSE EMPLOYEES.

Mr. CASSEL. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call up a report from the Committee on Accounts.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania calls up as unfinished business of the House resolution No. 182.

Mr. CASSEL. Mr. Speaker, I do not know that it is necessary to make any statement in reference to this resolution. There have been referred to the Committee on Accounts twenty-five separate resolutions. The committee has gone carefully over these various resolutions and has prepared this omnibus resolution, which provides for fourteen janitors to take care of thirty-six rooms. The number of janitors in the last Congress was nine, who took charge of eighteen rooms.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry. Do I understand the resolution is pending before the House now?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Illinois that it is unfinished business.

Mr. MANN. I do not know whether it is too late, but at the proper time I wish to ask for a division of the resolution.

The SPEAKER. When it comes to a vote it will be proper.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield to the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I would like to get two or three minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has the floor. Does the gentleman yield to the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. CASSEL. Yes. Does the gentleman want to make a statement now or simply to ask a question?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. If you will come over here in the middle of the Hall, so we can hear you, I think we will get through quicker.

Mr. CASSEL. All right. I will try to explain the provisions of the resolution. They are, first, to take care of the janitors of the House; second, to provide a number of additional clerks to the different committees; third, to provide a few assistant clerks, and, fourth, to pay certain obligations to the families of deceased Members. The Committee on Accounts bring the report in this shape in order to facilitate the business of the House and to save time. We have ten resolutions, and I will be glad to answer any question that Members may desire to ask concerning them. If not, I will say the report is printed in full and is before all of the Members.

Mr. CRUMPACKER rose.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER]?

Mr. CASSEL. Certainly.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I will be glad if the gentleman will explain the operation of this resolution with respect to the janitors, stating the number we already have, the number the resolution provides for, how they are distributed under the present arrangement, how it is proposed to distribute them, and what, if any, additional expense the additional janitors create. Also, if there is any increase over the expenditure of last year.

Mr. CASSEL. Mr. Speaker, in taking charge of this committee I found there was a great deal of dissatisfaction in reference to the janitor service in the House. Consequently I asked our clerk to secure for me a list of all the committee rooms, those that were supplied with janitors and those that were not, and to ascertain what it would cost to supply all the committee rooms with janitor service. We have provided in this for thirteen janitors for the various committee rooms. But these thirteen janitors are to take charge of thirty-six rooms, being an increase of five over what we have had heretofore, and an increase of expenditure of only $904. This is done by making this janitor service last only during the session of Congress instead of during the whole of the Congress, thus paying them only for the time they are actually in service. We are thereby providing for the care of all the rooms of the House at an additional expense of $904.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. If the gentleman will yield me two or three minutes, I will get through with my part of the subject.

Mr. CASSEL. All right. How long does the gentleman want?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Five minutes. If that is not enough I will ask for five minutes more.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the other afternoon when I objected to the consideration of this resolution, I had no idea as to what was in it, and nobody, except the five or six gentlemen who are on

that committee, had any idea of what was in it. It was more to the way it was being done than to anything else that I objected.

Mr. CASSEL. I want to say for the information of the House, an arrangement was made with the Speaker to make this report and have it published, so that the whole House might understand it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I understand that. I am opposed to the transaction of public business in that way—that is, to bring in an important measure like this—and this bill carries a good deal of appropriation with it—in the shank of the evening, when the vast majority of the Members are out of the House—nearly everybody out that can get out. It is not the proper way in which to transact the public business. Of course, there are a few on each side who hang around until the session closes every day, simply for the purpose of keeping out obnoxious measures. And without undertaking to assume to run things except for myself, I do not propose that any bill that amounts to anything to the country in general shall be passed through this House any more at that time of day, with as few Members as there are on the floor usually at that time. There are certain kinds of bills which we all recognize there is no opposition to when we hear them explained; for instance, bridge bills. I am glad that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] has prepared a general bridge bill which will take the nuisance of passing individual bridge bills out of this House. Now, if we could get rid of the private claims business, the war claims business, and the private pension business, then the real business of this country could be expedited very much. [Applause.] Another objection that I had to this bill was that it coupled together twenty-five or thirty different propositions, each one of which may be meritorious in itself; but I am opposed to omnibus bills of every shape and fashion, omnibus bills on statehood, omnibus bills on janitors, omnibus appropriations. The real truth about the appropriation business of this House is that the great evil of the system is in the lump appropriation plan.

I objected to this omnibus resolution the other day peremptorily, and would again under like circumstances. Afterwards it was printed in the RECORD and gave every man a chance to read it. Then members of the committee in whom I have great confidence came to me and stated that it was a unanimous report and that everything in the bill was all right. Now, I have stated my opinion about it; I have stated what I intend to do about that sort of bills, and it helps the other side as much as it does ours. There are no politics in that. There are probably as many men in proportion to the numbers on our side that would ask for the passage of bills like this as there are on that side, except that the Members on that side are a little closer to the machine of the House than Members on this side, and you get a little advantage in the end. But I do not care whether you Republicans do it or whether we Democrats do it, it is a vicious system of conducting public business. My opinion about it is that there ought to be a rule or understanding that when we start in on a debate like the one the other day, on this deficiency appropriation bill, that Members should understand that that is the only thing that is going to be transacted that day. Then we can go down to the Departments and transact necessary business for the people that sent us here or go where we please and transact our business, and no measure of any consequence ought to be called up under the circumstances.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Just a minute more. And if two or three Members on that side will join with two or three Members over here we will break up this vicious system of transacting the business of this House. [Applause.]

Mr. TAWNEY. Do I understand the gentleman from Pennsylvania to say this abolishes any of the messengers appointed in this Congress? What are the changes that are provided for in this resolution?

Mr. CASSEL. We have no control over those already appointed.

Mr. TAWNEY. How many of the annual messengers are there?

Mr. CASSEL. I do not know.

Mr. TAWNEY. Thirty-two is the number, if my recollection is right, as I understand it. Now, you propose to add to the annual roll how many session janitors?

Mr. CASSEL. We have fourteen janitors provided for in the bill.

Mr. TAWNEY. How many session janitors have you in addition to the fourteen proposed in this resolution.

Mr. CASSEL. We have no other.

Mr. TAWNEY. How many are on the rolls?

Mr. CASSEL. We have not appointed any session janitors. This covers all the resolutions that were referred to the committee of which we have any knowledge at all at this time.

Mr. TAWNEY. Now, one question further. Has the gentleman from Pennsylvania considered the matter of amending the resolution in respect to the matter of their employment?

Mr. CASSEL. I will ask the Clerk to read the amendment which I offer.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 2, line 9, after the word "messengers," insert the following: "And in case of failure to perform such duty shall be removed by the Doorkeeper."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

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

Mr. CASSEL. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Speaker, this resolution provides for the expenditure of a portion of the miscellaneous fund of the House. I have had occasion to complain in times past of the manner in which this fund has been expended. I am chairman of the Committee on the Census, and while the House provides, apparently, for an adequate number of janitors to care for all the committee rooms, the Committee on the Census has been compelled to employ a janitor—to employ another servant or employee of the House to perform the janitor work of that committee and pay the expense itself.

The Committee on the Census feels also that it ought to have a clerk. It is a committee that has considerable important business. It has done considerable business already at this session of Congress and will have considerable more. I believe that the House ought to provide itself, and it ought to provide its committees, with all that is reasonably necessary in order to facilitate the work of the House. I do not believe that any committee of this great House ought to be humiliated by being required to sweep its own floors, to clean its own spittoons—to do its own janitor work, in short.

The legislative appropriation bill carries, I am informed, about $25,000 for the contingent use of the House and $100,000 for the contingent use of the Senate. There is usually contained in the general deficiency bill about $15,000 in addition for the purposes of the House and about $40,000 in addition for the uses of the Senate. The Senate, composed of ninety members, expends three or four times as much for miscellaneous purposes as does the House, with its 390 Members; and the Committee on Appropriations in the last legislative bill undertook to limit and control the expenditure of this contingent fund—the fund that might properly be termed "pin money" of the House, this fund that ought to be absolutely and completely under the control of the House, in order that it might carry on its functions independently—undertook to control this appropriation by imposing some limitations upon it providing that it could not be used for the purpose of employing special help under circumstances that exist at this time. It imposed that condition also upon the miscellaneous fund of the Senate, but when the bill reached the Senate that body very properly, I think, in recognition of its own independence and dignity, said, "You have no right to say to us what we shall do with our contingent fund. That is a matter of our own, and it is none of your business; but if you desire us to help you tie the hands of your own Members in the expenditure of your own fund, we are perfectly willing," and the limitation was struck out in so far as it applied to the miscellaneous fund of the Senate, but allowed to remain upon the contingent fund of the House; and in order that the House might have any freedom of action at all it became necessary to pass a joint resolution repealing the limitation included in the last legislative appropriation bill upon the miscellaneous fund of the House.

Now, as a member of this honorable and distinguished body I feel a good deal of humiliation because it was thought necessary for the House to go to the Senate and ask that body to assist in tying up the House contingent fund, a fund which is necessary for the preservation of its independence and dignity, in such a manner that it could not expend it without the advice and consent of the Senate. The Committee on Appropriations did that, I think, perhaps inadvertently.

Mr. LITTAUER. Not all.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Perhaps I had better qualify that statement. The Committee on Appropriations never does anything inadvertently. But it may be that the Committee on Appropriations was not entirely able to control all the provisions in that bill after it left the House.

Now, I believe the distribution made by this resolution respecting janitor service for the House is a prudent one. I believe that all the committees of the House should be provided

with adequate janitor service, not necessarily a janitor for each committee. This resolution provides that one janitor shall serve three or four committees. Heretofore some of us have felt that the large committees, provided as they are with elegant mahogany furniture and velvet carpets, with clerks, janitors, and messengers, and all that sort of thing, have looked upon some of the small committees, when they asked for decent service, as if they suspected them of being looters of the public treasury. We simply want just common, ordinary treatment, and we believe the House ought not to be parsimonious and niggardly in the appropriation and in the expenditure of this purely personal fund that is so necessary to its proper administration and to the maintenance of its dignity and independence. I do not believe in the waste of public money in any particular or in any way. I believe that we ought to appropriate and expend the public money economically under all circumstances and at all times, but we certainly are entitled to enough to conduct the affairs of the House in a decent, dignified, and orderly manner.

Mr. CASSEL. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARTLETT], a member of the Committee on Accounts, such time as he desires.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, as one of the members of the minority on the Committee on Accounts, I desire to say that on the day before yesterday afternoon I was necessarily absent, being in attendance upon a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, so that I was not present when my friend from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] very properly, in my judgment, desired that these resolutions be passed over. I desire to state, in justice to the chairman of the Committee on Accounts, that the committee had unanimously agreed that when the resolutions should be presented, if there was not a full House, the report should be printed in the RECORD, so that all Members could read it before it was acted upon. Not only that, not only printed in the RECORD of yesterday, but a special report was made on this resolution. This has been done, and every one has had full opportunity to investigate the subject.

Now, this is a unanimous report from the Committee on Accounts; a report made upon a number of resolutions that have been introduced by Members of the House and referred to that committee by presenting these subjects in a single resolution. It is not, strictly speaking, an omnibus resolution, as my friend from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] calls it; it is a resolution carrying out the purposes of various resolutions that have been offered separately. It comes before the House in one resolution, because it was more convenient, and could be better stated in one than in all; and, furthermore, it would take up less time of the House in their consideration. There is no purpose to join a good and bad resolution together in order to carry the bad through.

Now, if the gentlemen of the House will examine the report that was published in the RECORD of yesterday they will find that while apparently the number of janitors has increased by two over the number employed during last Congress, making 14 instead of 12, which we had last year, we have increased the number of rooms which they are required to attend to and keep in order from 18 to 36. In other words, we have doubled up the work, so that instead of having 12 janitors for 13 rooms, we have 14 janitors for 36 rooms.

Before we agreed to report this resolution we had the officers of the House, among them the Doorkeeper, under whose management the work of these proposed janitors is to be done, before the committee. I desire to say for that official—having been a member of this committee for ten years—that I have never known him to appear before this committee to ask for any additional service or any additional employee in this House that he has not shown was proper and necessary. I want to say further for the Doorkeeper that he has a number of times discouraged, and expressed his views against, the adoption of resolutions which seemed to be for the employment of unnecessary officials.

The resolutions as they were originally introduced provided for the employment of these janitors for the Fifty-ninth Congress. The committee provided that when Congress adjourns the officials provided for in this resoultion shall no longer draw pay. The number of janitors last year appointed by this House drew pay during the recess of Congress in the Fifty-eighth Congress. That will not be so under these resolutions. This resolution appoints them simply for the sessions of the Fifty-ninth Congress.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Will the gentleman allow a question?

Mr. BARTLETT. Certainly.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Do the janitors continue to draw salary during the recess?

Mr. BARTLETT. Not under this resolution. They did during the last Congress, and they do now, but those appointed under this resolution—these fourteen—will not. I want to say that that was put upon this resolution and insisted upon before some of us would agree to it. The increase in janitor service will amount during the sessions of the Fifty-ninth Congress to $904.

We have been informed by gentlemen who are chairmen of committees to whom these janitors have been assigned, and I know it to be a fact in some cases, that some of them have been compelled to pay for the service of keeping the rooms in order out of their own pockets. For a number of the committee rooms chairmen pay for the services of keeping the rooms in order out of their own pockets.

Now, none of the gentlemen on this side of the Chamber have chairmanships of committees and do not use these rooms, but I take the position, and I think it is the correct one, that gentlemen who have these committee rooms assigned to them and transact the public business, whether it is small or whether it is great, ought not to be required to pay for janitor service out of their own pockets.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BARTLETT. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Does the gentleman from Georgia indorse the method of procedure of bringing in ten resolutions, entirely unrelated, in one resolution? I do not mean ten janitors, but ten resolutions, entirely unrelated to each other, in one resolution?

Mr. BARTLETT. I do for this reason: These resolutions all apply to the expenditure of money from the contingent fund, and are really on the same subject. They were resolutions introduced—every one for janitors and clerks and assistant clerks and with reference to the usual amount paid the families of deceased employees and for funeral expenses—and all relate to practically the same subject. I do not for myself see that there is any harm, or that any injury can be done to the public service by having these numerous resolutions, all relating to the same subject, coming from the same committee, all relating to expenditure from the contingent fund, embraced in one resolution. It was thought by the committee that it would be for the convenience of the Members of the House and facilitate the transaction of the public business. I do not see that there is any danger or any harm or anything vicious in the practice in pursuing that course.

Mr. MANN. Does not the gentleman think that a better practice would be to let every proposition stand on its own merits, instead of adopting a plan of I tickle you, you tickle me?

Mr. BARTLETT. I want to say to the gentleman there is no such purpose in this resolution.

Mr. MANN. Well, there may not be such a purpose in this resolution, but this resolution as a precedent won't stand long until there is a resolution naming somebody, as they do here, who shall be employed simply because he is taken in with the rest.

Mr. BARTLETT. No, sir; we do nothing of the kind.

Mr. MANN. I do not say the gentleman does this time. I am talking about the precedent.

Mr. BARTLETT. The gentleman knows as well as anybody in this House that upon the simple demand he can separate every one of these propositions and have a separate vote on them.

Mr. MANN. I have already announced that I would make that demand.

Mr. BARTLETT. I am aware of that fact, so that there is no danger of resolutions being coupled together so as to give either improper strength, and no gentleman can be called upon or expected to vote for all these resolutions in order to pass one or more of them.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BARTLETT. Yes.

Mr. FITZGERALD. On page 3, the last resolution, it is provided that the chairmen of certain committees shall appoint clerks. I will read the language. It says: "To be paid out of the contingent fund of the House the usual per diem compensation of $6."

Mr. BARTLETT. That has reference to clerks?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes. What I want to know is what is the meaning of this language which immediately follows it: "Which shall in each case equal in the aggregate the amount paid session clerks whose employment is provided for by law." If they are to be paid $6 a day, how is this aggregate to be made to equalize the amount paid some other clerks?

Mr. BARTLETT. They are paid up to the 30th day of June of the fiscal year.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Is it intended that these clerks shall be paid from the 1st of July last?

Mr. BARTLETT. No; the resolution says from the time they are certified by the chairman to have been appointed.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Why is this language in this resolution? After providing that they shall be paid the usual per diem of $6, then there follows this language:

Which shall in each case equal in the aggregate the amount paid session clerks, whose employment is provided for by law.

Mr. BARTLETT. That is mere surplusage, I think. I do not think it means anything particularly. They will not get over $6 a day under any circumstances.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The language would seem to indicate that it was intended perhaps they should.

Mr. BARTLETT. It does not.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Then why is the language in there?

Mr. GILBERT of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I would suggest to the gentleman from Georgia that in line 13, page 4, the language seems to indicate that the operation of the resolution is to retroact, and the pay is to begin from the time they enter on the discharge of the duty.

Mr. BARTLETT. Yes; that is it. They are to be paid from the day they enter into the service, as certified by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. GILBERT of Kentucky. That does not certify the pay shall begin from the enactment of the resolution.

Mr. BARTLETT. No; the pay is to begin from the time their employment is certified by the chairman.

Mr. JONES of Washington. On page 4, with reference to the page for the press gallery, it provides that he shall receive pay for the remainder of the fiscal year. Suppose that we adjourn a couple of months before the fiscal year, why should he be paid to the end of the year?

Mr. BARTLETT. That has been the custom and ruling, I am informed, of the Comptroller of the Treasury, that employees of this sort are paid to the 30th day of June.

Mr. JONES of Washington. They would not be paid that way if we did not provide for it.

Mr. BARTLETT. They have been doing it. This is in the usual form.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Why should they do it? Why should not we say until the end of the session?

Mr. BARTLETT. The gentleman can offer that amendment. I have no objection.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARTLETT] will permit me, I will say that the President of the United States declined an invitation to deliver an address at the University of Missouri on the 6th day of June largely on the theory that we would be here in June.

Mr. JONES of Washington. That may be very true, and we may be here after the fiscal year for a couple of months. Therefore we would have to bring in some other resolution to pay up this page. It seems to me it ought to read to the end of the session.

Mr. BARTLETT. The gentleman can offer that amendment. That page has been provided for the press gallery for years before I came here, and this resolution but carries out the practice and custom of the House in the past.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. Speaker, is this subject to amendment?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CURRIER). It is not subject to amendment until the hour controlled by the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired, or until he yields the floor.

Mr. GARRETT. Can you state accurately or comparatively how much expense this will add over and above the last Congress?

Mr. BARTLETT. In the matter of janitors it adds $904. In the matter of clerks it adds $1,772. The increase of expenses over and above the Fifty-eighth Congress is something like $2,700.

Mr. GARRETT. Now, I want to ask—I am not very familiar with the report just now—whether this provides clerks for any of those committees which as a matter of fact never do hold a meeting? There are committees in the House which never hold a meeting.

Mr. BARTLETT. I will state to the gentleman, and he will draw his own conclusions whether they do anything or not. There are clerks authorized for the Committees on the Census, Pacific Railroads, Private Land Claims, Election of President, Vice-President, and Representatives in Congress. Those are committees to which additional clerks are appointed, and we have here provided for assistant clerks for the Committees on the District of Columbia, Enrolled Bills, Indian Affairs, and Pensions.

Mr. GARRETT. Those are all large committees. I will state personally I do not know about the other committees.

Mr. BARTLETT. I have been here for eleven years and I do not know personally what work they do.

Mr. GARRETT. It seems to me while it might not be improper to employ janitors even for those committees that do not meet or do not meet often, because the chairman may transact some committee business—it might not be improper to employ janitors for those; but it does seem to me there ought not to be clerks employed in committees that never meet.

Mr. BARTLETT. We have not given a clerk to any of those committees as far as I am aware. We have only given clerks to those I have read, and an assistant clerk is given to the Pensions Committee. We did that upon the request of the chairman of that committee, whose letter is printed in the RECORD. We gave an assistant clerk to the Committee on Enrolled Bills upon a hearing from the chairman on the necessity for it, and it was clearly demonstrated. We gave an assistant clerk to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and I know myself personally, from the statement made by the chairman and those who are familiar with it, that it was very necessary. I want to state to both sides of the House that I know, as far as I am concerned and so far as my friend and colleague on this committee, the gentleman from New York, is concerned, who was at this hearing before this committee, we gave these matters most careful consideration. We desired not to be extravagant with the money of the people devoted to the contingent expenses of this House, but at the same time to endeavor to give a sufficient service to the House and Members of the House and to transact the public business satisfactorily and comfortably.

Now, so far as I am concerned, or my colleague the gentleman from New York upon the committee is concerned, we have no interest in the matter. We simply undertook to give to the Members of the House, the chairmen of these committees, and to these committees sufficient clerical service and sufficient janitor service to transact the business of the House, to take care of the property of the Government in these rooms, and in agreeing on this report we think we have done that which the facts before the committee amply and fully justified us in doing.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BARTLETT. Yes.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Is there a clerk to the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Justice?

Mr. BARTLETT. I think not.

Mr. HUGHES rose.

Mr. BARTLETT. The gentleman from Texas asked me whether there was a clerk to the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Justice provided for. I do not find any such clerk in this report. My attention has not been called to it.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. There is none needed, because it never meets and never had a bill before it.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Speaker, if the Members of this House will get the report made by the chairman of the committee and look on page 4, they will find a summary which gives an itemized statement of what this resolution provides, and I wish to say that some gentlemen have suggested that these resolutions should be divided. This would probably entail twice the amount that these resolutions call for in the one proposition. The committee took all these resolutions, got them together, considered them carefully, and just allowed what was absolutely necessary to give each committee to take care of them, and while there are fourteen janitors provided here for taking care of thirty-six committee rooms, I do not think a Member of this House will say that is extravagant. At least the Members who seem to be objecting the most to this resolution are the people who have the "pork in the barrel" in their own committee rooms to a very much larger extent than this resolution provides for. And if they are going to do that, I think it would be well to take some of the janitors of these larger committees and reduce them to the "session," instead of making them "annual," as they are at present. Now, the only additional clerk that is provided for in this resolution is that of the Committee on the President and Vice-President. This committee has a very large number of bills before it. They have had a large number of meetings. The clerk of that committee showed me a stack of letters to answer in connection with the new Federal election law. I feel that as this is a unanimous report, after being carefully considered by the Committee on Accounts, there ought to be no further objection to this bill passing in its present form, except the amendments that are suggested by the chairman himself.

On page 4, line 19, the chairman of the committee will ask, where there is a janitor provided for the Committee on the Judiciary, and it reads that it is for the present session, that it will be changed, and this messenger provided for the sessions

of the Fifty-ninth Congress. So the whole matter has been gone over with the closest scrutiny and looked into with an idea of the closest economy possible to avoid the different committees with what they are absolutely entitled to.

Mr. GOULDEN and Mr. GARDNER of New Jersey rose.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CURRIER). Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CASSEL] yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOULDEN]?

Mr. CASSEL. I do.

Mr. GOULDEN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to add a word or two as a member of the minority of that committee and to say that, after four full sessions of the committee, at which these various matters were fully discussed and, as ably stated by my friend from Georgia [Mr. BARTLETT], unanimously agreed upon, I hope upon a careful examination of the resolutions they will meet with the approval of every Member of this House. The total increase in the matter of janitors is $904, and the total increase in the matter of clerks is $1,772, carrying with it a total increase over last Congress of $2,676 and within the appropriation for the purposes named.

Mr. GILBERT of Kentucky rose.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from New York yield to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. GILBERT]?

Mr. GOULDEN. I do.

Mr. GILBERT of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to know what change in the conditions justifies this increased appropriation?

Mr. GOULDEN. The conditions were that the chairmen of the various committees that seldom met were paying out of their own pockets for janitors' services in order that the rooms might be kept decent and comfortable. Consequently the chairman of the Committee on Pensions, the work having increased from a thousand or twelve hundred bills annually to over two thousand this year, found the work so largely increased that it was necessary to have additional help. That explains the increase of an assistant clerk recommended in this report.

Mr. GILBERT of Kentucky. Did the committee make any investigation as to why certain committees never met at all?

Mr. GOULDEN. No, sir; we were satisfied when we investigated those committees that did meet and asked for anything additional or for a janitor. We had the chairmen of the different committees before us and satisfied ourselves that those that did not meet at all, or seldom, were not entitled to a clerk. The chairman of the committee [Mr. CASSEL], who is noted for the kind and impartial manner in which he presides over its sessions, has fully and satisfactorily explained the reasons for our unanimous action.

The majority members of this committee show the greatest courtesy to the minority, doing nothing without our approval. I therefore trust, Mr. Speaker, that this report will be adopted by the Members of this House, as it is undoubtedly in the interest of decency, in the interest of comfort, and the efficiency of the work of the various committees.

Mr. CASSEL. Now, Mr. Speaker, I wish to offer an amendment to cut out the words "and Labor," in line 10, page 2, at the request of the chairman of the Committee on Labor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman intend to yield any more time?

Mr. CASSEL. I will perhaps yield a few minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] to make his objection.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, I did not hear the statement of the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman offered an amendment, but as his time is not reserved any gentleman can be recognized for the balance of the hour, or recognized in his own time.

Mr. CAMPBELL. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has just offered an amendment which I did not hear.

Mr. CASSEL. It is that in line 10, page 2, the words "and Labor" be stricken out. This is done at the request of the chairman of the Committee on Labor. And on page 4, line 19, to add the words "sessions of the;" so as to make the line read "to serve during the sessions of the Fifty-ninth Congress," and to make this correspond with the other messengers that have been appointed by the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

Mr. CASSEL. I will yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman did not reserve his time, and has offered an amendment, and he has no time to yield, unless the gentleman yields the time.

Mr. OLMSTED. Mr. Speaker, I understood the gentleman to offer his amendment with the intention that it be considered as pending.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That is the understanding of the Chair.

Mr. OLMSTED. Then that would not take him off the floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understood him to yield his time.

Mr. CASSEL. I move the previous question on the amendment and resolution to its final passage.

Mr. MANN. Why, I thought the gentleman told me that he would give me some time.

Mr. CASSEL. I will if I can do so without losing my right to demand the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. How much time does the gentleman from Illinois require?

Mr. MANN. Just a few minutes.

Mr. CASSEL. I will yield the gentleman five minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman withholds his demand for the previous question and yields five minutes to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, the very fact that the gentleman from Pennsylvania can make a motion for the previous question on the adoption of this resolution is a reason why it is subject to criticism. Here is a resolution containing ten different propositions combined in one, each probably proper of its class, and possibly all of them expenditures that should be made. But if it should become a practice of the Committee on Accounts, having various resolutions sent to it, to bring them all in in one report and pass upon them all at one time upon a motion of the previous question being made, what chance has the House to determine the desirability of making these employments? What opportunity is here given for the House to judge of the necessity for these employments?

If we adopt such a practice there will be no end of the scandal that will arise in a few years, if it does not arise during this Congress. I hope that the Committee on Accounts, hereafter at least, will feel that it is its duty to bring these resolutions in separately before the House, so that each one can be determined on its merits. Here is a proposition to employ a particular individual. It is run in here with a lot of other resolutions. I do not know who that individual is. It may be perfectly proper to employ him. You do not know who the individual is. There is no method by which you can discuss any particular part of the resolution, because in a moment a motion for the previous question may be made upon the entire resolution.

Mr. BARTLETT. I will say to the gentleman there is just one whose name is mentioned in this resolution, and that is the page to the press gallery. That page is there now, and has been there for a number of years, and if elected by the gentlemen of the press gallery he will be the page for their service.

Mr. MANN. Who is paying him now for that service?

Mr. BARTLETT. He is not being paid.

Mr. MANN. Ah; then by what authority does some boy install himself in the employ of the House and then demand that we shall pay him, and run over the Committee on Accounts?

Mr. BARTLETT. That is not being done.

Mr. MANN. Somebody has made an appointment of a page in the gallery, and then you introduce a resolution which authorizes the employment and payment without a discussion upon the question.

Mr. BARTLETT. It is not my proposition.

Mr. MANN. I know the gentleman from Georgia well enough to know that if he had been framing this matter it would not have been brought in in this form. We would have had an opportunity to pass upon each proposition and to discuss each proposition by itself. I propose at the proper time to ask that the vote shall be taken upon each of these resolutions separately, without regard to how the vote shall be.

Mr. BARTLETT. This page in the press gallery has been employed for a number of years under authority of a similar resolution, and the same man has been there for several Congresses, performing this same duty, and the committee in reporting this resolution has simply been doing something that has been done here for years.

Mr. MANN. I have made no charge against the employee in the press gallery, but I am talking about the principle by which this method is pursued.

Mr. BARTLETT. I was trying to explain to my friend here that in one of these resolutions the employee was named and the reason why it was done. It was because the gentlemen in the press gallery had a meeting and came down and requested that we put in the resolution the name of this gentleman whom they had selected.

Mr. WILLIAMS. And who was doing that work.

Mr. BARTLETT. Who was doing that work and has been doing it for several years.

Several MEMBERS. Vote! Vote!

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 2, line 10, after the word "Laws," strike out the words "and Labor."

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I desire a separate vote upon each of these resolutions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is an amendment to the resolution. The gentleman will not be too late in asking for his separate vote. The gentleman will be recognized for that purpose. The question is on agreeing to the amendment which has been reported by the Clerk.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CASSEL. I offer another amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania offers another amendment, which will be reported by the Clerk.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 4, line 19, after the word "the," strike out the word "present" and insert "sessions of the Fifty-ninth;" so as to read "to serve during the sessions of the Fifty-ninth Congress."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. I should like to ask the gentleman a question, if he will yield to me.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. CASSEL. Yes.

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. I notice there is one section in the resolution where six months' pay of a deceased employee is proposed to be given to his brother. I should like to know what the circumstances were that induced the committee to report that resolution.

Mr. CASSEL. The brother is the only heir of the deceased employee of the House.

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. Was he dependent on him?

Mr. CASSEL. It is customary to pass such a resolution, without reference to the question of dependence. It has always been the custom in this House, in case of the death of an employee, to give to his family or the nearest of kin six months' pay and the expenses of the funeral.

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. Does the gentleman mean it is the custom to give that, regardless of the needs of the next of kin and regardless of how close they are?

Mr. CASSEL. Yes; it is. It has been the custom, and I have made a very careful investigation to determine that fact.

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. It seems to me it is a very bad precedent.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I want to ask the gentleman if he will yield to allow me to offer an amendment to strike out the words "fiscal year," and to insert "session of Congress," at the bottom of page 4 and the top of page 5, so that it will read "present session of Congress" instead of "present fiscal year."

Mr. CASSEL. I have no objection.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I desire to offer that.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Washington offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 4, line 25, and page 5, line 1, after the word "present," strike out "fiscal year" and insert "session of Congress."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CASSEL. Mr. Speaker, I demand the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania demands the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] demands a division of the question. Will the gentleman from Illinois point out the manner in which he desires to have the resolution divided?

Mr. MANN. I ask for a division of the question according to the resolutions, each resolution separately.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois desires a division of the resolutions; so that the question will be upon agreeing to the first resolution, which, if there be no objection, the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the chairmen of the Committees on (first) Education, (second) Levees and Improvements of the Mississippi River, (third) Mines and Mining, (fourth) Patents, (fifth) Industrial Arts and Expositions, (sixth) Coinage, Weights, and Measures, (seventh) Railways and Canals, (eighth) Militia, (ninth) Expenditures on Public Buildings, (tenth) Expenditures in the Department of Justice, (eleventh) Expenditures in the Navy Department, (twelfth) Expenditures in the Department of Commerce and Labor, and (thirteenth) Pacific Railroads be, and they are hereby, authorized to appoint a janitor to each of said committees to serve during the sessions of the Fifty-ninth Congress, whose compensation shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House, at the rate of $60 per month, and said janitors, under the direction of the Doorkeeper, shall also have the care of the rooms of the following-named committees and offices and shall perform all of the duties required of messengers, and in case of failure to perform such duty shall be removed by the Dookeeper, namely:

First. Revision of the Laws.

Second. Reform of the Civil Service, and the room of the index clerks.

Third. Expenditures in the Department of Agriculture, and Irrigation of Arid Lands.

Fourth. Expenditures in the Treasury Department, and Mileage.

Fifth. Manufactures.

Sixth. Disposition of Useless Papers in the Executive Departments.

Seventh. Private Land Claims, and Expenditures in the Post-Office Department.

Eighth. Census, and Ventilation and Acoustics.

Ninth. Alcoholic Liquor Traffic, and Immigration and Naturalization.

Tenth. Election of President, Vice-President, and Representatives in Congress.

Eleventh. Lieutenants, and guard rooms of the Capitol police and the room formerly used by the Committee on Examination and Disposition of Documents.

Twelfth. Expenditures in the State Department, and Expenditures in the War Department.

Thirteenth. Expenditures in the Interior Department.

The pay of such janitors shall begin from the time they entered upon the discharge of their duties, which shall be ascertained and evidenced by the certificate of said chairmen.

The resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Clerk will read the next resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Clerk of the House is hereby authorized to appoint a janitor to perform service in the office of the file, journal, and printing clerks of the House, to be paid out of the contingent fund of the House, at the rate of $60 per month.

The resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Clerk will read the next resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the chairmen of the following-named committees are hereby authorized to appoint clerks to such committees to serve during the sessions of the Fifty-ninth Congress, to be paid out of the contingent fund of the House the usual per diem compensation of $6, which shall in each case equal in the aggregate the amount paid session clerks whose employment is provided for by law, namely, Census, Pacific Railroads, Private Land Claims, and Election of President, Vice-President, and Representatives in Congress: *Provided*, That the pay of such clerks shall begin from the time they entered upon the discharge of their duties, which shall be ascertained and evidenced by the certificate of the chairmen of said committees.

The resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Clerk will read the next resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the chairmen of the following-named committees are hereby authorized to appoint assistant clerks to such committees to serve during the sessions of the Fifty-ninth Congress, to be paid out of the contingent fund of the House the usual per diem compensation of $6, which shall in each case equal in the aggregate the amount paid session clerks whose employment is provided for by law, namely: District of Columbia, Enrolled Bills, Indian Affairs, and Pensions: *Provided*, That the pay of such clerks shall begin from the time they entered upon the discharge of their duties, which shall be ascertained and evidenced by the certificate of the chairmen of said committees.

The resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Clerk will read the next resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary is hereby authorized to appoint a messenger to said committee, to serve during the sessions of the Fifty-ninth Congress, whose compensation shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House at the rate of $60 per month from and after December 4, 1905.

The resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Clerk will read the next resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Doorkeeper of the House is hereby authorized to employ Hugh Williams as a page in the press gallery of the House during the remainder of the present session of Congress, to be paid out of the contingent fund of the House at the rate of $75 per month from and after December 4, 1905.

The resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Clerk will read the next resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Clerk of the House is hereby authorized and directed to pay to Mrs. Sarah M. Henshaw, daughter of Norton McGiffin, deceased, late a folder on the rolls of the Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives, a sum equal to six months' pay at the rate of compensation received by him at the time of his death, and a further sum not exceeding $250 on account of the funeral expenses of said Norton McGiffin, said amounts to be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

The resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Clerk will read the next resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Clerk of the House is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of the contingent fund of the House, to Thomas W. Conway, brother of Joseph R. Conway, deceased, late a laborer in the Doorkeeper's department of the House, a sum equal to six months' salary at the rate of compensation received by him at the time of his death, and a further sum not exceeding $250 on account of the funeral expenses of said Thomas W. Conway, said amounts to be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

The resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Clerk will read the next resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the compensation of the assistant clerk to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, whose employment was authorized by a resolution adopted by the House December 19, 1905, is hereby authorized to be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

The resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Clerk will read the next resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Doorkeeper of the House is hereby authorized and directed to employ a lady attendant in the ladies' reception room, Statuary Hall, to serve during the sessions of the Fifty-ninth Congress, to be paid out of the contingent fund of the House at the rate of $60 per month.

The resolution was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. CASSEL, a motion to reconsider the several votes whereby the resolutions were agreed to was laid on the table.

PRINTING FOR COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION.

Mr. HOWELL of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization be authorized to have such printing done as may be required in the transaction of its business during the Fifty-ninth Congress.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman if it is usual for that committee to have this authority.

Mr. HOWELL of New Jersey. It is.

Mr. SMITH of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I should like to hear some reason why this privilege should be extended to the committee. If no explanation is made, Mr. Speaker, I shall object.

Mr. HOWELL of New Jersey. I would say, Mr. Speaker, that it is customary for us to have printing done. We are taking testimony, and it is necessary.

Mr. SMITH of Kentucky. Is this the unanimous report?

Mr. HOWELL of New Jersey. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Kentucky. I have no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The question was taken, and the resolution was agreed to.

PRINTING FOR COMMITTEE ON LABOR.

Mr. GARDNER of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Labor be authorized to have printed and bound whatever papers and documents in connection with subjects under consideration by the committee may be necessary to the transaction of its business.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. SMITH of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I want to know if this is the unanimous report of the committee?

Mr. GARDNER of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, that is a resolution which has been passed annually for the Committee on Labor for many years—something that is necessary. It is here now instead of on the first day of the session because of my own forgetfulness of my duty on that day. There are few committees of this House having more hearings and more occasion to print than the Committee on Labor.

Mr. SMITH of Kentucky. I want to know whether the committee has actually considered this resolution and whether the report on it is unanimous?

Mr. GARDNER of New Jersey. That is not a committee resolution. It is not customary for such resolutions to be considered.

Mr. SMITH of Kentucky. Well, then, I shall object to it. The gentleman says that it has not been considered by the committee.

Mr. GARDNER of New Jersey. I desire to say to the gentleman, Mr. Speaker, that it is entirely outside of the custom for resolutions of this nature to be considered by committees. They are generally submitted by the chairman at the organization of the committees, when unanimous consent is not required, and they go as a matter of course. There is no question about the necessity of it. The Committee on Labor is engaged in a hearing now on the child-labor bill, and it is absolutely necessary that it should have the authority to print.

Mr. SMITH of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I believe that a committee ought to consider a resolution and authorize the request. That is what I believe about it, and therefore I shall object.

Mr. GARDNER of New Jersey. That is because the gentleman does not know; but he has the right to object, of course.

Mr. SMITH of Kentucky. I am willing for the gentleman to entertain his opinion on that proposition, and I can draw my own conclusions from statements made on the floor of this House by gentlemen who wish to make them. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman objects.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, Senate bills of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and referred to their appropriate committees, as indicated below:

S. 1517. An act granting an increase of pension to John C. Kennedy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 1524. An act granting an increase of pension to John M. Berkey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 1525. An act granting an increase of pension to Zachariah Bradfield—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 1529. An act granting an increase of pension to James L. Small—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 1702. An act granting a pension to Adolphus N. Pacetty—to the Committee on Pensions.

S. 1709. An act granting a pension to Florence Greeley De Veaux—to the Committee on Pensions.

S. 1735. An act granting an increase of pension to Washington Hogans—to the Committee on Pensions.

S. 1827. An act granting an increase of pension to George C. Chase—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 1828. An act granting an increase of pension to Alvin Abbott—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 1842. An act granting an increase of pension to Ransom O. Thayer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 1852. An act granting an increase of pension to Milton Marsh—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 1987. An act granting a pension to Ella T. Hapeman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 2023. An act granting a pension to Amanda M. Richey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 2071. An act granting an increase of pension to Henry T. Anshutz—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 2112. An act granting an increase of pension to John Heck—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 2113. An act granting an increase of pension to Agnes Zentz—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 2144. An act granting an increase of pension to James A. M. Brown—to the Committee on Pensions.

S. 2229. An act granting an increase of pension to William I. Hilkey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 2255. An act granting an increase of pension to James Thompson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 2256. An act granting an increase of pension to Alexander F. McConnell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 2293. An act granting an increase of pension to William C. Hitchcock—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 2481. An act granting an increase of pension to Elijah R. Wilkins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 2486. An act for the relief of Richard C. Silence—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 2556. An act granting an increase of pension to Louise J. D. Leland—to the Committee on Pensions.

S. 2555. An act granting a pension to Sarah A. Bargar—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 2564. An act granting an increase of pension to Michael Matheney—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 2583. An act granting an increase of pension to Thomas Robey—to the Committee on Pensions.

S. 2730. An act granting an increase of pension to James P. Ford—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 2779. An act granting an increase of pension to James J. Egan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 2825. An act granting an increase of pension to John M. Scott—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 2879. An act granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Hoge—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 3180. An act granting an increase of pension to Jacob A. Geiger—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 3243. An act granting an increase of pension to Akey C. Johnson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 3244. An act granting an increase of pension to Anna F. Keith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Senate concurrent resolution 5:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed 3,000 copies of Senate Document No. 77, Fifty-eighth Congress, second session, "Les Combattants Françaises de la Guerre Américaine, 1778–1783," of which 500 shall be for the use of the Senate, 2,000 for the use of the House of Representatives, and 500 for the use of the National Society of the Sons of the American Revolution, to be distributed under the direction of A. Howard Clark, registrar—

To the Committee on Printing.

Senate concurrent resolution 7:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to inform the Senate whether changed conditions necessitate a change of project for the main breakwater of the harbor of refuge at Point Judith, Rhode Island, and if so, to submit plans and estimates for such revised project—

To the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Senate concurrent resolution 1:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the concurrent resolution passed February 2, 1904, providing for the publication of the proceedings on the occasion of the unveiling of the Rochambeau statue is hereby continued in force, and excepted from the limitation of one year, as provided in section 80 of the act of January 12, 1895, providing for the public printing and binding and the distribution of public documents—

To the Committee on Printing.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

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

H. R. 3451. An act granting an increase of pension to Alpheus A. Rockwell;

H. R. 2395. An act granting an increase of pension to Christopher Clinton;

H. R. 3487. An act granting an increase of pension to Ferdinand Weise;

H. R. 6518. An act granting an increase of pension to James M. Long;

H. R. 1868. An act granting an increase of pension to Perry Egge;

H. R. 8713. An act granting an increase of pension to Payton S. Lynn;

H. R. 2718. An act granting an increase of pension to James F. Hare;

H. R. 8550. An act granting an increase of pension to John Bierer;

H. R. 3340. An act granting an increase of pension to William Moorhead;

H. R. 1062. An act granting an increase of pension to George E. Brickett;

H. R. 2770. An act granting an increase of pension to Ephraim Plumpton;

H. R. 486. An act granting an increase of pension to John Armstrong;

H. R. 1199. An act granting a pension to Lydia A. Jewell; and

H. R. 1766. An act granting an increase of pension to John T. Stone.

ADJOURNMENT.

Then, on motion of Mr. PAYNE (at 4 o'clock and 37 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned until to-morrow, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

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 Secretary of War, transmitting, with a favorable recommendation, a draft of proposed legislation as to funds transferred by the several staff departments of the Army to the insular department of the Philippines—to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination of St. George Sound, Florida, including Apalachicola and Carrabelle harbors—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Commissioner of Patents, transmitting his annual report for the calendar year 1905—to the Committee on Patents, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, with a copy of a letter from the Commissioner of the General Land Office, a draft of a bill relating to sale of town sites of Heyburn, Rupert, and Sherrer, Idaho—to the Committee on the Public Lands, 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. SMITH of California, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the House joint resolution (H. J. Res. 77) accepting the recession by the State of California of the Yosemite Valley grant and the Mariposa Big Tree Grove, and including the same, together with fractional sections 5 and 6, township 5 south, range 22 east, Mount Diablo meridian, California, within the metes and bounds of the Yosemite National Park, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 579); which said joint resolution and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to which was referred the House joint resolution (H. J. Res. 59) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior, in conjunction with the State of Texas, to determine and establish the boundary line between the Choctaw Nation, Indian Territory, and the State of Texas, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 580); which said joint resolution and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HOGG, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 8461) to amend chapter 1495, Revised Statutes of the United States, entitled "An act for the survey and allotment of lands now embraced within the limits of the Flathead Indian Reservation, in the State of Montana, and the sale and disposal of all surplus lands after allotment," as amended by section 9 of chapter 1479, Revised Statutes of the United States, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 584); 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. RICHARDSON of Alabama, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 1280) granting a pension to Mary K. Lewis, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 546); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DRAPER, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 1545) granting a pension to Florence D. Rafferty, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 547); 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. 2340) granting a pension to Evelyn S. Beardslee, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 548); 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. 2342) granting a pension to Winifred E. Lewis, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 549); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. AIKEN, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 4217) granting an increase of pension to Daniel M. Rose, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 550); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. LONGWORTH, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 4713) granting a pension to Mary Manning, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 551); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DICKSON of Illinois, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 4727) granting a pension to Emma M. Boyer, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 552); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MACON, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 4737) granting an increase of pension to Odilia Logan, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 553); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. McLAIN, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 4826) granting a pension to Leola V. Franks, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 554); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. AIKEN, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 5238) granting an increase of pension to Lockey Stewart, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 555); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DRAPER, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 5955) granting an increase of pension to Jennie L. Overton, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 556); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BENNETT of Kentucky, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 6076) granting a pension to Anna M. Case, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 557); 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. 6613) granting a pension to Thomas J. Slevens, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 558); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Kentucky, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 6936) granting an increase of pension to William Miller, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 559); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MACON, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 7599) granting an increase of pension to William Holland, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 560); 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. 7600) granting an increase of pension to John Welch, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 561); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BENNETT of Kentucky, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 8217) granting an increase of pension to Sarah A. J. Tayman, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 562); 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. 8846) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Todd, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 563); 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. 8847) granting an increase of pension to Phil. B. Thompson, sr., reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 564); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. McLAIN, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 10192) granting an increase of pension to Alanson B. Thomas, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 565); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MACON, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 10353) granting a pension to Thomas B. Davis, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 566); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. McLAIN, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 10434) granting an increase of pension to Samuel F. King, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 567); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DICKSON of Illinois, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 10439) granting an increase of pension to Mary Ann Gaunt, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 568); 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. 10457) granting a pension to Lizzie Bremner, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 569); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. LONGWORTH, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 10459) granting a pension to Alta M. Westenhaver, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 570); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MACON, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 10552) granting an increase of pension to James Wilkerson, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 571); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Kentucky, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 10765) granting an increase of pension to Robert M. Whitson, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 572); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DRAPER, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 10766) granting an increase of pension to Rachel L. Bartlett, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 573); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BENNETT of Kentucky, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 10588) for the relief of John H. Parker, a sailor in the Navy of the United States before and during the Mexican war, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 574); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 12054) granting an increase of pension to Martha E. Hallowell, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 575); 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. 21) granting a pension to Mary G. Bright, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 576); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 988) granting a pension to Russell A. McKinley, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 577); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 2082) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth T. Carpenter, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 578); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. NEVIN: A bill (H. R. 13087) to increase to $30 per month certain persons pensioned under the act of June 27, 1890—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RANSDELL of Louisiana: A bill (H. R. 13088) authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to make experiments with a view to eradicating Texas fever—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BOWERSOCK: A bill (H. R. 13089) to provide for enlarging and improving the United States building at Kansas City, Kans.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. ALEXANDER (by request): A bill (H. R. 13090) to advance, upon retirement, the rank of all enlisted men who served in the Army of the United States during the civil war—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MOON of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 13091) to provide a code of penal laws for the United States—to the Committee on Revision of the Laws.

By Mr. ANDREWS: A bill (H. R. 13092) to provide for the settlement of land claims in certain States and Territories—to the Committee on Private Land Claims.

By Mr. FLOOD: A bill (H. R. 13093) providing for the erection of a public building in the town of Cliftonforge, Va.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13094) to provide for the purchase of the McLean property and adjacent property at Appomattox, Va., in commemoration of the surrender of the Army of Northern Virginia to General Grant—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MARTIN: A bill (H. R. 13095) to regulate corporations, joint stock companies, and other associations engaging in interstate and foreign commerce in food and fuel supplies—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13096) to regulate corporations, joint stock companies, and other associations engaging in interstate and for-

eign commerce—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FOSTER of Vermont: A bill (H. R. 13097) granting additional pay to all officers and enlisted men of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, and so forth—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BANKHEAD: A bill (H. R. 13098) to light the Potomac public speedway and driveway—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. WILEY of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 13099) providing for examination and survey of the Kill von Kull and Newark Bay, New Jersey, with a view to securing increased depth and width—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. HEPBURN: A bill (H. R. 13100) to establish a laboratory for the study of the criminal, pauper, and defective classes—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BATES: A bill (H. R. 13101) relating to liability of common carriers by railroads in the District of Columbia and Territories and common carriers by railroads engaged in commerce between the States and between the States and foreign nations to their employees—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PARSONS: A bill (H. R. 13102) to amend section 1395 of the Revised Statutes, to provide for temporary chaplains in the Navy—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. GARDNER of Michigan, from the Committee on Appropriations: A bill (H. R. 13103) making appropriations for the payment of invalid and other pensions of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1907, and for other purposes—to the Union Calendar.

By Mr. PAYNE, from the Committee on Ways and Means: A bill (H. R. 13104) to amend an act entitled "An act to revise and amend the tariff laws of the Philippine Islands, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1905—to the Union Calendar.

By Mr. FOSS: A bill (H. R. 13105) for the erection of a public building in the city of Waukegan, Ill.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BRUNDIDGE: A bill (H. R. 13106) granting to the Batesville Power Company right to erect and construct canal and power stations at Lock and Dam No. 1, upper White River, Arkansas—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. WANGER: A bill (H. R. 13189) to establish a laboratory for the study of the criminal, pauper, and defective classes—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FOWLER: A concurrent resolution (H. C. Res. 15) providing for the printing of 500 additional copies of the Annual Report of the Treasurer of the United States—to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. SULLOWAY: A resolution (H. Res. 193) to pay Marcellus Butler $100, for services—to the Committee on Accounts.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BANKHEAD: A bill (H. R. 13107) granting a pension to Lucinda Wideman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13108) granting a pension to Andrew J. Tidwell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13109) granting a pension to Sarah Frederick—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BANNON: A bill (H. R. 13110) granting an increase of pension to James M. Mooman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURKE of South Dakota: A bill (H. R. 13111) granting an increase of pension to Lewis S. Perkins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURNETT: A bill (H. R. 13112) for the relief of the heirs of William C. Blackwell, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BUTLER of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 13113) for the relief of John Gentry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13114) granting a pension to Eliza J. Howard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CALDER: A bill (H. R. 13115) granting an increase of pension to William McGovern—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CONNER: A bill (H. R. 13116) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Williams—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13117) granting an increase of pension to Spencer J. Cox—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DE ARMOND (by request): A bill (H. R. 13118) granting a pension to Caroline Hutts—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 13119) granting an increase of pension to John H. Fish—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DAVIS of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 13120) for the relief of the heirs of William Ewing, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13121) granting a pension to Samuel T. Jones, alias Thomas Jenkins—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DEEMER: A bill (H. R. 13122) to correct the military record of John Allen—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. EDWARDS: A bill (H. R. 13123) for the relief of Stanley E. Brown—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13124) for the relief of A. B. Gilliland—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13125) granting an increase of pension to William B. Bowling—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ESCH: A bill (H. R. 13126) granting an increase of pension to Theodore Groezinger—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FLOOD: A bill (H. R. 13127) for the relief of J. Terry Dillard—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. GARRETT: A bill (H. R. 13128) for the relief of the estate of H. S. Simmons, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13129) granting an increase of pension to Pinkney W. H. Lee—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAY: A bill (H. R. 13130) granting a pension to Rebecca J. Fisher—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAYES: A bill (H. R. 13131) for the relief of I. J. Truman—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HEPBURN: A bill (H. R. 13132) granting an increase of pension to Henry Towns—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13133) granting an increase of pension to Gilbert W. Clark—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KELIHER: A bill (H. R. 13134) granting an increase of pension to Gustavus S. Perkins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13135) granting an increase of pension to E. Bradford Gay—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13136) granting an increase of pension to William Gaynor—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LAFEAN: A bill (H. R. 13137) granting a pension to Rosanna Wavell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LEE: A bill (H. R. 13138) granting an increase of pension to Eada Lowry—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LE FEVRE: A bill (H. R. 13139) granting an increase of pension to William Walrod—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13140) granting an increase of pension to Jesse W. Howe—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13141) granting an increase of pension to William A. Southworth—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LOUDENSLAGER: A bill (H. R. 13142) for the relief of Daniel B. Murphy—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McCREARY of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 13143) granting an increase of pension to James H. Price—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McGUIRE: A bill (H. R. 13144) granting to Kingfisher College certain lands in Kingfisher County, Oklahoma Territory, for the purpose of an experiment station and the teaching of agriculture to the students of said college—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. McNARY: A bill (H. R. 13145) granting an increase of pension to Margaret G. MacNamara—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MANN: A bill (H. R. 13146) granting an increase of pension to Sarah Kearney—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MILLER: A bill (H. R. 13147) for the relief of E. N. Smith—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MURDOCK: A bill (H. R. 13148) granting an increase of pension to William Davis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. OVERSTREET: A bill (H. R. 13149) granting an increase of pension to Ida L. Martin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PARKER: A bill (H. R. 13150) granting an increase of pension to Cate F. Galbraith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RANSDELL of Louisiana: A bill (H. R. 13151) granting a pension to Christopher C. Harlan—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SCOTT: A bill (H. R. 13152) for the relief of W. H. De Long—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13153) granting an increase of pension to George Budden—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SIMS: A bill (H. R. 13154) for the relief of John T. Irion—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SMITH of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 13155) granting an increase of pension to John L. Brandt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SPARKMAN: A bill (H. R. 13156) granting an increase of pension to Simeon Hollingsworth—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 13157) granting an increase of pension to Lianthia T. Grumley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TRIMBLE: A bill (H. R. 13158) for the relief of Irene E. Johnson, administratrix of the estate of Leo L. Johnson, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13159) for the relief of Uriah Edwards—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13160) for the relief of Mrs. Joanna Edwards—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13161) granting a pension to Cynthia A. Embry—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13162) granting a pension to William P. Hanlon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13163) granting a pension to Mrs. Isaac Blackwell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13164) granting a pension to Sallie A. Graves—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13165) granting a pension to Martin Noland—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13166) granting an increase of pension to William Evans—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13167) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Sauer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13168) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. John N. Marshall—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13169) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of James H. Dennis—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TOWNSEND: A bill (H. R. 13170) granting an increase of pension to John R. Mabee—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WEEKS: A bill (H. R. 13171) granting an increase of pension to Jonathan K. Porter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WELBORN: A bill (H. R. 13172) for the relief of the widow and heirs of John A. Stephens, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13173) for the relief of the widow and heirs of John A. Stephens, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13174) granting an increase of pension to William H. Burnaugh—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13175) granting an increase of pension to Thomas J. Gordon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13176) granting an increase of pension to Isaac E. George—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13177) granting a pension to Adam Walk—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13178) granting a pension to Mary E. Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13179) granting an increase of pension to James W. Lankford—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BENNET of New York: A bill (H. R. 13180) entitling the owner of the launch *Elsa* to sue the United States for damages to said boat—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BROOKS of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 13181) granting certain lands to the town of Tincup, Colo., for cemetery purposes—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13182) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Huber—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BRUNDIDGE: A bill (H. R. 13183) granting a pension to Mary K. McDowell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DARRAGH: A bill (H. R. 13184) for the relief of First Lieut. George Van Orden, United States Marine Corps—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 13185) for the relief of Thomas M. Bybee—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13186) granting an increase of pension to B. M. Bennett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WACHTER: A bill (H. R. 13187) granting an increase of pension to Samuel A. Bell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13188) granting a pension to Michael Burkhard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of bills of the following titles; which were thereupon referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 1277) for the relief of the administrators, as such, of the estate of Ira T. Jordan, deceased—Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on War Claims.

A bill (H. R. 13011) appropriating money to pay William Tucker for services and expenses as acting captain and drillmaster of Company D, One hundred and fifth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteers—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 13037) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Jane Kearney—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 13038) granting an increase of pension to Rebecca Ramsey—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 13042) for the relief of Alexander C. Landis—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

By Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania: Petition of Pen and Pencil Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. BROOKS of Colorado: Petition of 20 citizens of New York and vicinity, for relief for heirs of victims of *General Slocum* disaster—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BRADLEY: Petitions of Stonyford (N. Y.) Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, for repeal of revenue tax on denaturized alcohol—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURLEIGH: Petition of 14 citizens of New York and vicinity, for relief for heirs of victims of *General Slocum* disaster—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BURNETT: Paper to accompany bill for relief of estate of Andrew Reece—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of estate of Wade Smith—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of estate of Solomon Keene—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of estate of William Keith—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of estate of Jonathan H. Ellison—to the Committee no War Claims.

By Mr. BURTON of Ohio: Petition of Harvey Rice Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Theodore Groezinger—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania: Petition of J. L. Pile Council, No. 73, Order United American Mechanics, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Agnes Kenit et al., for investigation of conditions in the Kongo Free State—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BUTLER of Tennessee: Paper to accompany bill for relief of William Boyd—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of John Gentry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Mrs. Eliza J. Howard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COOPER of Pennsylvania: Petition of Clearing House Association of Philadelphia, for amendment to the national-banking law—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, petition of the Commercial Law League of America, for reform of the consular service—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Valley Grange, No. 878, for repeal of revenue tax on denaturized alcohol—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DALZELL: Petition of the Philadelphia Clearing House Association, favoring including surplus with capital in measuring loans—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota: Petition of National Grange, for repeal of revenue tax on denaturized alcohol—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DE ARMOND: Paper to accompany bill for relief of John H. Fish—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Caroline Hulls—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DIXON of Montana: Petition of J. G. Stewart, of Preston, Mont., favoring extension of time for shipment of stock—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FLACK: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Marcus Crossman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of the American Mining Congress, for law relative to mines on Spanish and Mexican land grants—to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

Also, petition of the Western Fruit Jobbers' Association, for additional power to the Interstate Commerce Commission—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GARRETT: Paper to accompany bill for relief of estate of H. S. Simmons—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. GRANGER: Petition of Kenyon L. Butterfield, president of the Rhode Island College of Agriculture and the Mechanic Arts, favoring bill H. R. 11788—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, papers relative to relief of Amos M. Bowen—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, petition of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Arnolds Mills, R. I., and the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Rhode Island, for prohibition in Indian Territory and Oklahoma as States—to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Rhode Island, for passage of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Providence (R. I.) Council, No. 67, United Commercial Travelers of America, to amend the bankruptcy law—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Unions of Warren and Westerly, R. I., for prohibition of liquor traffic in Indian Territory and Oklahoma as States—to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, petition of the Rhode Island State board of agriculture, for free basic-slag meal—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Rhode Island State board of agriculture, for passage of bill H. R. 345—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of the Arlington Free Baptist Church and Elisha T. Reed et al., of Woonsocket, R. I., for prohibition of liquor traffic in Indian Territory and Oklahoma as States—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. HAY: Paper to accompany bill for relief of William Dean—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Rebecca J. Foster—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAYES: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Mary E. Bennett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOWELL of New Jersey: Petition of the Woman's Club of Orange, N. J., for a child-labor law—to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. HULL: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Miller C. Hunter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KAHN: Petition of the California State Federation of Labor, for increase of pay of the employees at life-saving stations—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the California State Federation of Labor, against reduction of duty on tobacco and cigars from the Philippines—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the California Medical Society, for increase of efficiency of the Medical Department of the Army—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of the Outdoor Art League of California, for preservation of Niagara Falls—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of the Chamber of Commerce of San Francisco, Cal., relative to Chinese exclusion—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KELIHER: Petition of the Massachusetts State Board of Trade, for consolidation of mail matter of the third and fourth classes at the 1-cent rate, and for passage of bill H. R. 4549—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Nebraska: Petition of the World Publishing Company, of Omaha, Nebr., for repeal of the tariff on linotype machines—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of F. A. Kennedy, of Omaha, Nebr., against the tariff on linotype machines—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KNAPP: Petition of George A. Fuller, for bill H. R. 345—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Dexter Grange, No. 724, of New York, and Grange No. 71, of Lowville, N. Y., for repeal of revenue tax on denaturized alcohol—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Ontario Lodge, No. 69, Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen, of Oswego, N. Y., for bills H. R. 239 and 9328—to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. LILLEY of Connecticut: Petition of the Connecticut Federation of Woman's Clubs, for compulsory-education and child-labor bills in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of W. B. Davidson et al., for repeal of revenue tax on denaturized alcohol—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LIVINGSTON: Petition of Gate City Council, No. 5, Junior Order United American Mechanics, for restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. LOUDENSLAGER: Petition of the Woman's Home Missionary Society of Camden, N. J., against liquor selling in any Government building—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liqour Traffic.

By Mr. McCREARY of Pennsylvania: Petition of the Christian Endeavor Society of Philadelphia, Pa., for prohibition in Indian Territory as a State—to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, petition of the Christian Endeavor Society of Philadelphia, for prohibition in all Soldiers' Homes and buildings of the United States Government—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. MANN: Petition of the Illinois State Horticultural Society, of Princeton, Ill., for protection of apple vinegar—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of the Western Fruit Growers' Association, favoring railway rates by Interstate Commerce Commission—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of F. W. Thurston & Co., for repeal of revenue tax on denaturized alcohol—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOON of Tennessee: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Sarah A. Chauncey—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MORRELL: Petition of citizens of Philadelphia; Richmond Council, Daughters of Liberty, and Smith River Council, No. 71, Junior Order United American Mechanics, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of the Painters, Decorators, and Paper Hangers of America, for repeal of revenue tax on denaturized alcohol—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Clearing House Association, for amending banking law—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, petition of Philadelphia Lodge, No. 511, Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen, favoring bill H. R. 9328—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Lodge No. 511, Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen, favoring bills H. R. 239 and S. 1657—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NEEDHAM: Petition of the Chamber of Commerce of San Francisco, favoring liberal laws relative to Chinese exclusion—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of the Sacramento Valley Development Association, for an appropriation to stop the pear blight—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of the California State Federation of Labor, favoring increase of pay of surfmen and keepers of lighthouses—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Cigar Makers' Union of the United States and Canada, against bill H. R. 3—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OVERSTREET: Petition of the Hardwood Lumbermen's Association, favoring Interstate Commerce Commission having control of freight rates—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Indiana Grain Dealers' Association, favoring railway-rate power in Interstate Commerce Commission—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Ida L. Martin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PADGETT: Petition of citizens of Houston and Humphreys counties, Tenn., for a parcels-post law—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. PATTERSON of Pennsylvania: Petition of Springville Council, No. 659, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Artz, Pa., favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. PAYNE: Petition of citizens of New York, for repeal of revenue tax on denaturized alcohol—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PERKINS: Petition of Irving Rouse, for repeal of revenue tax on denaturized alcohol—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PUJO: Petition of the North Carolina State board of agriculture and the Interstate Association of Live Stock Sanitary Board, of Guthrie, Okla., relative to the cattle tick—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of the American Veterinary Medical Association of Cleveland, Ohio, relative to extermination of the cattle tick—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of the Association of Commissioners of Agriculture of the Southern States, relative to extermination of the cattle tick—to the Commitee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of the North Carolina State Farmers' Association, relative to extermination of the cattle tick—to the Commitee on Agriculture.

By Mr. POU: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Elizabeth F. Partin—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. RUCKER: Petition of Waller & Eubank, against the tariff on linotype machines—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SAMUEL: Petition of Catawissa Council, No. 96, Junior Order United American Mechanics, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of 200 citizens of Mount Carmel, Pa., for prohibition in Oklahoma as a State—to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, petition of 200 citizens of Mount Carmel, Pa., against liquor selling in any Government building—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

Also, petition of 200 citizens of Mount Carmel, Pa., favoring the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of 16 citizens of New York and vicinity, for relief for heirs of victims of *General Slocum* disaster—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SMITH of Kentucky: Paper to accompany bill for relief of F. M. Hatler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of William Zachery—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Texas: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Rich C. Daley—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of George M. Troger—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of John G. Stocks—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Robert M. White—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of George B. D. Alexander—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Silas N. H. Ballard—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Robert C. Bell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SPERRY: Petition of Liberty Bell Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of citizens of the Second district of Connecticut, for repeal of revenue tax on denaturized alcohol—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Pennsylvania State Federation of Woman's Clubs, for compulsory education in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Alabama: Petition of Ralph C. Richards et al., for repeal of revenue tax on denaturized alcohol—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THOMAS of Ohio: Petition of the Progress Club of Niles, Ohio, against spoliation of Niagara Falls—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Girard Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of A. H. Brown et al., for repeal of revenue tax on denaturized alcohol—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TIRRELL: Petition of Local Union No. 921, of Waltham, Mass., Painters, Decorators, and Paper Hangers of America, for repeal of revenue tax on denaturized alcohol—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VAN WINKLE: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Margaret Underhill—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WOOD of New Jersey: Petition of members of the Fourth Presbyterian Church of Trenton, N. J., relative to the Indian trust fund—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of George Van Master—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. YOUNG: Petition of George E. Briggs, against bill H. R. 7079—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of citizens of Michigan, against the Army canteen—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, *January 26, 1906.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

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

PRIVATE PENSION BILLS.

Mr. SULLOWAY. Mr. Speaker, under the rule certain bills on the Private Calendar are in order for to-day, but I understand that it is desirable to go on with the urgent deficiency bill. I therefore ask unanimous consent that it be ordered that to-morrow be substituted for to-day for the consideration of bills on the Private Calendar.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New Hampshire asks unanimous consent that to-morrow be substituted for to-day for the consideration of bills on the Private Calendar. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

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

S. 25. An act to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a building thereon at Auburn, in the State of Maine;

S. 610. An act to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Sheridan, in the State of Wyoming;

S. 800. An act to provide for the erection of a public building at Atlanta, Ga.;

S. 846. An act to increase the limit of cost of the United States post-office at Elizabeth, N. J.;

S. 1277. An act authorizing a public building at Fayetteville, N. C.;

S. 1358. An act to amend an act entitled "An act authorizing the construction of additional light-house districts," approved July 26, 1886;

S. 1725. An act granting certain land to the Missionary Baptist Church, of Rock Sink, Fla.;

S. 2087. An act to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building at Jersey City, N. J.;

S. 2292. An act for the relief of certain entrymen and settlers within the limits of the Northern Pacific Railway land grant;

S. R. 17. Joint resolution to print the Fourth Annual Report of the United States Reclamation Service; and

S. R. 23. Joint resolution providing for an extension of time for completing the highway bridge and approaches across the Potomac River at Washington, D. C.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIX, 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. 622. An act granting an increase of pension to Hiram Swain—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 238. An act granting an increase of pension to John Savage—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 625. An act granting an increase of pension to Phebe J. Bennett—to the Committee on Invalid pensions.

S. 1042. An act granting an increase of pension to Francis Piccard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 1456. An act granting a pension to Joann Morris—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 328. An act granting an increase of pension to John W. Warner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 322. An act granting an increase of pension to Isabella Workman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.