

SENATE.

MONDAY, February 5, 1894.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.
The Journal of the proceedings of Friday last was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. T. O. TOWLES, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House has agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4859) for the relief of certain settlers upon the Iowa Reservation, Oklahoma Territory.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 5529) to repeal section 311 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, relating to accounts of the Treasury of the United States, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

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

A bill (H. R. 683) for the relief of the heirs of Martha A. Denly, deceased; and

A bill (H. R. 4859) for the relief of certain settlers upon the Iowa Reservation, Oklahoma Territory.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, transmitting, in compliance with law, an abstract of the military force of the United States according to the latest returns received at the office of the Adjutant-General, United States Army, for the year ending 1893; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting, in response to a resolution of January 24, 1894, certain information relative to the retirement from active service of officers of the Navy, etc.; which, on motion of Mr. HALE, was, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate resolutions of the Legislature of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to the tariff on cotton manufactures; which will be referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. HARRIS. The resolutions of a legislative body are invariably read. That is my recollection.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolutions will be read.

The memorial was read and referred to the Committee on Finance as follows:

COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS, In the year 1894.

Resolutions relative to the tariff on cotton manufactures.

Whereas the people of Massachusetts believe that the passage of the Wilson bill, now pending before Congress, and especially that part relating to the cotton industry, will not only greatly injure the cotton business generally, but will entirely destroy the fine-goods business of Massachusetts: Therefore,

Resolved, That the senate and house of representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, in general court assembled, respectfully urge upon Congress the importance and public benefit of defeating that portion of said bill entitled "Schedule I—Cotton Manufactures," and request the Senators and Representatives in Congress from this Commonwealth to use their influence against the passage of said section.

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions, properly attested, be transmitted by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the presiding officers of both branches of Congress, and also to the Senators and Representatives in Congress from this Commonwealth.

In senate, adopted January 24, 1894.

In house of representatives, adopted in concurrence January 29, 1894.

A true copy. Attest:

WILLIAM M. OLIN,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

Mr. COCKRELL presented memorials of George S. Mephram & Klein, of St. Louis, Mo.; of Charles B. Gray and other citizens of Cruise, Mo., and of Dingee, Weinman & Co., of Lynchburg, Va., remonstrating against a reduction of the duty on manufactured and unmanufactured barytes; which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of the Kauffman Milling Company, of St. Louis, Mo., remonstrating against a reduction of the duties on all articles imported into this country; until such countries from which they are imported shall revise their tariff laws and cease to discriminate against American flour in favor of wheat; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented memorial of the Whitman Agricultural Company, of St. Louis, Mo., remonstrating against placing agricultural implements upon the free list; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of Fennimore Association, No. 5, Lithographic International Protective and Insurance Association

of the United States and Canada, of St. Louis, Mo., remonstrating against a reduction of the duty on imported lithograph prints, and praying that the present duty be changed from ad valorem to specific; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of 258 miners of lead ores in Southwest Missouri and Southeast Kansas, remonstrating against a reduction of the duty on lead ore; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Mooresville, Mo., in the interest of fraternal college and society journals, praying for the passage of the Manderson-Hainer bill, proposing to amend the postal laws; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented a petition of the board of directors of the Merchants' Exchange, of St. Louis, Mo., praying for the passage of House bill No. 3183, to prevent train-robbing and train-wrecking; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of Drs. James Weir Heddens, W. B. Davis, and Daniel Morton, a committee on behalf of the Buchanan County Medical Society, of St. Joseph, Mo., praying for the enactment of legislation to establish a bureau of public health within the Treasury Department of the United States; which was referred to the Committee on Epidemic Diseases.

He also presented a petition of the Humane Society of Missouri, praying for the enactment of legislation providing for an international maritime conference for the better protection and care of animals in transit; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a memorial of Dodson-Hills Manufacturing Company, of St. Louis, Mo., remonstrating against the proposed reduction of the duty on pickles; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented petitions of sundry cigar manufacturers of Jefferson City and Lamar, Mo., praying for the imposition of a uniform duty of 5 per cent on unstemmed leaf tobacco; which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. SQUIRE. I present a memorial signed by about a thousand citizens, artisans, and mechanics of Ilion, my old home in the State of New York, remonstrating against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill. I move that the memorial be referred to the Committee on Finance.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. HAWLEY presented a memorial of the Board of Trade of Waterbury, Conn., remonstrating against the imposition of an income tax; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. CULLOM. I present nineteen petitions of citizens of Suffolk County, Long Island, N. Y., praying for the retention of the duties on agricultural products, as provided by the act of October 1, 1890. The petitioners, whose signatures are attached, number 639 persons. I move that the petition be referred to the Committee on Finance.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. CULLOM presented petitions of H. L. Dahl and sundry other members of the Merchant Tailors' National Exchange of the United States, remonstrating against a reduction of the duty on cloth, etc.; which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of the drug trade section of the New York Board of Trade and Transportation, praying that certain amendments be made in the proposed tariff bill to the schedules which affect the drug trade; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Belvidere, Ill., praying for an increase of the tax on spirituous liquors; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of Continental Council, No. 55, National Union, of Chicago; of sundry citizens of Greenup, and of sundry citizens of Highland Park, all in the State of Illinois, praying for the passage of the Manderson-Hainer bill, proposing to amend the postal laws; which were referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented a petition of drug millers of New York, Chicago, Ill.; Peoria, Ill.; Philadelphia, Pa.; Jersey City, N. J., and Fond du Lac, Wis., praying for a change in section 468, in free-list schedule of the Wilson bill, relating to drugs, etc.; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. LODGE presented the memorial of George N. Nixon and 25 other operatives of the Waite Felting Manufactory, of Franklin, Mass., remonstrating against the proposed reduction of the duty on woolen and worsted goods; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented the memorial of B. F. Huntington and 301 other citizens of Essex County, Mass., remonstrating against the

passage of the Wilson tariff bill; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented petitions of Charles W. Stiles, secretary of the Council of the Washington (D. C.) Biological Society, and of Prof. C. H. Hitchcock and 11 other members of the faculty of Dartmouth College, New Hampshire, praying for the removal of all duties upon scientific and philosophical apparatus whose chief use is for instruction or research; which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. VEST presented petitions of J. F. Park and other citizens of New London, of F. M. Chapman and other citizens of Louisiana, and of J. B. Bradley and other citizens of Norborne, all in the State of Missouri, praying for the passage of the Manderson-Hainer bill proposing to amend the postal laws; which were referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented memorials of B. A. Roy and other citizens of Bonne Terre, and of R. Bugg and other citizens of Potosi, all in the State of Missouri, remonstrating against the importation of silver-lead ores from Mexico, and also against the proposed reduction of the duty on lead ores; which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. SHERMAN presented a memorial of the File Manufacturers' Association, of New York City, N. Y., and memorials of 64 citizens of Morgan; of 111 citizens of Washington; of 27 citizens of Akron, and of 116 citizens of Cleveland, all in the State of Ohio, remonstrating against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill; which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented memorials of 227 business men and wool-growers of the Territory of New Mexico, remonstrating against placing wool on the free list; which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of Ideal Council, No. 231, National Union, of Toledo, Ohio, in the interest of fraternal, college, and society journals, praying for the passage of the Manderson-Hainer bill proposing to amend the postal laws; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented a petition of Carpenters' Local Union, No. 143, Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners, of Canton, Ohio, praying for the enactment of legislation for the better protection of American labor, the enforcement of the law of domicile, and the restriction of immigration; which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a petition of Local Union, No. 39, Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners, of Cleveland, Ohio, praying for the governmental control of the telegraph service; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. WASHBURN presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of St. Paul, Minn., praying that an appropriation be made for an examination and survey for the location of a canal connecting Lake Superior and the Mississippi River; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a petition of 83 citizens of Minnesota, praying for the postponement of all legislation which will disturb or repeal our present laws for the raising and collecting of Government revenue; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented petitions of Lodge No. 96, Ancient Order of United Workmen, of Tracy, Minn., and of Lodge No. 20, Ancient Order of United Workmen, of Winona, Minn., praying for the passage of the Manderson-Hainer bill, proposing to amend the postal laws; which were referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. PALMER presented a petition of sundry citizens of Illinois, praying that the Kaweah colonists, of Tulare County, Cal., be compensated for losses sustained by them through the action of the Government, and that every opportunity possible be afforded them to carry out their plans of industrial coöperation; which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Dakota, Big Rock, Caledonia, Coffeen, and Cisco, all in the State of Illinois, in the interest of fraternal, college, and society journals, praying for the passage of the Manderson-Hainer bill, proposing to amend the postal laws; which were referred to the Committee on Post-Office and Post-Roads.

He also presented petitions of cigar manufacturers of Peoria, Olney, Jerseyville, and Chicago, all in the State of Illinois, praying for the imposition of a uniform duty of 35 per cent on unstemmed leaf tobacco; which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of the board of supervisors of Sangamon County, Ill., praying that an appropriation be made for paving the road from Springfield to Camp Butler, Ill., so that convenient access may be had at all seasons of the year to the national cemetery there located; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a memorial of sundry brewers of Peoria, Ill., remonstrating against an increase of the internal-revenue

tax on malt liquors; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of the Board of Trade of Chicago, Ill., praying for the passage of the bill (H. R. 4182) providing for an international maritime conference for the better protection of animals in transit; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. GALLINGER. I present a petition of the New Hampshire Medical Society, in favor of the passage of the bill to establish a bureau of public health in the Treasury Department of the United States, which bill, it seems, was prepared by the New York Academy of Medicine after consultation with the leading sanitarians of the country.

In presenting this petition I ask the indulgence of the Senate for a single word. It seems to me, while I do not desire to forestall the action of the committee or of Congress on this important matter, that it may be well at this time to put on record the appreciation of the people of this great country of the most excellent work done during the past year by the Marine Hospital Service, which under existing law has charge of quarantine and health affairs in the United States. I feel sure that there will be an agreement on all hands that during the period of threatened invasion of cholera and of other epidemic diseases, the medical affairs of this country have been in safe hands, and I venture to suggest that they should not be disturbed unless some overwhelming reason is shown why a change should be made.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The petition will be referred to the Committee on Epidemic Diseases.

Mr. STOCKBRIDGE presented petitions of F. M. Joblin, George Snyder, and others, citizens of Michigan; of Alanson Tent, No. 717, Knights of Maccabees, of Alanson, and of S. E. Carl and other citizens of Morrice, all in the State of Michigan, in the interest of fraternal society and college journals, praying for the passage of the Manderson-Hainer bill proposing to amend the postal laws; which were referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. HOAR presented resolutions adopted by the senate and house of representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, urging upon Congress the importance and public benefit of defeating that portion of the Wilson tariff bill relating to cotton manufactures; which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of 36 citizens of Chicopee Falls, Mass., praying for the passage of Senate bill 1353, providing cheaper postage on the publications of fraternal societies; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. MARTIN presented petitions of H. W. Nichols and other citizens of Liberal; of Riverview Lodge, No. 294, Ancient Order of United Workmen, of Kansas City; of W. H. Perkins and other citizens of Munden; of A. Reese and sundry other citizens of McCune; of W. H. Draut and sundry other citizens of Oakley; of George W. Ifland and sundry other citizens of Sedan; of Levi Horner and sundry other citizens of Lawrence; of sundry citizens of Hillsboro; of O. B. Fleming and sundry other citizens of Minneapolis; of Lodge No. 23, Ancient Order of United Workmen, of Oswego; of J. M. Stanley and sundry other citizens of Tescott; of F. S. Palmer and sundry other citizens of Hays City, and of Lodge No. 29, Ancient Order of United Workmen, of Meriden, all in the State of Kansas, in the interest of fraternal college and society journals, praying for the passage of the Manderson-Hainer bill, proposing to amend the postal laws; which were referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. VILAS presented petitions of sundry citizens of Loyal and Washburn, in the State of Wisconsin, and three petitions of sundry citizens of Wisconsin, in the interest of fraternal college and society journals, praying for the passage of the Manderson-Hainer bill, proposing to amend the postal laws; which were referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. DOLPH presented a petition of sundry citizens of Oregon, in the interest of fraternal society and college journals, praying for the passage of the Manderson-Hainer bill, proposing to amend the postal laws; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. DOLPH. I present the petition of B. F. Duvall, of Washington, D. C., prosecutor in the case of the United States vs. W. C. Griswold, relative to a bill which I have introduced and which has been referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. I move that the petition be referred to that committee.

The motion was agreed to.

WILLIAM R. WHEATON AND CHARLES H. CHAMBERLAIN.

Mr. DOLPH. By direction of the Committee on Public Lands, I report back favorably, without amendment, the bill (S. 1051) for the relief of William R. Wheaton and Charles H. Chamberlain, of California. This is a majority report. There are

least three members of the committee who for the present do not assent to the report.

Mr. PASCO. My understanding was that the report was to be withheld for a few days in order to give time for the minority to prepare a report. I did not know that the bill was to be reported this morning.

Mr. DOLPH. Why not let the report be printed? Does the Senator prefer to have it withdrawn?

Mr. PASCO. That was my understanding before the committee.

Mr. DOLPH. I wish the Senator would now indicate, so that we may have no misunderstanding about it, when the views of the minority are to be presented.

Mr. PASCO. I think that the Senator from Oregon should at least give time to the different members of the committee who wish to examine the report. Some were not present at the meeting and there was a wish expressed that the other members of the committee should be made aware of the facts and arguments presented in the report. I think it would be well to withhold the report for a day or two.

Mr. DOLPH. I am sorry there should be a particle of misunderstanding between myself and the Senator from Florida. I thought it was only intended that I should withhold the report until other members of the committee who were not present might be informed of the action which was taken. The Senator can have all the time he wants. It is a bill that has twice passed Congress. It has passed the Senate in every Congress since I have been here, and it has been discussed on a Presidential veto. Everybody is familiar with it. I do not see how the report can be examined before it is printed. If the Senator from Florida desires to have that course pursued, I will submit the report and let it be printed, with leave to the minority to take any time they want to submit their views, or I will keep the bill on my desk, or hand it to any member of the committee, and give the minority any reasonable time that the Senator desires. I merely want to know what he desires about it.

Mr. PASCO. I suggest to the Senator to withhold the report until Wednesday or Thursday, and in the meantime it can be examined by any member of the committee who wishes to see it, and we shall determine whether we want to file a minority report. My judgment is at this time that a minority report will be filed.

Mr. DOLPH. Very well.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. SHERMAN introduced a bill (S. 1555) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Louis F. Folger; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1556) to relieve Titus Priest from the charge of desertion; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. GRAY introduced a bill (S. 1557) to enable purchasers at judicial sales of railroads, of railroad corporations organized under the laws of the United States, to reorganize as new corporations, and to define the powers thereof; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1558) for the correction of the military record of Capt. Joseph H. Richards; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. MARTIN introduced a bill (S. 1559) to regulate the taxing of fees, salaries, and other compensation of receivers, attorneys, trustees, and other persons acting under or by authority of any judge or court of the United States, in any action, suit, or other legal proceeding pending in any court of the United States; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1560) authorizing the retirement of judges of the United States; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1561) to amend section 714 of the Revised Statutes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1562) for the relief of Cassius G. Foster; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. ALLEN introduced a bill (S. 1563) to prevent the abuse of the writ of injunction, and other legal process, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. HALE introduced a bill (S. 1564) to reorganize and increase the efficiency of the personnel of the Navy; which was read twice by its title.

Mr. HALE. I introduce the bill by request. I move that it

be printed and referred, with the accompanying memorandum, to the Committee on Naval Affairs, in order that the joint committee of the two Houses may consider it.

The motion was agreed to.

BILL RECOMMITTED.

Mr. STEWART. I move that the bill (S. 100) to reimburse certain persons who expended moneys and furnished services and supplies in repelling invasions and suppressing Indian hostilities within the territorial limits of the present State of Nevada be recommitted to the Committee on Claims. I find a mistake in the report which I submitted upon the bill.

The motion was agreed to.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. FAULKNER. I have received a communication from the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], who has been compelled to leave the city by reason of sickness in his family, in which he requested me to ask the Senate for eight days leave of absence. I make that request.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia? The Chair hears none, and leave is granted as indicated.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED.

The bill (H. R. 5529) to repeal section 311 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, relating to accounts of the Treasury of the United States, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Organization, Conduct, and Expenditures of the Executive Departments.

PRESIDENTIAL APPROVAL.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. O. L. PRUDEN, one of his secretaries, announced that the President had on the 2d instant approved and signed the joint resolution (S. R. 55) providing for the erection of fire-escapes and bridges at the Government Printing Office and fire-escapes at the Maltby Building.

HEARINGS ON REVENUE BILL.

Mr. HALE submitted the following resolution, which was read:

Whereas the bill (H. R. 4864) "to reduce taxation, to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes," has duly come to the Senate and been referred to the Committee on Finance; and

Whereas the representatives of many great industrial interests and many laboring men in the United States believe that no opportunity has heretofore been given to be heard upon the provisions of said bill; and

Whereas the representatives of said industries and many men employed in labor in the United States desire to present their objections to many of the provisions of said bill before any action is taken by the Senate: Therefore,

Resolved, That the Committee on Finance is hereby directed, in its consideration of bill H. R. 4864, commonly known as the Wilson tariff bill, to give opportunity to all persons who represent the various interests affecting the business and the industries and the labor of the people of the United States to be heard before said committee shall report its action to the Senate.

Mr. HALE. I do not ask for immediate action upon the resolution, and I do not know that there will be any necessity for its passage, or for the Senate to act upon it. Whatever may be reported, I am not going to assume that the Senate Committee on Finance, in treating this most grave subject-matter that will come before the Senate at the present session, will decline hearings. Therefore, I ask that the resolution may lie on the table, and I shall call it up at some near day in the future for the purpose of making some remarks upon it.

Mr. HARRIS. Will the Senator from Maine be satisfied to refer his resolution to the Committee on Finance?

Mr. HALE. I think it quite likely, after—

Mr. HARRIS. Oh, if the Senator wants it to lie over for a special purpose, of course I do not object.

Mr. HALE. I may make that motion myself, but at present I would rather have it go over.

Mr. COCKRELL. Let it be printed and lie on the table.

Mr. ALLISON. I should like to hear the resolution read again.

The resolution was again read.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution will be printed and lie on the table as suggested.

ISSUE AND SALE OF BONDS.

Mr. PEPPER. On the 18th day of last month I offered a resolution in the Senate for the purpose of obtaining an expression of the Senate in opposition to the authority of the Secretary of the Treasury to issue bonds as proposed, and I took occasion to submit some remarks upon the resolution. The hour of 2 o'clock arriving, the remarks were continued and the resolution, as I supposed, and as everybody else supposed, went upon the Calendar. But I do not find it upon the Calendar. I suppose it was a mistake, and I merely call attention to it in order that it may be corrected.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair is advised that the resolution to which the Senator from Kansas refers has gone to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. PEPPER. I do not know by what action it was referred to that committee.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair is unable to recall the action in regard to it. What is the request of the Senator now?

Mr. PEPPER. I simply want to have the resolution placed on the Calendar; that is all.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. SHERMAN. The formal motion is to discharge the Committee on Finance from its further consideration, and then the resolution goes upon the Calendar as a matter of course.

Mr. PEPPER. I did not know that it had been referred to any committee. It certainly was not done by my request. If a motion is required now, I submit it.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. ALLISON. I should like to know what the resolution is.

Mr. SHERMAN. It is the resolution of the Senator from Kansas in regard to the issue of bonds. It has been referred to the Committee on Finance, and he prefers it to be on the Calendar. I stated that the Committee on Finance ought to be discharged from its further consideration, and then it will be placed on the Calendar as a matter of course.

Mr. ALLISON. I should think by unanimous consent it could be agreed that the resolution be restored to the Calendar.

Mr. PEPPER. I wish the Senate to understand that I am not desiring to change any order of the Senate, but I was not aware that such a reference had been made. It was not my intention at the time that the resolution should be referred; I preferred that it should lie on the table, as perhaps some other Senators would desire to speak on it. That was my wish at the time; and I supposed it would go upon the Calendar without any motion, simply because its consideration had extended beyond the hour of 2 o'clock.

Mr. HOAR. I should like to inquire as a matter of information what is the resolution which has been under discussion to which the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DUBOIS] moved an amendment.

Mr. PEPPER. The resolution to which I refer was one reciting the fact of a proposition to issue bonds upon the part of the Secretary of the Treasury and the phraseology of the resolution was so framed that the Senate would express its opinion that there was no such authority for the proposed issue of bonds. Through the courtesy of the Senate I was permitted to continue my remarks beyond the hour of 2 o'clock, and at the conclusion of the remarks I supposed that the resolution under the rule and the practice would go upon the Calendar, but I see it is not there and I wish it now to be placed there.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Kansas asks that the Committee on Finance be discharged from the further consideration of the resolution indicated by him and that it be placed on the Calendar. Is there objection?

Mr. HARRIS. There is. I object to any such order.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Under the rule the motion will go over until to-morrow.

Mr. PEPPER. Then I move that the Committee on Finance at present be discharged from the further consideration of the resolution, and that it be placed upon the Calendar.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair entertains the motion of the Senator from Kansas. It will come up in its regular order to-morrow.

Mr. PEPPER. I beg leave to suggest that what I am now asking is not in the nature of a resolution. It is an ordinary motion that must be acted upon now, or it would die of itself. I suggest that it is not a motion having the character of a resolution.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair will refer the Senator from Kansas to the rule.

Mr. ALLISON. I do not see the chairman of the Committee on Finance in his seat; but the Senator from Kansas states that this resolution offered by him was referred to the Committee on Finance without his knowledge, and that he desires it shall remain upon the Calendar. If that be true, I submit that by unanimous consent it ought to be restored to the Calendar.

Mr. HARRIS. I could not hear the statement of the Senator from Kansas; but if he states the fact that his resolution was referred without his knowledge I withdraw all objection. I want to put him in *statu quo*. I want him to have all the rights he is entitled to have.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Kansas has so stated. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kansas? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. HOAR. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry. I desire to know what has become of the resolution of the Senator from

Nevada [Mr. STEWART], upon which the Senate has had a discussion for the last two or three days?

Mr. CHANDLER. It has gone over until Wednesday, by unanimous consent.

Mr. HOAR. I do not find it on the Calendar.

Mr. BERRY. It went over until Wednesday by unanimous consent.

Mr. HOAR. So I understood, but I do not find it on the printed Calendar.

Mr. TELLER. I can answer the Senator from Massachusetts. It was, by general consent, to go over until Wednesday morning.

Mr. HOAR. So I understood, but it is not so noted on the Calendar, so far as I can see.

Mr. TELLER. I suppose it would not go on the Calendar.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair will state that the resolution has never been on the Calendar.

Mr. TELLER. It has not been on the Calendar. It is not entitled to go on the Calendar at present under the arrangement. It will come up on Wednesday.

DEALINGS IN "OPTIONS" AND "FUTURES."

Mr. BERRY. There is on the table Senate bill 1537, introduced three or four days ago by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. GEORGE]. It is a bill to prohibit dealing in futures, or an antioption bill. I wish to make a motion to refer the bill to the Committee on the Judiciary, and if the Senate will grant me the indulgence I should like to occupy not exceeding ten minutes on the motion to refer.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair hears no objection, and the Senator from Arkansas will proceed.

Mr. BERRY. I move that the bill (S. 1537) to encourage and promote commerce among the States and with foreign nations, and remove obstructions thereto, be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. President, I simply desire to state that my position in regard to this matter has been somewhat misunderstood by some persons in my own State, and misrepresented by one or two newspapers—unintentionally, I hope. The bill now introduced by the Senator from Mississippi is the same bill he offered as a substitute to the House bill which was known as the Hatch bill during the last Congress. The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. PUGH], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. COKE], all three of them distinguished members of the Judiciary Committee, supported that substitute for the Hatch bill.

There was a yea-and-nay vote taken upon the substitute of the bill of the Senator from Mississippi for the Hatch bill, and I ask leave to insert in the RECORD the names of those who voted for the George bill:

YEAS—19.

Berry,	Dolph,	Jones of Ark.	Pugh,
Blackburn,	George,	Morgan,	Ransom,
Butler,	Gorman,	Morrill,	Vance,
Call,	Harris,	Pasco,	Walshall.
Coke,	Hunton,	Peffer,	

I wish to state that I followed the Senator from Mississippi, the Senator from Alabama, and the Senator from Texas in their support of the report of what was known as the George antioption bill. I voted for it at the time, and stated that if it should be adopted I should vote for it on its final passage. I voted for it precisely as did the Senator from Mississippi, and when the amendment was not adopted I voted against the Hatch bill, and the Senator from Mississippi, although he was paired, was paired against the Hatch bill, and would have voted against it, as he stated openly on the floor of the Senate, and has since stated in the State of Mississippi.

I ask leave, without reading it or causing it to be read, to be permitted to insert in my remarks a short statement which I made at that time, giving the reasons for my vote.

The statement referred to is as follows, and will be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 21, 1893:

Mr. BERRY. Mr. President, I had hoped that some measure might be framed which Congress could pass which would, without violating the Constitution, directly and effectually forever prohibit dealing in futures or the system of futures as defined in this bill. While I have great and serious doubts as to the constitutionality of the amendment of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. GEORGE], I felt willing to defer to his superior judgment upon that question. If that amendment had been adopted I should have voted for the bill. A majority of the Senate, however, has voted down that amendment, and has thereby forced those of us who believe as I do either to vote against the bill as it now stands or to vote for a measure which I believe contradicts and contravenes some of the most vital principles of the party to which I belong.

There are no two principles of the Democratic party which have been made more prominent in the past, as I conceive, than these, that each State has a right to regulate its own domestic affairs, to make its own police regulations in its own way without interference by the General Government; and the other is that taxation can only be imposed by the Federal Government for the purposes of raising revenue. These principles have been declared in every Democratic platform which has been framed for a series of years. At Chicago it was declared by that great party—and I fully approve that dec-

laration—that any attempt to lay taxes for any purpose except for the purposes of revenue was contrary to the Constitution of the United States, and was robbery.

Upon that platform I have stood. I believe that this evil ought to be suppressed, and I believe that it is a great evil. I have no sympathy whatever with the speculators who gamble in farm products; I believe that such gambling has worked infinite damage to the people of the South. Yet, while I believe that, I believe that a greater evil would come to that people if their representatives should strike down the only barrier which protects them from Federal interference in their local affairs. If we violate the principles of the party in this most vital form, I can not see upon what basis the party is hereafter to stand.

Much as I should like to vote for this measure, glad as I should be to comply with the wishes of many of the people of my State who have been always my warmest and most devoted friends, yet I can not and will not give my vote for a measure which imposes taxation, but which the Senator in charge of the bill has stated is not expected to and it is known that it will not produce one dollar of revenue. I shall therefore vote against the bill.

I also ask that the Secretary read the extract which I send to the desk, which purports to be the report of an interview with Mr. HATCH, a member of Congress from Missouri, who introduced the Hatch bill in the House of Representatives and who was its champion. The extract is taken from the Washington Post of Saturday, February 3.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. PEPPER. Yes, Mr. President.

Mr. BERRY. I merely ask that the interview with Mr. HATCH be read as part of my remarks.

Mr. PEPPER. I did not understand the request. I have no objection to that.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. In the absence of objection, the Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

Representative HATCH, of Missouri, will introduce his new antioption bill in the House next week. There will then ensue a fight over the question of its reference, Mr. HATCH being anxious that it shall be referred to the Committee on Agriculture instead of to the Ways and Means Committee. He believes that he will be successful in his desires, and he also has strong hopes that the bill will pass.

"I am very glad that it did not pass during the last Congress," said he yesterday, "for it would have been made the scapegoat for the hard times. As it is, the Sherman law has been made to bear the burden. The delay, too, has given me an opportunity to detect unsatisfactory details in the old bill, and I think I have a measure that will command universal support. It distinctly protects the legitimate sales, while taxing those establishments where illegitimate selling is done.

In other words, if a sale is made, and the article sold is not delivered in a certain time, then the tax is imposed. I have been in conference with the Commissioner of the Internal Revenue, and with other officers of the Treasury Department, and the bill which will be presented will be one that can be administered. The exchanges of the country are now ready to support the new bill, and some of them have gone so far as to suggest that they are ready to pay a tax—say of \$10 per head—upon their membership. This will bring them into closer relations with the Government, and will tend to the protection of their rights and privileges. I feel certain that the bill will pass the House, and I feel equally sure that the President will sign it, if for no other reason than the one which influenced his signature to the oleomargarine bill, namely, that it was a revenue measure. The antioption bill will bring revenue into the Treasury from the day it becomes a law."

Mr. BERRY. Mr. President, I merely desire to add that I believe now, as I believed during the last Congress, and stated on the floor of the Senate, that dealing in futures ought to be prohibited. I believe that practice tends to reduce the price of cotton and wheat. I stated that I was anxious to vote for a bill if I could find a constitutional bill which would prohibit it. I was willing to defer to the judgment of the Senator from Mississippi, and did support his bill, which dealt with the subject directly, made dealing in futures a crime, and fixed a penalty. I have not changed my views on the subject, but am still in favor of prohibiting the dealing in futures, and will again vote for the George bill, or any other that will accomplish the same purpose and which is constitutional and democratic.

I voted against the Hatch bill as it was then presented for the reason that it was admitted that that bill would not bring one dollar of revenue into the Treasury, and while purporting to be a revenue measure, it was not in any sense a revenue or tax measure.

I have not seen the last bill of Mr. HATCH of Missouri, but I wish to state now that if he so frames his bill as the interview says he will, then all objections to it on my part will be removed and that will bring it within the rule and the Democratic idea, that it is a tax to raise revenue and does raise revenue, and that that is the purpose of it, and that it will also prohibit the dealing in futures, I shall support the bill. I have believed all the time, and I think since the passage of that bill through the Senate one year ago, the continued low price of cotton and of wheat has proved beyond any question that prices are kept down by reason of the dealing in futures. I am anxious now, as I was then, to pass a bill which is inside of the Constitution and which will stop and prohibit such dealings; and I am glad that Mr. HATCH has come to the conclusion that there were objectionable features in the other bill, and frankly says so, and that he will remove them in his new bill.

Mr. WASHBURN. Mr. President, I was absent from the

Chamber for a moment, and I should like to inquire what is the motion or business pending before the Senate?

Mr. BERRY. I made a motion to refer the antioption bill of the Senator from Mississippi to the Committee on the Judiciary. It is the same as the substitute offered by the Senator from Mississippi in the last Congress.

Mr. WASHBURN. I move, as an amendment, that the bill be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. BERRY. The Senator from Mississippi is absent, and if the Senator from Minnesota desires the bill to go to the Agricultural Committee, I will ask that it may go over until the Senator from Mississippi comes in.

Mr. WASHBURN. I was going to ask whether the Senator from Mississippi had expressed any preference in regard to the reference of the bill?

Mr. BERRY. He has not to me.

Mr. WASHBURN. Then I suggest that it go over and not be referred until that Senator shall be in the Chamber.

Mr. BERRY. The reason I made the motion was that in the last Congress the subject was before the Judiciary Committee, and I supposed the Senator from Mississippi wanted it to go there again.

Mr. WASHBURN. I beg the Senator's pardon. The Senator from Mississippi did not introduce a bill in the last Congress.

Mr. BERRY. He offered it as a substitute for the House bill.

Mr. WASHBURN. He introduced it as an amendment, and the bill and amendment were sent to the Judiciary Committee; but we never had any majority report, and probably should never have if the bill should be again referred to that committee.

I wish to say that I am not in favor of this bill, although I shall vote for it if it is the best bill we can get reported to the Senate, because I believe more strongly to-day than I ever have in the necessity of a measure of this kind. So I am prepared to go to the utmost limit, surrender my own private judgment to a reasonable extent and support any bill which is likely to remedy this great evil. I believe now, however, as I believed last Congress, that this subject must be dealt with under the taxing power of the Government, and that being the case, as in the last Congress, the bill must first come from the other end of the Capitol.

So I think we shall have to wait until we see what action will be taken there and what bill is to come to us from that body. In the meantime it seems to me this bill should remain on the table to be referred after a preference expressed by the Senator from Mississippi.

I understood in the last Congress that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. BERRY] was heartily in favor of some measure to put an end to this system of gambling, and am now glad to learn that we are likely to have some effective measure that will receive both his support and vote.

Mr. BERRY. I agree entirely with every word which the Senator from Minnesota has said. So far as I am concerned I should prefer that the bill go to the Committee on Agriculture. The only reason I suggested its reference to the Committee on the Judiciary was that I thought the Senator from Mississippi preferred that it should be so referred.

I agree with the Senator from Minnesota, and am more strongly convinced than I ever was, that there ought to be some law passed to stop these transactions. If Mr. HATCH so changes his bill, as he says he will, as to relieve it from constitutional objection, I have no doubt that he will have the support of every Senator on this side of the Chamber who believes, as I do, that dealing in cotton and wheat futures ought to be prohibited, if it be possible to do it under a constitutional law; and if he frames the bill as the interview says he will, then it will be constitutional and Democratic.

Mr. PEPPER. I think the proper reference for this bill is to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and if it should so happen, after considering the matter, that the committee desire the opinion or if the Senate desire the opinion of the Committee on the Judiciary, the bill might then be referred to that committee.

Mr. BERRY. I withdraw the motion that the bill be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The motion to refer is withdrawn.

REPEAL OF ELECTION LAWS.

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

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2331) to repeal all statutes relating to supervisors of elections and special deputy marshals, and for

other purposes, the pending question being on the amendment proposed by Mr. CHANDLER.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, the Senate for a few hours may well turn away from the inferior question of money and its uses to the supreme question of man and his liberty.

Banks and tariffs, stocks and trade,
Let them rise or let them fall,
Freedom asks our common aid.

Controversies over silver and bonds are incidental and ephemeral. Vigilance to protect the lives of citizens and the freedom, purity, and honesty of the suffrage is vital, and must be eternal if the Republic is to live.

I wish to speak briefly in behalf of the colored people of the country, who stand sadly in need of national consideration and national protection. It is as true now as it was when President Hayes expressed the idea that "the loyal people of the South need special and powerful protection." By the census of 1890 the total population of the United States was 62,222,250. The total population of African descent was 7,470,040, or more than one-tenth of the whole. Deduct from this number all except those living in the sixteen Southern States and there are 6,813,580 colored people in those States. This colored population gives the sixteen Southern States 39 Representatives in the House out of 127. I have a table, which I will insert, showing how this result is obtained.

The table is as follows:

Southern States.	Representatives in Congress.	Colored population, 1890.	Ratio of representation.		A fair assignment of representation based on colored population would be—
			Divided by—	Gives—	
Delaware.....	1	28,386	174,000	.161	0
Maryland.....	6	215,657	174,000	1.239	1
Virginia.....	10	635,438	174,000	3.640	4
West Virginia.....	4	32,690	174,000	.184	0
North Carolina.....	9	561,018	174,000	3.221	3
South Carolina.....	7	683,934	174,000	3.959	4
Georgia.....	11	858,815	174,000	4.935	5
Florida.....	2	166,180	174,000	.955	1
Missouri.....	15	150,184	174,000	.861	1
Kentucky.....	11	298,071	174,000	1.540	2
Tennessee.....	10	430,678	174,000	2.475	2
Alabama.....	9	678,489	174,000	3.899	4
Mississippi.....	7	742,559	174,000	4.266	4
Louisiana.....	6	559,193	174,000	3.213	3
Texas.....	13	488,171	174,000	2.805	3
Arkansas.....	6	309,117	174,000	1.776	2
Totals.....	127	6,813,580	174,000	39.1	39

The total colored population of 7,470,040 in the whole United States, divided by 174,000, gives 43 Representatives in Congress.

Mr. CHANDLER. The basis of representation in the act of 1891 was 174,000 inhabitants for each Representative in Congress, and the sixteen Southern States, by reason of their colored population of 6,813,580, became entitled to 39 additional Representatives, with a fraction more. The total colored population, 7,470,040, divided by 174,000, would give 43 Representatives in Congress. Of those 39 Representatives, out of 127 from the sixteen States in the present Congress, 7 are Republicans. If we may assume that the votes of the colored people, if they had been freely cast under the fifteenth amendment, would have elected 39 Republican Representatives in Congress, those who are curious about coincidences in figures may note that the 32 Republican Representatives in addition to the 7, making the 39, would have defeated the Wilson tariff bill when it came up for consideration in the House of Representatives and passed by 64 majority.

Mr. President, the question is as to the future of the colored race. A million and a half of them are given the ballot by the fifteenth amendment to the Constitution, and in order that they may be secure in the exercise of the constitutional right thus given them there have been passed civil-rights laws and national election laws, which it is now proposed to repeal. The question before this people to-day, which, as I have said, is one of more importance than questions of stocks and bonds, of money and its uses, is whether the million and a half voters, the male representatives of the 7,000,000 people constituting one-tenth part of all the population of the United States, who are given the ballot by the fifteenth amendment to the Constitution, shall have the right to cast their ballots freely and fully and to have them counted as the ballots of the white citizens, at least in the Northern States, are counted, and thus exercise that influence in Government which they are entitled to exercise under the Constitution of

the United States as it stands written upon the records of the nation.

The record of the Republican party with reference to the colored people of the country is a record of honor. It is a defensible record; it is one for which to-day, now and here, I challenge the criticisms of Senators upon the other side of the Chamber.

Mr. PALMER. May I ask the Senator from New Hampshire a question?

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

Mr. CHANDLER. I always yield to the Senator from Illinois with pleasure.

Mr. PALMER. Will the Senator say the laws that are now sought to be repealed have secured to the colored people the rights which he claims for them?

Mr. CHANDLER. They have not.

Mr. PALMER. Will the Senator then say what is the use of retaining them on the statute book?

Mr. CHANDLER. If the Senator from Illinois, when at the head of those forces of the Union Army which he commanded, failed to win a victory, it certainly would have been a singular argument to have insisted that his forces should be disbanded and he himself dismissed from the service of the United States.

Mr. PALMER. When defeated under circumstances similar to those to which the Senator refers, I waited until I obtained reinforcements and found a more favorable opportunity for the struggle. One of the reasons why I oppose the election laws is because they are utterly useless.

Mr. CHANDLER. I accept the statement of the Senator that he advocates the repeal of the election laws because he believes they have not accomplished the end which they were intended to accomplish, but I do not commend the reasoning of the Senator that having deliberately adopted the fifteenth amendment of the Constitution as the last of the conditions which the victorious North exacted of the defeated South, and having enacted laws in pursuance of that amendment which may have failed to enforce the amendment and to make it a living reality to the colored people of the South, we should therefore abandon those laws, blot them from the statute book, and do as the Senator from Illinois does in his new political associations, forsake the fifteenth amendment and leave the colored people of the Southern States without the ballot with which to protect themselves.

Mr. PALMER. Instead of abandoning the fifteenth amendment I regard it as one of the crowning triumphs of modern civilization and republican government. But regarding the election laws as a mere menace, as merely useless, merely offensive, injurious to both races, I propose to abandon them because they have failed.

Mr. CHANDLER. The Senator from Illinois is in favor of the fifteenth amendment, but against its enforcement. That is the substantial position of the Senator.

Mr. PALMER. The Senator from New Hampshire is in favor of the fifteenth amendment, I take it, and he favors the retention upon the statute book of laws which he admits are worthless with reference to the colored people, for whom he is now speaking.

Mr. CHANDLER. I did not admit they were worthless.

Mr. PALMER. Useless; they have failed to accomplish the purpose for which they were enacted.

Mr. CHANDLER. I admit that they have not accomplished the result they were designed to accomplish.

Mr. PALMER. They have failed. Why retain that which has failed?

Mr. CHANDLER. If that argument is good it is good against any laws for the enforcement of any clause in the Constitution which have not fully accomplished the purpose for which they are designed. The way to do if a constitutional amendment is defied in any section of the Union is to pass laws for its enforcement, and if those laws do not enforce it, then to pass further laws for its enforcement and go on until the clause in the Constitution is a living reality, or else abandon the Constitution. I ask the Senator from Illinois whether he is in favor of blotting the fifteenth amendment from the Constitution and of giving up the attempt to secure suffrage to the 1,500,000 voters of the colored race?

Mr. PALMER. Does the Senator wish an answer now?

Mr. CHANDLER. I should like an answer.

Mr. PALMER. I should no more abandon the fifteenth amendment than I should abandon the Declaration of Independence. I regard them as being essential parts of each other, the one intended to give effect to the other. Its beneficial effects have already been experienced by the country; but the question is, when these laws have utterly failed and are mischievous in another aspect, why retain them?

Mr. CHANDLER. The argument of the Senator from Illinois

would apply to all laws. If his argument amounts to anything it is this: Point out any law either on the national statute book or any State statute book which does not accomplish the object for which it was enacted and then that law should be repealed. The Senator may be satisfied with his position in reference to the fifteenth amendment. He, a soldier of the Union Army who did his part to put down the rebellion, and to give freedom to the colored man, who gloried as he did in the adoption of the fifteenth amendment, now appears upon the floor of this Chamber to advocate blotting from the statute book all the laws made in pursuance of the Constitution in order to enforce this most valuable and sacred right which was grandly given to a whole race of human beings.

Mr. President, I said the record of the Republican party on the question of the colored man is one of honor, one that is easily defensible, one which can challenge assault from any quarter. The first act of the Republican party was to resist the extension of slavery into free territory. The three great acts of the Republican party with reference to the colored man have been, first, opposition to the repeal of the Missouri Compromise and resistance to the extension of slavery into Kansas and Nebraska; second, the emancipation policy developed during the war and made fixed and certain by the thirteenth amendment; third, the conferring of the suffrage upon the colored race, made secure, as was supposed, by the fifteenth amendment, to aid in the enforcement of which the civil-rights acts and the national election laws were passed. Upon each and every one of those great deeds of the Republican party which constitute its imperishable record now and for the centuries to come I challenge criticism. They are defensible one by one down to the present hour.

Mr. President, does anyone upon this floor, Republican or Democrat, who was a Union man or who was a Confederate during the war of the rebellion, now undertake to question the wisdom or the patriotism of the Republican party in resisting the extension of slavery into free territory? That struggle was brought on by the determination of the slave power to bring into the Union additional slave States. The declared policy of the slave-holding interests in early days soon came to be this, that the slave States should exceed, or at all events equal, the free States, so that there should never be a majority from the free States in the United States Senate; and that whenever in the growth of the nation new States should be added to the Union, if the slave States could not be kept in the majority there should, at least, be admitted a slave State for every free State, so that there should be no opportunity afforded by legislation for weakening slavery in its intrenched position in the National Government.

The thirteen original States had arranged themselves, seven free, six slave. Louisiana, with slavery, became a State in 1812; and the free and slave States were thus made equal. Thenceforth the slave power took care that new States should come in only in pairs: Kentucky and Vermont, Tennessee and Ohio, Indiana and Mississippi, Illinois and Alabama, Maine and Missouri (the free States here gaining the Missouri Compromise, dedicating to freedom in the future all the Louisiana purchase, except Missouri, north of 36° 30' north latitude); Arkansas and Michigan, Florida and Iowa. When Mr. Polk became President fifteen States had been admitted, eight slave and seven free, and the States were twenty-eight in number, free, fourteen; slave, fourteen. Next the Mexican war, unjustifiably waged to enlarge the area of slavery, gave to the Union the slave State of Texas; but the free State of Wisconsin was close at the door and kept the balance even.

At last, however, the country came to the compromises of 1850, when both of the great political parties became proslavery. But the result of the election of 1852, when a proslavery President was chosen from New Hampshire, indicated to the slave interests that the Northern people, in their fears that the slavery conflict would bring a dissolution of the Union, would submit to almost any measure for the protection of slavery which might be demanded by its advocates. The compromises of 1850 had also proved unsatisfactory to the South. Although it had obtained the passage of the fugitive-slave law, it had been compelled to consent to the admission of the free State of California, which had suddenly, through the discovery of gold, sprung into being as a great and prosperous Commonwealth; and this admission, without that of any counterbalancing slave State, had at last broken the Southern scheme, and made the Union of States one containing sixteen free States to fifteen slave States. Herein we see the motives for the repeal of the Missouri Compromise and the struggle to bring in an additional slave State from Kansas, and if possible another slave State from Nebraska.

Mr. President, here was the birth of the Republican party, the resistance to the repeal of the Missouri compromise, the opposition to the enslavement of the free plains of Kansas. The

party then first came into being, one which had not before existed and which never would have existed as the Republican party if it had not arisen from a sense of devotion to the principle of hostility to slavery embodied in the determination that this country should not be cursed with any more slave territory than that which then existed within its limits. The Republican party was organized because of the existence of the black man within the limits of the country and for no other reason. It was organized because this race then five million, now seven million, people existed within our borders. As the Republican party was organized because of the existence of the black man within our limits and has been faithful to the black man and the true interests and real interests of the colored race up to this hour, I trust it will do its duty, such as it may see it to be, at the present time and from this time onward. If the Republican party abandons the fifteenth amendment and forsakes the colored man and submits him to the oppressions which are now being heaped upon him; if it surrenders its great principles connected with the race which gave the party birth and existence and its glorious career, I say it will lose the hold which it has always had upon the public sentiment of the North, it will die the death of all parties which are faithless to their professions and to their trusts, and it will die a deserved death.

The next act of the Republican party in reference to the colored people was the emancipation policy. The slave power, defeated in its attempt to bring into the Union new slave States formed upon the plains of Kansas and Nebraska, brought on the war of the rebellion. The Republican party became the war party of the country; and great as that war was, terrible as it was in its expenditure, of life and of treasure, until 300,000 Union lives were sacrificed and six thousand millions of Union treasure were expended, and an equal number of lives and an equal amount of treasure probably were lost upon the Southern side, yet that heroic and historic conflict to maintain the Union of the States was only one that was incident to the question of slavery, incident only to the existence in the country of the black people of the country, constituting a tenth portion of our whole population.

The war was fought; the Union was saved, and that Union is now enshrined in the hearts of all our countrymen, North and South. In the course of the war it became the policy of the Republican party to give freedom to the black man, and that freedom proclaimed by Abraham Lincoln in two immortal proclamations was embodied in the thirteenth amendment and is now a part of the Constitution. Is there any person in this Chamber, is there any man of prominence either North or South who will stand before his countrymen and condemn the action of the Republican party in giving freedom to the colored race? I take it that it is one of the admitted propositions upon which men North and South, Union men, and men who were in the rebellion, agree, that slavery was a curse to the nation, and that it was wisely and beneficially and patriotically abolished by the Republican party.

The next great act of the Republican party was the conferring of suffrage upon the male members of the colored race. The war being over, the Southern States proposed to come back into the Union, under the reconstruction policy of President Johnson, with no proscription of any of the men who had been engaged in the rebellion, with no disabilities imposed upon any of them, and without giving suffrage to the colored race which had been enfranchised. Under the attempt at reconstruction of President Johnson came the black codes, the horrible laws of the South, which are described in the minority report, and which were so well characterized by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR] in the Senate on March 30, 1861, as "contrived with devilish ingenuity to reenslave that race which the Constitution of the United States declared free," and as proposing "to sell free citizens for the crime of being out of work."

In response to the attempt of the South to come back into the Union without restrictions, conditions, or limitations, under the reconstruction policy of President Johnson, and with increased political power to the extent of sixteen Representatives in Congress and in the electoral college by reason of the existence of the colored race to whom the ballot was denied, making forty votes in all based upon the colored population, the reconstruction policy of Congress was adopted and finally the fifteenth amendment became a part of the law of the land.

Mr. President, it will be remembered that President Johnson exacted of the reconstructed Southern States that they should recognize the abolition of slavery and the repudiation of the rebel debt. This exaction he secured with difficulty. It was hard for the men who had been in rebellion, but who proposed within a few short months after the close of the war to come back into the Union, to consent even to the adoption of the thirteenth amendment, abolishing slavery, and to the repudiation of the rebel debt. It took many admonitions from President

Johnson to secure the acceptance of these conditions on the part of the newly reconstructed States. So far as suffrage for the black man was concerned, they refused to give it. President Johnson at one period in the progress of reconstruction thought there ought to be suffrage conferred upon the most intelligent black men, and he wrote a letter on the 15th day of August, 1865, to Governor William L. Sharkey, at Jackson, Miss., whom he had appointed provisional governor of that State. I send to the desk and ask to have read an extract from the letter to Governor Sharkey.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read as directed.

The Secretary read as follows:

Extract from letter of President Andrew Johnson, dated August 15, 1865, to Governor W. L. Sharkey, Jackson, Miss.

If you could extend the elective franchise to all persons of color who can read the Constitution of the United States in English and write their names, and to all persons of color who own real estate valued at not less than \$250, and pay taxes thereon, you would completely disarm the adversary and set an example the other States will follow. This you can do with perfect safety, and you thus place the Southern States, in reference to free persons of color, upon the same basis with the free States. I hope and trust your convention will do this.

MR. CHANDLER. President Lincoln had also recommended that in Louisiana the same experiment be tried, and he wrote a letter to Governor Michael Hahn which will forever live in history. I ask the Secretary to read what I send to the desk.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read as directed.

The Secretary read as follows:

EXECUTIVE MANSION, Washington, March 13, 1864.

MY DEAR SIR: I congratulate you on having fixed your name in history as the first free-state governor of Louisiana. Now you are about to have a convention, which, among other things, will probably define the elective franchise. I barely suggest, for your private consideration, whether some of the colored people may not be let in: as, for instance, the very intelligent, and especially those who have fought gallantly in our ranks. They would probably help, in some trying time to come, to keep the jewel of liberty in the family of freedom. But this is only a suggestion, not to the public, but to you alone.

Truly, yours,

A. LINCOLN.

HON. MICHAEL HAHN.

MR. CHANDLER. While the Southern governments which were organized under the plan of President Johnson reluctantly accepted the thirteenth amendment and repudiated the debt incurred in aid of the war of the rebellion, no notice whatever was taken by any one of them, either of the recommendation of President Johnson or the advice of President Lincoln. But the Republican party, when it became necessary in the progress of reconstruction, gave the ballot to the black man. The Republican party came to the conclusion that this emancipated race could never be protected effectually unless it had the ballot. It gave the ballot, and forever to secure it the fifteenth amendment was adopted, and from that hour to this, theoretically at least, the right of suffrage for the colored man has been a part of the Constitution. Is there now any Senator upon this floor who contends that the suffrage ought not to have been given under the circumstances by reason of which it was conferred? Is there any Senator, is there any statesman, or is there any public man of eminence in this country who condemns the fifteenth amendment and censures the Republican party for the reconstruction policy which Congress adopted?

In the North American Review of March, 1879, there is a notable discussion of this point in answer to two questions asked by the editor of the Review: "Ought the negro to be disfranchised?" "Ought he to have been enfranchised?" The contributors to the colloquy were Senator Blaine, Senator Lamar, Governor Wade Hampton, James A. Garfield, Alexander H. Stephens, Wendell Phillips, Montgomery Blair, and Thomas A. Hendricks. The debate is a notable contribution to the literature of this subject, and throughout the discussion there is hardly a suggestion, except from Mr. Montgomery Blair, that the black man ought not to have been enfranchised; while most of the distinguished Southerners admit that the wisest policy with which to follow the emancipation of the colored race was to give suffrage to every man who was a citizen, without regard to the color of his skin.

The Republican party having thus emancipated the black man, having given him the suffrage, having fastened that suffrage in the Constitution by the adoption of the fifteenth amendment, found itself confronted with a determined and demoniac resistance upon the part of the white men of the South to the practical exercise of the right of suffrage by the black man, and they also found themselves confronted with enormous frauds upon the suffrage in the State of New York. Under these circumstances the Republican party adopted what is known as the national election laws. First they passed, after the adoption of the fifteenth amendment, the act of May 31, 1870, to enforce the right of suffrage in the several States, and subsequently the national elec-

tion laws providing for national supervisors and for special deputy marshals.

I submit upon the whole record that the Republican party could have done nothing else but pass all these laws. When the Republican party, step after step, led on by the necessities of the situation, and, as I believe, by the will of God who rules above, had given freedom to the negro, had also given to him suffrage, and had found that the free exercise of that suffrage was being resisted by crimes horrible to humanity, it determined that laws should be passed by the Congress which should make the suffrage a living reality and which should remove all obstacles to voting that might be put in the way in any of the Southern States. I assert that the record will show that if emancipation was right, if the fifteenth amendment granting suffrage was right, it was equally right and equally defensible to put upon the statute books of the country the national election laws which it is now attempted to repeal.

MR. HIGGINS. And equally necessary.

MR. CHANDLER. If the Republican party was justified in passing all these measures while it had power in this country, and if without dishonor and without cowardice, having adopted the fifteenth amendment as a part of the fundamental law of the land, as the last condition which the triumphant North required of the defeated South, the Republican party did wisely in placing the election laws upon the statute books, why should the Democratic party, now in power, begin to tear down this great work of the Republican party? Where is the deed that is to be done to-morrow in this Chamber, in the passage of this bill which is the first fruits of Democratic power in all the branches of the National Government to end? Where is the Democratic party to stop if first it repeals the national election laws, which were appropriate and fitting assertions of national power for the enforcement of the fifteenth amendment? Will the Democrats in power not also attack the fifteenth amendment itself, and if they attack and destroy the fifteenth amendment and virtually take the suffrage away from the black man, will they not also, little by little in this process of reaction and retrogression, come to reduce him virtually to a state of slavery? Such, Mr. President, is a fair argument, such is a fair inference. The work that is to be begun to-morrow, if it is not stopped before it reaches its legitimate results, will be destructive of the interests, rights, and citizenship of the black race throughout the entire South.

Mr. President, it may be pertinent to consider what has been the conduct of the colored race during all this time. How has the negro behaved? Has he given any excuse for the attack upon his rights which the Senate intends shortly to consummate? It is agreed that the colored man from the beginning to the end of the struggle, which was to result in making him free and which resulted in making him a voter, has been judicious and has been humane. It is conceded that he was well behaved from the beginning to the end of the controversy over slavery. It is admitted that during the war of the rebellion the colored man did not undertake, whatever his sympathies may have been, to organize insurrections. He was glad to receive freedom under the thirteenth amendment, but he did not demand the suffrage. That great gift was given to him without his asking by the power of the United States. He accepted it. He endeavored to exercise it. He has tried to exercise it wisely and well, and to-day, notwithstanding the terrible condition of their race in the Southern country, the colored men as a whole must be acquitted of any misbehavior, of any misconduct, or of anything that requires them to be censured. And yet what is their present condition?

The fifteenth amendment is practically a nullity throughout the South. No one of the 39 votes based upon the colored people, either in the House or the electoral colleges, is cast effectively as the colored people desire to have it bestowed. Moreover, the colored people are not only denied the right of suffrage, but their lives are constantly taken from them in defiance of law, in defiance of civilization, and in defiance of all the rules of humanity.

Mr. Frederick Douglass in a recent discourse, on Tuesday, January 9, 1894, in this city, discussed the various aspects of the "so-called, but mis-called negro problem." His eloquent oration will take permanent place in the history of this momentous question. Mr. Douglass describes the present condition of his race in the Southern States under the rule of mob law which so often prevails throughout that whole section. I ask the Secretary to read the extract from Mr. Douglass' discourse which I have marked.

MR. HARRIS. Who is the author of the matter which the Senator from New Hampshire desires to have read?

MR. CHANDLER. Frederick Douglass, an inspired apostle of the colored race.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

I have waited patiently but anxiously to see the end of the epidemic of

mob law and persecution now prevailing at the South. But the indications are not hopeful; great and terrible as have been its ravages in the past, it now seems to be increasing, not only in the number of its victims, but in its frantic rage and savage extravagance. Lawless vengeance is beginning to be visited upon white men as well as black. Our newspapers are daily disfigured by its ghastly horrors. It is no longer local, but national; no longer confined to the South, but has invaded the North. The contagion is spreading, extending, and overleaping geographical lines and State boundaries, and if permitted to go on it threatens to destroy all respect for law and order, not only in the South, but in all parts of our country, North as well as South. For certain it is that crime allowed to go on unresisted and unarrested will breed crime. When the poison of anarchy is once in the air, like the pestilence that walketh in the darkness, the winds of Heaven will take it up and favor its diffusion. Though it may strike down the weak today, it will strike down the strong to-morrow.

Not a breeze comes to us now from the late rebellious States that is not tainted and freighted with negro blood. In its thirst for blood and its rage for vengeance, the mob has blindly, boldly, and defiantly supplanted sheriffs, constables, and police. It has assumed all the functions of civil authority. It laughs at legal processes, courts, and juries, and its red-handed murderers range abroad unchecked and unchallenged by law or by public opinion. Prison walls and iron bars are no protection to the innocent or guilty, if the mob is in pursuit of negroes accused of crime. Jail doors are battered down in the presence of unresisting jailers, and the accused, awaiting trial in the courts of law, are dragged out and hanged, shot, stabbed, or burned to death, as the blind and irresponsible mob may elect.

We claim to be a Christian country and a highly civilized nation, yet I fearfully affirm that there is nothing in the history of savages to surpass the blood-chilling horrors and fiendish excesses perpetrated against the colored people by the so-called enlightened and Christian people of the South.

The minority of the committee, in the text of the report which I had the honor of submitting to the Senate, refrained from discussing the lynchings of negroes that made such an appalling record during the last few years. In a note, however, we spoke as follows:

Such barbarities during the reconstruction period, and while the process was going forward of destroying Republican governments at the South and making that section, including almost all the Congressional districts therein, solidly Democratic, were justly attributable to a determination to subdue and terrorize everywhere the colored people as well as the white Republicans, and at all hazards and by all means to accomplish the predetermined political object.

But now the result is all accomplished, the fifteenth amendment practically subverted, and all danger of Republican governments and negro supremacy at an end, and the declaration of Gen. Blair and Mr. Bayard made good, that one or the other race must have all the power or none, why is it that the crimes against the colored race increase in number and atrocity? It has been claimed that the unlawful homicides arise mainly from the desire promptly to punish assaults upon women, but surely for this purpose there is no need to change the method from the usual one of shooting or hanging to burning at the stake; and moreover the record shows that of late years the negroes are unlawfully slain under charges of many other offenses than the one named. We submit in the appendix a few statistics which certainly ought to arouse the most profound and serious reflections upon the terrible condition of our civilization, the discussion of which seems to be as much suppressed as was that of slavery before 1860.

In 1891, according to the Tribune of January 1, 1892, there were lynched 195; of whom 189 were men, 6 women; 169 South, 26 North; 121 negroes, 69 whites, 2 Indians, 2 Chinese, 1 Mexican.

In 1892, according to the Tribune of January 1, 1893, there were lynched 236; of whom 231 were men, 5 women; 200 South, 36 North; 155 negroes, 80 whites, 1 Indian.

In 1893 there were lynched, according to the Chicago Tribune of December 31, 200 victims, 196 men, 4 women; 183 South, 17 North; 154 negroes, 30 whites, 5 Mexicans, 7 Indians, and the 4 women.

The memorial of the National Citizens' Rights Association, dated June 2, 1892, and signed by Mr. Albion W. Tourgee, says:

The lives of the citizens of the United States are taken by lawless mobs in all the Southern States upon the most trivial pretense, and without any fear of punishment. The right of trial by jury is denied by the establishment of lynch law. Punishment for murder is practically unknown if the victims have a black skin. In twenty-seven years only four cases of the execution of a white man for the murder of a colored person can be found, though such killings have averaged more than one a day during that time. * * *

The most barbarous and cruel tortures, for ages unheard of in civilized lands, are inflicted by unrestrained mobs. Seven men were burned alive, one was flayed alive, and one slowly and cruelly dismembered in twelve recent consecutive months.

Within less than ninety consecutive days of the present year more than sixty colored citizens of the United States were publicly lynched in those States.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, this is no overdrawn picture. It is not rhetorically stated; it is simple truth. The colored people have not only been deprived of the suffrage under the fifteenth amendment, but they are deprived of the privilege of being protected by the laws which protect the white people of the North and of the South. When accused of crime they are seized and subjected to mob violence. They are tortured; they are mutilated; they are coal-oiled and burned—and this in a land of pretended civilization; this in a land which pretends to be Christianized.

Mr. President, it is not a pleasant task to refer to these untoward events which are so fatal to the claim of this country to be a humane and enlightened and civilized nation.

I am not willing to refer to specific cases of cruelty, of torture, and of murder that have existed in States of this Union. Senators are sensitive about the honor of their States, and they would reply with warmth and heat if any specifications were made.

This subject has not been treated in the report of the minority in a spirit of harshness, but it has been treated in a spirit of

truth, because it is necessary to bring it into full view in order to do justice to the political situation of the colored race. Necessarily a race that can not be protected by the laws of the States and the laws of the United States in its rights to life, liberty, and property, which can not be protected from cruel deaths by torture, and by hanging, and by burning, and lynchings for alleged crimes, can not be protected in the right of suffrage. The result is that the colored people at the South, notwithstanding their constitutional rights, are rapidly being deprived of every right that is worth the having to a freeman. If they complain, they are told that it would be wise for them to leave the country.

There are upon this floor Senators who advocate the proposition that the whole colored people, 7,000,000 strong, must leave this country and go elsewhere. That is the only answer the apologists for the present condition of affairs in the Southern States can make when they are confronted with the fact that although the black man theoretically, according to the Constitution and before the laws, has every right that every other man of any other color is entitled to, yet all the rights which are dear to men are violently taken from him. He is told if he does not like the treatment to which he may himself be subjected, if he does not like the treatment to which his race is subjected, he may leave the country and go to foreign lands.

Mr. President, the question is a serious one. Mr. Lincoln had forebodings at the close of the war when he uttered that pathetic sentence which was repeated by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] the other day. Mr. Lincoln feared that the war never would end until all the wealth that had been piled by the bondsmen's two hundred and fifty years of unrequited toil had been sunk, nor until every drop of blood drawn with the lash had been paid by another drawn with the sword. Mr. Jefferson in a spirit of prophecy looking at slavery said he trembled for his country when he reflected that God is just. These two great men have told us that there is no solution for the negro question except justice, and, Mr. President, that is the only remedy that will solve this terrible problem that now afflicts the country.

We were told by Gen. Blair and Mr. Bayard that the two races can not live together side by side in this country, sharing equally in political power; that the black man can never be allowed to live by the side of the white man and exercise the right of suffrage; that all the political power must be in the hands of one race or the other, and the one that seizes it must be the superior race, the Caucasian race. We are told, as the superior race never has yielded to the inferior race, that there is no remedy for the existing condition of affairs.

Mr. President, I do not accept the assertion as correct. I admit that the history of mankind has constantly shown superior races trampling upon inferior races, but do we not believe that humanity is making progress? Do we not believe that advancing Christianity is doing something for mankind? I believe so. The remedy for the condition of things at the South is to be found through a higher civilization and a nobler Christianity than any to which we have yet attained in this country.

The basis of Christianity is forbearance. The essence of Christianity is that the strong shall not oppress the weak. I believe that this people, with their great and glorious future before them, will find themselves able to deal with this problem and will at last find that they can allow equal rights to all men, the right of suffrage as well as all other political rights, without regarding the fact that a tenth part of the freemen of America have black skins while the other nine-tenths have white skins.

Mr. President, I desire to close this branch of what I have to say by again using language of Mr. Douglas, wherein he points out the remedy for the existing condition of affairs. I appropriately join with him in saying:

But, my friends, I must stop. Time and strength are not equal to the task before me. But could I be heard by this great nation, I would call to mind the sublime and glorious truths with which, at its birth, it saluted a listening world. Its voice then was as the trump of an archangel, summoning hoary forms of oppression and time-honored tyranny to judgment. Crowned heads heard it and shrieked. Tolling millions heard it and clapped their hands for joy. It announced the advent of a nation based upon human brotherhood and the self-evident truths of liberty and equality. Its mission was the redemption of the world from the bondage of ages. Apply these sublime and glorious truths to the situation now before you. Put away your race prejudice. Banish the idea that one class must rule over another. Recognize the fact that the rights of the humblest citizen are as worthy of protection as are those of the highest and your problem will be solved; and whatever may be in store for it in the future, whether prosperity or adversity; whether it shall have foes without or foes within; whether there shall be peace or war, based upon the eternal principles of truth, justice, and humanity, and with no class having any cause of complaint or grievance, your Republic will stand and flourish forever.

Mr. President, it has been with feelings of no ordinary regret that I have witnessed in this Chamber the defection of the distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. STEWART] from the friends of the national election laws. When I first came to this city, some thirty years ago, I saw him in his pride of place in the Senate. I came to know him and to admire him in all the

strength of his intellectual and moral greatness. I saw in him the author of the fifteenth amendment of the Constitution. In February, 1869, the Senator from Nevada led the movement in Congress which placed within the Constitution the fifteenth amendment, granting the right of suffrage to all citizens. The Senator has never claimed too much credit to himself for that act. It originated with him. It was conducted through the Senate and its committee by him. It was promptly sent out by his agency to the States in the spring of 1869, and was speedily adopted and became a part of the Constitution.

This was not all which the Senator from Nevada did. As soon as the fifteenth amendment became a law, the Senator took the floor in this Chamber in advocacy of the bill of May 31, 1870, to enforce the right of citizens of the United States to vote. He is entitled to great honor for the passage of that law. He was not only the author of the constitutional provision, but he was also the leader in the movement to pass the statute of May 31, the most valuable provisions of which are to be repealed by the pending bill, to which I sadly realize he gives his support.

I will read from some of the utterances of the Senator from Nevada in the Forty-first Congress, at the second session, page 3560 of the Congressional Globe, May 18, 1870. He said:

You may create as many offenses as you please, but if you provide no machinery for punishing them it will amount to nothing.

On May 24 he advocated a section of the bill which he said was designed—

to give effect to the fifteenth amendment, allowing the voter not only the right to vote, but the right to have his vote counted and to be made effective. (Page 3574.)

On May 25, 1870, the Senator from Nevada said:

I congratulate the Senate and the country that we are about to assert some of the powers of Congress for the protection of voters; for the protection of the downtrodden; for the protection of persons in their political and civil rights; that we are about to get a bill which asserts something of the dignity and power of this nation. (Page 3507.)

On the same day the Senator said:

Rights guaranteed and granted to the people can not be taken from them. No party can stand on the basis of taking away such rights. (Page 3507.)

The Senator further said:

We have commenced legislation in the right direction by attempting to guard the ballot box in New York against the trampling of it down by the Democratic party. Why should gentlemen talk about our want of faith in the people? Sir, our faith in the people is unlimited; but we have no faith in a Democratic oligarchy in New York City or New Orleans or Georgia, which by its power shall drive loyal men from the polls.

We believe that it is the duty of this Government to see that republican institutions prevail in this country. * * *

We proclaim now and here that we will exert all the power we can exert under the Constitution to protect the ballot box in every State of the Union. * * *

I tell you, my Democratic friends—

The Senator said—

If you ever expect to succeed you must turn your attention more to the justice of the case, and stop your technical pleas. The same technical pleas have been made ever since the war began. You have been all the time trying to find in the Constitution "how not to do it." (Page 3508.)

And on July 4, 1870, an appropriate day, the Senator from Nevada made a strong appeal for the American negro. He said:

The negro was among us. This was his native land. He was born here. He had a right to protection here. He had a right to the ballot here. He was an American and a Christian, as much so as any of the rest of the people of the country. He loved the American flag. Although he was ignorant, although he had been a slave, it became important that he should be enfranchised, so that he might protect himself in this great strife that we always have and always must have in a free government, where every man must take care of himself. (Page 5152.)

In the discussion of the elections amendment to the naturalization bill, April 13, 1871, the Senator from Nevada also advocated a similar doctrine. He said:

When the weakest man in this nation, when the poorest and humblest creature in this nation may lose his life with the approbation of any considerable portion of the people for political purposes, the foundations of your society are shaken, the stability of your Government is at hazard. (Forty-second Congress, first session, page 690.)

Much more to the same effect is to be found in the language of the Senator from Nevada, who, having secured the passage of the fifteenth amendment, and having been the champion of the national elections bill, now discovers that it is wise that those laws should be stricken from the statute book, abandons the friends of free suffrage, and joins himself with the Senators upon the other side of the Chamber in striking down the very laws of which he was the champion and the conspicuous advocate.

Mr. President, I shall not detain the Senate longer at this time, for I find that I am not strong enough to speak as I should like to do. I submit that these laws are a part of the great scheme of the Republican party and of this people for the protection of a race of seven millions of human beings, constituting a tenth part of our people. There was no escape for that party from the duty of resistance to slavery extension; there was no escape for that party, after the folly and the madness of the slave power had brought on the war of the rebellion, from the duty of emancipating the slave; there was no escape from the enfranchise-

ment of the slave, and after the fifteenth amendment was adopted there was no escape from the enactment of laws that would cause the fifteenth amendment to be a living force, to be obeyed by the whole people of this country, and that would enable the black man to enjoy the suffrage which was given by that amendment.

Mr. President, I look with dire apprehension upon the course which the Senators upon the other side of the Chamber propose to pursue. I look with great fear forward to the era which they are inaugurating the first moment that they find that the Democratic party, after twenty-seven years' exclusion, is in power in every branch of the National Government.

Mr. President, the majority report twice proclaims that it is the purpose of the majority to wipe out the legislation which is upon the statute books that grew out of the war of the rebellion. The reconstruction measures of Congress are to be wiped out. The wiping-out process begins with striking down the national election laws. If it is the intention of Senators to go on with that process and to carry out by all the legislation which they can put upon the statute book the work of undoing the result of the last thirty years, they have undertaken a task in which I do not believe they will be sustained by the people of the country.

Mr. President, this question is one of infinite importance because it concerns so vital a subject as the suffrage. It is not an unhealthy condition of a republic that there are changes of the political power of the country. It is only under remarkable conditions that one political party in any country will retain power for a quarter of a century and the other great political party for that long period be excluded from political power. It is not unnatural nor always lamentable that such changes take place, provided always that the suffrage is free and that the result of any one election may be undone as the result of a succeeding election.

But, Mr. President, it is fearful danger to a republic when the suffrage is so destroyed that there can not be a change of political control from one party to another as the result of successive elections. It is to that condition of things that we are coming in this country. The Democratic party having acquired possession of all branches of the Government intend to strike down the national election laws; they intend to maintain a solid South, sixteen solidly Southern States, with 32 Senators in this Chamber, and they intend to maintain 127 Representatives in the other branch of Congress, the representatives from a solid South. They intend to prevent any reaction which may arouse this people from taking effect in the election of a House of Representatives or a Senate or a President contrary to the politics which they have adopted. To resist a condition of this kind the American people ought to be invoked by every power which Republican Senators and Republican Representatives are capable of exerting.

Mr. President, in addition to the review made in the minority report of the election laws of some of the Southern States which are averred to be unjust, I desire to submit certain further statements. Although the names of the authors are in some cases not given they are known to me. The statements are as follows:

ALABAMA.

To Senator CHANDLER: In replying to your letter of December 30, I do not know where to begin or leave off. The frauds, ballot-box stuffing, stealing of the boxes after the close of the election, destruction of same, false count—that is, counting Republican ballots Democratic—false returns or false certificates of result, and by driving colored men who are Republicans from the polls (this is seldom resorted to in later years) and by what Democratic authority claims as a most virtuous remedy against a large Republican majority precinct, the prevention of the opening of the polls in various ways, failure to produce the required lock box, the registration list, or appearance of the appointed managers, have made elections in this State a sham and a fraud since August, 1876.

These frauds in this State have been so open, so common, and so constant that a review of the appointed managers of each precinct will enable one to name the Democratic majority at each precinct in advance of the election. It is rare to find an intelligent man in this State who will deny the charge of fraud, but who readily admits, justifies the same, and declares it will go on so long as negroes are allowed to vote, or at least whenever they are in a majority. No Senator or Representative from this State in the United States Congress will declare the elections in this State to be full, free, and fair.

I know thousands of white men in this State who in their personal and private affairs and dealings are as honest and fair as could be desired, yet, in the management of an election feel justified and believe it to be right, patriotic, and fair to falsify the returns or to suppress the Republican or anti-Democratic vote. This has been the conduct of elections since August, 1876. No vote is allowed to be in the way of the organized Democratic wis-

The present State election laws were especially gotten up and passed to screen Democratic managers and to make fraud easy. The last law (Sayre law) is only an amendment to former laws, becoming necessary on account of the appearance of the Alliance-Populist-Jeffersonian-Democratic party, which numbers a majority of the white vote of the State. The Sayre law should be called, "A law for the more effectual swindling of the voters of this State, etc."

[Rooms of the Republican State Executive Committee of Alabama.]

MONTGOMERY, ALA., October 10, 1892.

To the Republicans of Alabama:

By direction of the Republican State campaign committee, I present the following for your consideration: For eighteen years the Republican party in this State has been out of power; and for all that time the Republicans of Alabama have been practically disfranchised, possessing, it is true, the legal

right to vote, but without the legal power to have that vote counted as cast. This condition of affairs has come about through election laws, and methods which are a reproach to the State and a stain upon the chivalry and civilization of the age. So long as none but Republicans were affected by these methods and frauds all remedy appeared hopeless. But when these methods were applied, as in the recent State election in August last, to the Jeffersonian Democracy of the State—the protest against these frauds upon the right of suffrage became so great as to rend in twain the Democratic party of Alabama.

If permitted, organized Democracy would apply the same frauds against any form of opposition, it matters not on what platform or by whatsoever name it may be called. The white people of the white counties will no longer submit to the dictation, the arrogance, and intolerance of the few leaders of organized Democracy in the Black Belt counties of this State. So oppressive have become the rule of the machines, so autocratic the bosses, so appalling the frauds upon suffrage, that the friends of honest elections and popular government have united to defeat organized Democracy and restore the government of this State to the hands of the people. Alabama is no longer a certain Democratic State, for election frauds have recoiled upon their originators. The overthrow of the frauds have brought their own condemnation. The great movement of the people in this State for self-government, which can only be secured by a "free vote and a fair count," is sure of success in November. We as Republicans can rest assured that the solid South is soon to be broken, and that Alabama will be the first to lead in this glorious advance.

The perpetrators of election frauds have been condemned by the people, who will crush them in the wreck of their own crimes. Freedom and honesty of elections are not only fundamental principles of the Republican party, but "the right preservative of all other rights," the palladium of American liberty, and the only security of free government. Without honest elections no individual can make his influence felt upon the legislation of his country, either State or national.

The citizen is but a mere cipher—possessing the right to vote, but powerless to make his vote express his will. The people of Alabama have awakened to these vital facts. They have thrown off the memories, shadows, and prejudices of the past. They have declared for a "free vote and a fair count" as their only hope for the future, as their only escape from the machine and the bosses. Let us, then, join them in securing this cardinal doctrine of Republicanism and assist them in vindicating the majesty of law and the rule of the people. The present struggle in Alabama is to dethrone the bosses, destroy the machine, and restore the control of the government to the hands of the people. So adroitly has ballot-box stuffing in Alabama been carried on that many honest Democrats have, for many years, refused to believe the story of its crimes. Awakened at last to the enormity of this outrage upon citizenship they, alike, with Republicans, now acknowledge their debt of gratitude to the heroic men who have exposed ballot-box frauds in this State. The oligarchy which has so long governed this State in the name of Democracy has for years been supreme. It has governed in opposition to the popular will, defied the people, acknowledged no masters but the machine. It has cajoled and mocked the people with false promises. What, then, is the duty of the hour? So far as Republicans are concerned, that duty is plain and imperative. We should stand shoulder to shoulder with those who propose, if clothed with authority, to secure and protect in this State "a free vote and a fair count." This heritage of American freedom has long been a delusion; let us now help those who can make it a living, potential reality.

R. A. MOSELEY, JR.,
Chairman Republican State Campaign Committee.
BEN. DE LEMOS, Secretary.
ARKANSAS.

EUREKA SPRINGS, ARK., January 6, 1894.

DEAR SIR: In accordance with your request, I inclose herewith a copy of the election laws of the State of Arkansas, as digested by the Hon. Ben B. Chism, secretary of state. I will first direct your attention to such provisions as I consider seriously defective, and afterwards to such remedies as suggest themselves to my mind.

Section 2 provides for a State board of election commissioners, consisting of the governor, auditor, and secretary of state. As all of these officers are strong and active partisans of the same political party, and as they constitute the force that gives motion to the whole election machinery, I think it will be admitted that this provision is defective. The same section also provides that the State board, so constituted, shall "appoint within and for each county in the State a county board of election commissioners."

Section 9 provides that "all of said county commissioners shall not be members of the same political party." This seems fair upon its face, but its disingenuousness will be apparent when considered in connection with the provision in section 8, which says: "Each commissioner (county) shall have one vote, and two shall constitute a quorum, and the concurring votes of any two shall decide all questions before them. They shall, after their organization as aforesaid, not less than five days before any general election, appoint three judges of election for each voting precinct in the county." The most important function of the county board, in the interest of fairness, is the appointment of judges of election, but under this provision two members of the board belonging to the same party have only to make up their slate, and by their concurring votes, put it through. The other member of the board, for all practical purposes, might as well be at home; besides, even if the minority member was allowed to select one judge, the fact that he owes his official existence to the state partisan board does not secure to the party he is intended to represent a faithful, wise, and efficient officer, but upon the contrary he may be merely a Republican in name, and either inactive, half-hearted, intemperate, ignorant, or corrupt.

The same disingenuousness will be found to exist in section 11, which, among other things, provides that "the judges of election so appointed shall be discreet persons, able to read and write the English language, and qualified electors in the precincts for which they are appointed to act; and they shall not all be selected from the same political party if competent persons of different politics can be found." In many counties in Arkansas a white Republican, if he exercises his right to vote and shows an interest in the success of his party, is not considered a discreet person by his Democratic neighbors, and the negro Republican, no matter what his educational qualifications may be, is not considered a competent person to fill any position of honor or trust. So it is in the power of the two partisan members of the county board, who contemplate frauds at the polls, to either select an inefficient or corrupt Republican, or under the pretext that no discreet or competent person can be found, to select all of the judges from their own political party. The first election held under the provision of this act produced many instances of such action, resulting in the subversion of previously existing large Republican majorities.

You will observe that in section 11 the words "discreet persons" and "if competent persons of different politics can be found" are emphasized, by the use of italics, and, as no other sentence in the digest is so emphasized, some, perhaps over suspicious, persons have hinted that the person respon-

sible for such italicizing intended thereby to furnish a cue to his partisan members of the county boards.

Section 20 provides that "If any election judge shall be absent, at the time fixed for the opening of the polls, the other judge or judges shall appoint some person or persons having the qualifications prescribed by this act for election judges, to supply such vacancy." It has happened, in previous elections in this State, for the purpose of securing a solid board of election judges in the interest of one political party, the judge or judges of the other party have, either fraudulently or forcibly, been kept from the polls; hence I regard this provision as defective. The same section provides that "Judges of election shall appoint two clerks at each precinct." You will observe that the clerks are not required to be of different political parties, which makes that provision defective.

Section 23 provides that "the police force at each precinct shall be appointed and under the control of the sheriff." As the sheriff is likely to be a partisan, this might result in the entire police force being all of one political party.

In section 43 it is provided that "no one shall be permitted, under any pretext whatever, to come nearer than 50 feet of any door or window of any polling room from the opening of the polls until the completion of the count of the ballots and certification of the returns, except as herein provided." When both parties have a fair representation in the election boards, the clerks of election, and the police force outside, this provision is wise; but without such representation I consider it as defective in the extreme.

Under section 54 it is provided, that "any elector who shall tell the judges that he can not read or write, or that by reason of physical disability he is unable to mark his ballot, may have the assistance of two of the judges in the preparation of his ballot, who, in the presence of the elector and in the presence of each other shall prepare his ballot for him as he wishes to vote it." As there are many voters in Arkansas, both white and black, who are unable to read and write, and as this provision puts it in the power of the judges belonging to one political party to prepare the ballot of the ignorant voter belonging to the other, I regard this provision as opening a way to gross frauds on the part of election officers; for even if the election board should have one member belonging to the different party from the other two, under this provision the two members of the same party and of the opposite party to that of the voter may prepare his ballot.

Section 22 provides that "no ballot shall be received from any elector or deposited in the ballot box which does not have the name or initials of at least one of the judges indorsed on the back of it." I do not think the voter should lose his vote on account of the failure, either accidentally or intentionally, of the election officers to make such indorsement.

Under section 64 it is provided that "the judges of election, if for any reason they shall deem it proper to do so, may adjourn the count for any reasonable period, not beyond the day succeeding that on which the election was held; pending the making of the count any judge shall have the right to remain within the ballot box, but during the time for which the count is adjourned a safe place of deposit may be agreed upon by all of the judges." This provision opens the way for tampering with the ballot box, either by the election officers, when they are all of the same political party, or by persons in charge of the safe place where the box may be deposited. Past experience, in this State, has too frequently shown the abuse of such privileges.

In the foregoing I have attempted to point out the most glaring defects in this law. There are doubtless others of less importance that I may have overlooked. I will now suggest in general terms such changes in the law as seem absolutely necessary in the interest of fair and honest elections.

Section 2 should be amended so as to make the State board of commissioners consist of members belonging to different political parties, and these members should be representatives of their parties; for instance, the governor and auditor might constitute two members of the board, and the candidate for governor who received the next highest number of votes upon the ticket upon which the governor was elected might constitute the other member. And in case he should be dead or unable to serve, the other candidates upon the State ticket receiving the next highest number of votes should take his place in the order named upon said ticket. If three parties had tickets in the field, any one of which polled more than one-tenth of the entire vote, then the election board could consist of the governor and the other two candidates for governor receiving the next highest number of votes, and vacancies could be provided for as in the first case. This section should be amended so as to provide that in the appointment of county commissioners each member of the State board should select one. This would provide for a county board of commissioners, in which each party would have at least one bona fide representative.

Section 8 should be amended so as to require each member of the county board to appoint one judge of election, which would secure a board of election judges composed of members belonging to different political parties and bona fide representative men.

Section 10 should be amended so as to provide for the filling of any vacancies in the county board, by the selection of a commissioner by the member of the State board who made the original selection.

Section 11 should be amended to require the election judges to be of different political parties, unless there should be no qualified elector who can read or write in the precinct of the different political party to select from. In order to provide for vacancies in the board of election judges, each member of the county board should have the right to select an alternate, whose selection should only be known to the commissioner making the selection and the person appointed, so as to prevent any fraudulent attempt to keep him from the polls upon election day.

Section 20 should be amended so as to provide, in case of the absence of any election judge at the time fixed for opening the polls, that the alternate, if present, upon producing his written authority, should take his place; and if neither the original judge or alternate should be present, that the electors present should elect a judge for the time being. Section 20 should also be amended so as to require that the judges belonging to different political parties, if the different political parties should be three, should each select one clerk; but if the different political parties should only be two, then, that the two judges belonging to one party should select one clerk and the judge belonging to the other should select one.

Section 23 should be amended so as to require the judges of election to select the police force necessary to preserve order, etc., and if three political parties be represented in the election board, then each judge shall appoint an equal number of policemen; and if but two of the political parties be represented in the board, then the two judges of one party shall select one-half of the policemen and the judge of the other party the other half.

Section 43 should be amended so as to allow the elector who fails to make out his ticket, in the time prescribed, to obtain the assistance of one of the judges belonging to his own political party.

Section 54 should be amended so as to permit the elector who may be unable to read or write, or otherwise disqualified to prepare his ballot, to require one of the judges of his own political party to assist him.

Section 55 should, in my opinion, be stricken out.

Section 64 should be amended so as to require the judges before separating, at the closing of the polls, to count the ballots and declare the result,

and not to permit the ballot box at any time, from the opening of the polls to the counting and declaring of the result, to be out of their possession.

Of course these alterations will only apply to elections where Congress has the constitutional power to alter or amend the State law. If there ever was a time when some power should be invoked to protect the rights of voters in Arkansas that time now exists. The present law was framed by a partisan Legislature, in both branches, and was approved by a partisan governor; and as I have shown, under its provision it is within the power of the party in power to prevent any human being not a member of that party from witnessing or scrutinizing the acts of the election officers within the sacred circle of 50 feet radius for forty-eight hours, from the opening of the polls until the votes are counted and the result declared; and it is also under certain circumstances within the power of the same party to place the entire police force upon the outside in the hands of its members.

The effect of this law as it now stands is practically to take from the voter at the polls the right to select their public officers and transfers that right to the primaries and conventions of the party in power, which certainly is subversive of republican government. If it is necessary to correct the evils of unrestricted suffrage in certain localities in this State, I respectfully submit that this is not the way to bring it about; for the evils arising from unconstitutional and antirepublican methods will in the end surely produce public disaster far greater than those affording excuses for such legislation.

Yours, respectfully,

POWELL CLAYTON.

HON. W. E. CHANDLER,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

LITTLE ROCK, ARK., January 9, 1894.

DEAR SIR: I am in receipt of a letter from Gen. Powell Clayton advising me that he had written you, transmitting a copy of the Arkansas election law and giving his views as to the defects in the law and the remedies which he thought should be applied. Gen. Clayton requests that I advise you as to the practical working of the law here.

The county of Jefferson ranks second in population among the counties of the State, and prior to the passage of the present election law cast the largest Republican vote of any county in the State. I give herewith the vote in 1888, before the passage of this law, and in 1892, after its passage:

Year.	Harrison.	Cleveland.
1888	5,363	1,855
1892	1,092	1,784

This shows a falling off in the Republican vote of 80 per cent after the passage of the law.

The State board of election commissioners refused to appoint a Republican recommended by the Republicans of Jefferson County and appointed a man who, while he made some claim to being a Republican, usually voted and worked with the Democratic party, and, of course, the county board appointed such judges and clerks of elections for the different wards and townships in the county as would carry out the orders of the Democratic county committee. This was the plan pursued by the state commissioners in Republican counties generally.

Below I give you figures from a few other Republican counties, if you desire to use more than the figures in relation to Jefferson County:

County.	Year.	Harrison.	Cleveland.
Phillips	1888	2,123	789
Do.	1892	1,331	1,481
Monroe	1888	1,167	784
Do.	1892	616	796
Miller	1888	1,015	1,164
Do.	1892	647	1,064
Onachita	1888	1,165	1,303
Do.	1892	630	1,305
Chicot	1888	1,621	211
Do.	1892	685	861
Ashley	1888	800	1,089
Do.	1892	478	1,099

Yours, truly,

HENRY M. COOPER, Chairman.

HON. W. E. CHANDLER,
Washington, D. C.

FLORIDA.

PALATKA, FLA.

DEAR SIR: Noticing in the papers the report of proceedings of the United States Senate, I beg to draw to your attention some matters relative to Florida. Our county commissioners are appointed by the governor, and they are always all Democrats and generally of the poorest material in their party. They draw the jurors for the circuit court.

Mr. Pasco complains of the United States officials, judge and marshal, for doing just what the Florida State authorities are known to have done. In our new election law a capitation tax is required; we are required to have a certificate of registration, giving age, and general description, and exact place of residence, and required to vote in separate boxes, for each officer and the inspectors are to be appointed by an appointee of the governor, with no provision to represent both parties; the State and county officials to be voted for at one place, and Congressman and Presidential Electors at another, but not to be separated more than some few hundred feet. At the first election in 1890 we are required to have but one capitation tax receipt, but after the year 1890 we are required to have the two receipts for the two years next preceding the election. As to Deputy Marshal Sanders, it is generally understood that he was elected to the Legislature from an honestly Democratic county, and simply upon his merits.

In our constitution and the laws of 1889 may be found the provisions herein cited. I might add that Duval County (Jacksonville) has as many voters as the eleven smallest counties in the State. It is represented by one senator and two or three assemblymen, while the eleven smallest counties are represented by five senators and eleven assemblymen, the representation of

the large Republican counties having been cut down. Most of this I presume you are acquainted with, but, with the idea that some of these points have not come to your notice, I send them.

Very respectfully,

Senator W. E. CHANDLER,
Washington, D. C.

FRUITLAND, FLA., March 7, 1890.

DEAR SIR: Our governor is elected, therefore is a Democrat. Our State canvassing board is the same. Two of the county canvassing boards of each county are appointed by the governor, and the third elected. Therefore in about thirty-five counties the entire canvassing board are Democrats, and in ten counties the Republicans may get one.

The registering officers in each county are appointed by the governor. Therefore everyone in the State are Democrats.

The inspectors of elections are appointed by the county commissioners, who are appointed by the governor. The supreme court is elected, because they are sure to be Democrats. The seven circuit judges are appointed by the governor. The district attorneys are appointed by the governor. The jury men are selected by the county commissioners, who are appointed by the governor.

The city of Jacksonville is a strong Republican town, but the Democratic Legislature gave them a charter that allows the Democratic governor to appoint the aldermen.

The Democratic Legislature gave Palatka, a Republican town, a charter dividing it into wards, so the Democrats can get ten out of fourteen aldermen.

I am yours truly,

Mr. CHANDLER.

January 31, 1890.

DEAR SIR: I see by the papers that you have been debating with our Senator, Mr. PASCO; you ought to have told him that the election of 1876 was not an election by the people, but by the supreme court, so far as the State was concerned. George F. Drew, the defeated candidate for governor that year, asked the supreme court for a mandamus compelling the canvassing board to return him elected governor, and he got it and the office, and to show how they managed to keep in power, I will quote from the law:

"SEC. 13. Each elector, upon being registered, shall be furnished by the registration officer with a certificate, which shall be numbered by consecutive numbers for each district, and shall contain a statement of his name, age, color, occupation, place of residence, and date of registration as entered in the registration book; which certificate shall be signed by the registration officer. No person shall be allowed to vote in any other election district than the one for which he is registered, nor shall any person whose name does not appear upon the registration list be allowed to vote unless he procures and exhibits such certificate to the managers of elections."

Now the day that the registration books were opened for registration in this (Putnam) County, Democratic brokers appeared on the streets to buy Republicans' certificates, offering from one to five dollars, and when they bought one (or could get one to hold for safe-keeping until election, as they sometimes did), off went the name from the registration list, and one the less Republican vote was assured.

"SEC. 23. The voting shall be by ballot, which ballot shall be plain white paper, clear and even cut, without ornaments, designation, mutilation, symbol or mark of any kind whatsoever, except the name or names of the person or persons voted for, and the office to which such person or persons are intended to be chosen, which name or names and office or offices shall be written or printed or partly written and partly printed thereon in black ink, or with black pencil, and such ballot shall be so folded as to conceal the name or names thereon, and, so folded, shall be deposited in a box to be constructed, kept, and disposed of as hereinafter provided, and no ballot of any other description found in any election box shall be counted."

Now, that is a very innocent law if you do not know the object for which it was made. Inclosed are illustrations. Each county is divided into justice districts, and an honest Democrat will aspire to that honor in each voting precinct, and provide himself with a blue or red pencil with which to write his name on the ballots of his Republican friends in the blank space left for that purpose; and when that dodge won't work or plays out, he shortens his pencil so that he can hold it between two fingers without being noticed, the point being in the palm of the hand; then he will say to his Republican friends, "Let me see who you are going to vote for," and take his ballot by the top and put it in the hand in which is the pencil and press his thumb lightly on it over the point of the pencil and moves it slowly up with the other hand, like he was carefully reading the names on it, thus leaving a blue or red mark on the back. Judging from reports from precincts I have heard from, 150 would be a low estimate of the Republican ballots not counted in this county in consequence of such marks. When a State makes a law on purpose to have the votes of the unsuspecting thrown out, I think that Congress should put heavy penalties on those that play the tricks for which the law was made.

Very respectfully,

Late private, Company A, Fifth New Hampshire Volunteers.

HON. W. E. CHANDLER,
Washington, D. C.

[The Mail and Express, Monday evening, December 8, 1890.]

FLORIDA FRAUDS—HOW REPUBLICANS ARE DISFRANCHISED IN THE SOUTHEASTERNMOST STATE—NO JUSTICE POSSIBLE FOR REPUBLICANS—A CONSTITUTION AND LAWS MADE ON PURPOSE TO KEEP THE ENTIRE CONTROL OF POLITICAL AFFAIRS IN DEMOCRATIC HANDS—FACTS ABOUT THE ELECTIONS OF 1888 AND 1890—THE REGISTRATION TRICK, THE POLL-TAX TRICK, AND THE BALLOT-BOX FRAUDS.

OCALA, FLA., December 8.

[Special.]

Florida was once a Republican State. It is Republican yet on a fair count. This county, Marion, has a nominal Republican majority of about 500 votes. Duval County, in which Jacksonville is situated, has more than 2,000 Republican majority. St. John's County, of which St. Augustine is the chief town, is now represented in the State senate by the only Republican in either branch of the Legislature, the Hon. O. B. Smith.

Until the last three or four years the Republicans have been able to elect some local officers and some members of the Legislature. But the Democrats have been working to secure absolute control, and at last they have got it, and they do not propose to allow a single Republican to be elected as such. Here are some of the methods by which complete control has been secured.

THE REGISTRATION LAWS.

A new constitution went into effect in 1885, and the election of 1888 was the first general election held under its provisions. It vested the supervision of registration in officers appointed by the governor, who may be of the same political party. In Ocala the supervisor was a man named Gregg. He took charge of the registration books, both old and new, and proceeded to make the registry to suit himself. Local Republicans applied to him for copies of the old registration books, and for transcripts of the new registration lists, offering to pay whatever sum was needed for transcribing. He put them off for awhile on various pretexts, but finally they got him cornered, and he said to them: "Boys, I can't do this thing. If I should let you see the registration lists I would be turned out of office before the sun sets to-morrow." Then the Republicans applied to the court for a mandamus compelling Gregg to show the books. The matter was put off by the court until a few days before election, when it would have been too late in any case to add any new names to the lists, and then the mandamus was granted, provided it did not interfere with his duties. He swore that it did so interfere, and the mandamus was dissolved.

ANOTHER FRIVOLOUS PRETEXT.

In Duval County that same year the Republican county ticket was elected, and the officers-elect prepared their bonds, which were amply secure. But the State comptroller, whose duty it is to approve bonds of officers-elect, refused for one pretext or another to approve these until the legal limit of sixty days, during which according to the law such bonds must be approved, had expired. Then the old county officers held over until the governor appointed a new set, who were of course all Democrats.

THE POLL-TAX FRAUD.

The law in Florida makes the payment of a poll-tax a prerequisite to voting, and this tax is made assessable and collectible separate, and separate receipts must be given for it. The taxes must all be paid and receipts given before thirty days previous to election. This year in Jacksonville up to October 1 the Republicans who had their taxes paid and held tax receipts outnumbered the Democrats by several hundred.

Three more days remained, and Republican leaders made every effort to get their men to come and pay. They came and stood in line, sometimes a hundred at once, at the office of the collector. He had no extra assistants, the governor having refused the application which had been presented by a number of leading Republicans that an extra force be granted him temporarily, and he had himself sent away one of his assistants.

HOW IT IS DONE.

Further, the business licenses for groceries, liquor stores, stables, and all sorts of business fell due the 1st of October, and although they were payable at any time within the year, the Democratic business men crowded to the collector's office those first four days of October and he attended to them first. The result was that he issued only about twenty-five tax receipts a day.

After October 4 the Democratic managers had a book of tax receipts antedated and signed in blank by the collector, and they paid the poll tax of every Democrat who was delinquent and sent him or gave him the receipt. Further, the Democrats all along had been allowed to pay poll taxes for each other, while the Republicans were compelled to pay each for himself. Of course, the result was that all Democrats were qualified to vote, while a great many Republicans were not.

HOW A REPUBLICAN WAS CHEATED OUT OF OFFICE.

Notwithstanding all the efforts of the poll-tax tricksters, Mr. J. F. Nichols, the Republican candidate for sheriff of Duval County, was elected, receiving, on account of his personal popularity and the general disgust at his opponent, nearly half the white Democratic vote. But the Democratic executive committee informed the inspectors of election that they must declare imperfect and illegal all ballots which had been mutilated by the scratching out of one name and the insertion of another. The inspectors, of course all Democrats, adopted this rule, and so managed to count in the Democratic sheriff. These inspectors are all appointed by the county executive committee, who themselves are appointed by the governor, and all may be Democrats.

THE BALLOT-BOX TRICK.

The State law provides that the separate ballot boxes for different officers shall be labeled in printed roman letters or plain script in the English, German, or Spanish language. In Jacksonville the election was held in a darkened room.

The ballot boxes were labeled in a fine, almost illegible script. An intelligent white voter told me it was all he could do to make out the labels on the boxes. When an ignorant voter came in he could not tell where to put his ballots. If the previous voter had told him the order and arrangement of the boxes, they were shifted around so he got confused.

Still further, in every part of the State a pile of Democratic ballots was on each box. All an ignorant Democrat had to do was to take one of these ballots and put it in the box on top of which he found it. A Republican in Jacksonville asked why Republican ballots were not also piled on the proper boxes, and an inspector told him "It would confuse our voters."

A leading Democrat in St. Augustine told me he asked the inspectors there why Republican ballots were not put on the boxes, and they told him the Republicans hadn't furnished any to put there. A Republican in Ocala took in a lot of Republican ballots with him when he went to vote and placed them on the proper boxes. The inspectors said nothing, but when the next Republican went in to vote the tickets had disappeared and the inspectors denied all knowledge of their whereabouts.

NO VOTES ALLOWED CAST IN SOME PLACES.

One would think that all these arrangements would be entirely sufficient for all purposes, but the list of expedients is not exhausted yet. The law provides that the inspectors shall be three in number. If one is absent, the two present may choose a third. If only one is present, he may appoint the other two. If none are present, no election can be held.

In some of the strongest Republican precincts, as in Madison and Gadsden Counties, the inspectors, being all Democrats, did not appear, and no votes could be cast.

These things all tend to give the greater significance to the Alliance movement. If the Alliance men are sincere, they will see to it that there is a free ballot and a fair count. If there is, then there is a living chance for the Republican party, even in this State.

If they are not sincere, if they attempt to draw the color line and to prevent Republicans from voting, then the colored Alliance men will inevitably break away from the organization. What the colored Alliance men desire is a fair chance—to be allowed to buy and sell goods on equal terms with white men, and to vote as they please and have their votes counted. If the Alliance does not give them this they will bolt it.

W. A. PLATT.

LOUISIANA—REPUBLICAN ADDRESS.

HEADQUARTERS REPUBLICAN STATE CENTRAL
COMMITTEE OF LOUISIANA.

New Orleans, May 2, 1892.

To the Republicans of Louisiana:

The so-called election held in Louisiana on the 19th ultimo was a crime against liberty, an outrage on society, and a disgrace to civilization, perpetrated by a faction of the Democratic party numbering among its adherents less than one-half of the Democratic voters of the State. But this faction had the powerful assistance of the acting governor of Louisiana, and accomplished its purpose by the unscrupulous use of a partisan election law, and by combining the methods of assassins, murderers, highway robbers, perjurers, forgers, ballot-box stuffers, thieves, and common cheats.

The leaders of this faction glory in their infamy, unblushingly proclaim that they have captured the State, and insolently say to the Republicans whom they have outraged and wronged, "Well, what are you going to do about it? Protests are useless. It will avail you nothing to ring the changes on charges of intimidation and fraud. That which we did was done in the name of the Democratic party; therefore, throughout the nation that party will sustain us. As for the Republican party of the North, it is tired of the negro; it repudiates Southern Republicans; it will give you neither aid nor sympathy, so what are you going to do about it?"

The question thus presented is a very serious one to us. There is much truth in the statements therein made. Protests are usually unmeaning formalities. A contest to be determined by those who were chiefs in the conspiracy to control the State and who share largely in the spoils would be apparently mere folly.

The national Democratic party will of course unhesitatingly accept a result which counts in advance the electoral vote of Louisiana for the Democratic nominee for President, and the Republican party in the Northern States (if we are to judge from the recent utterances of prominent leaders) excuses, if it does not justify, Democratic outrages in the Southern States.

It is even worse than that. If the statements of prominent Federal officials here are true, there are reasons to believe that the National Administration, placed in power by Republican voters, and largely by the votes of colored Republicans, sympathizes with the conspiracy against free government, if it did not actually give to the conspirators aid and comfort. No assistance was given to us by the Republicans of the North. They know we are poor. They knew we were struggling against desperate odds. Yet no words of encouragement or sympathy came to us from them. On the contrary, they listened to the infamous slanders circulated against us by our political foes and by the traitors who bolted from our party. Some of them even repeated those slanders and falsely averred that the Republican party was simply an annex of the lottery and that the ticket nominated by the Republican convention was placed in the field in the interest of McEnery.

The best refutation of these calumnies is found in the campaign which the Republicans of Louisiana made to win, and which they did win at the polls. The Republicans of Louisiana know that we had scarcely any money with which to make that campaign. Not even enough to defray the unavoidable necessary expenses of the campaign. We received no money from the lottery or from any other source save the voluntary contributions of a few devoted Republicans who were determined that a canvass of the State should be made, that the party should be organized, and that tickets should be printed and sent to the voters.

As for the lottery company, the Republicans were against it, not only on moral and economic grounds, but for other reasons. The lottery has always been against us. It gave the money which enabled the Democrats to take possession of the State government in 1877. It has always contributed large sums to maintain by force and fraud Democratic government in this State.

The influence of that company secured the appointment of Warmoth as collector of the port of New Orleans and his confirmation by the Senate, against the wishes and protests of the Republicans of this State. All this is well known in Louisiana. It would be idle to attempt to make the Republicans of this State believe that Warmoth is or ever has been opposed to the lottery. It is simply impossible to make them believe that the Republican party of this State either favored the lottery or was in any manner assisted by the lottery in the late campaign.

But to return to the question. What are we going to do about it? We now propose to submit to you, and through you to the people of the United States, a plain, unvarnished statement of facts. We appeal to the conscience of the nation. What the effect will be remains to be seen. Meanwhile we will continue to hope that truth and justice will in the end prevail.

The Republicans of Louisiana should be congratulated, and may congratulate themselves on the earnest, zealous, resolute effort made by them to secure the success of the Republican party. With a few exceptions, each and every Republican did his full duty faithfully and well. It is not their fault that the result of our splendid victory at the polls will be stolen from us.

In the face of dangers and difficulties which must be experienced to be appreciated and with very inadequate means, we have accomplished great results. The State has been thoroughly canvassed. The Republican party is efficiently organized in every parish of the State, and over 129,000 Republican voters are registered. From 20,000 to 30,000 colored voters were kept from the polls by intimidation and violence, but, as shown by the returns made by partisan election officers, more than 85,000 colored voters cast their ballots at the recent election. If the election had been peaceable everywhere the Republican ticket headed by Hon. A. H. Leonard as candidate for governor would have had a majority over all other tickets in the field, and as it was that ticket was elected by a very large plurality.

This can be demonstrated by considering the returns of the election in connection with certain facts, which, if not conceded, can not be successfully denied. The primary election held in this State on the 22d of March last, to determine whether McEnery or Foster should be the candidate of the Democratic party, at which only white Democrats were allowed to vote, was hotly contested and unquestionably brought out the full white Democratic vote of the State. According to the final returns of that primary, Foster received 43,602 votes, and McEnery received 43,052 votes, making in the aggregate 86,655 votes, which is the total Democratic vote of the State. The number of votes cast at the election is as returned 174,646. Assuming that 86,655 white Democrats voted, then 87,991 votes must have been cast by white Republicans and colored voters. The number of white Republicans in this State is unknown. It is certainly small, but at least exceeds the number of black Democrats.

The relative strength of the two parties is therefore measured by the color line. The whites are Democrats, the blacks are Republicans, and the blacks have at least 20,000 more voters than the whites. The colored voters of Louisiana are Republicans. They can not be Democrats. They are not allowed to be Democrats. They are not permitted to vote in primary elections, and their right to vote at all is denied by the Democratic party. More than that, it was well known that Mr. Foster, the candidate of one faction of the Democratic party, favors a constitutional provision depriving the negro of the right of suffrage.

The number of colored men in Louisiana who are Democrats is so small that it is never taken into account by anyone here. The few white Republicans of this State who voted at the recent election voted a Republican

ticket, and all the colored voters who were permitted to vote voted that ticket. These facts, which are frankly admitted by the Democrats of Louisiana in their ordinary conversations, appear when the returns of the general election are compared with the returns of the primary.

The parish of Lafourche gave at the primary 1,894 votes for McEnery and 950 votes for Foster; total, 2,844. At the general election it gave to McEnery 1,804 and for Foster 1,000 votes, making 2,804 votes, 40 votes less than the white Democratic vote cast at the primary. It is evident that no colored men voted a Democratic ticket in that parish, and as Leonard received in that parish 1,080 votes and Breauz 66 votes, which were cast by colored men, it is also evident that in Lafourche Parish the colored voters unanimously vote the Republican ticket. The parish of Tensas gave at the primary 301 votes for McEnery and 85 for Foster; total, 387. At the election it gave for McEnery 190, for Foster 207, making 397 votes, an increase of only 10 votes, cast probably by whites who failed to vote at the primary, but at most it can only be claimed that 10 colored men voted the Democratic ticket.

According to the returns, Leonard received in that parish 1,264 and Breauz 190 votes, cast by colored men. It is therefore certain that in Tensas Parish the colored voters unanimously vote the Republican ticket. The parish of Lafayette gave at the primary 579 votes for McEnery and 1,030 for Foster; total, 1,609; at the election it gave for McEnery 568 and for Foster 1,059, making 1,628, an increase of 19 votes, which must have been cast by whites who failed to vote at the primary, because that parish was effectually "regulated." No colored men were allowed to vote there.

It must be evident to any sane mind that the colored voters would have been allowed to vote a Democratic ticket if they had wanted to do so, and that they were kept from the polls by violent means to prevent them from unanimously voting the Republican ticket. This conclusion is made still stronger when it is remembered that at the general election of 1888 the parish, with a registration of 1,344 blacks, cast for the then Republican candidate for governor 1,234 votes. The parish of St. Martin gave at the primary 609 votes for McEnery and 683 votes for Foster, total 1,292. At the election it gave for McEnery 359 and for Foster 965, making 1,324, an increase of 32 votes, which must have been cast by whites who failed to vote at the primary because that parish was also "regulated." No colored man was allowed to vote there. The colored voters were unquestionably kept from the polls in St. Martin by violent means to prevent them from unanimously voting the Republican ticket. This conclusion is further borne out by the fact that at the general election of 1888, this parish, with a registration of 2,198 blacks, cast for the then Republican candidate 1,624 votes.

The parish of Terrebonne gave at the primary 1,452 votes for McEnery and 637 for Foster, total 1,789 votes. At the election it gave for McEnery 1,126 votes and for Foster 590 votes, making 1,716 votes, a decrease of 73 votes. It is certain that no colored man voted a Democratic ticket in that parish, and as the returns give Leonard 305 votes and Breauz 2 votes, it is also certain that all the colored men who were allowed to vote there voted unanimously Republican tickets. The registration of Cameron parish in 1888 shows: whites 396, blacks 54. As shown by returns of recent election that parish gave for the Democratic candidate 392 votes and for the Republican candidate 62 votes. It is certain the colored voters of that parish do not vote the Democratic ticket.

East Carroll parish, with a registration of 321 whites in 1888, gave, as shown by the recent election, 301 votes for the Democratic candidate and 1,095 votes for the Republican candidate. St. James Parish gave at the primary 756 votes for McEnery and 697 for Foster; total, 1,453. At the election it gave McEnery 539 and Foster 766, making 1,305, a decrease of 148 votes. It is certain that no colored man voted a Democratic ticket in that parish, and as the returns give Leonard 1,285 and Breauz 236 votes cast by colored voters, it is also certain that the colored voters of St. James unanimously vote the Republican ticket. The city of Shreveport gave at the primary 634 votes for McEnery and 416 for Foster; total, 1,050. At the election it gave McEnery 416 and Foster 568, making 1,012 votes, a decrease of 38 votes. It is certain that the colored voters of Shreveport do not vote the Democratic ticket. The fact that they vote the Republican ticket unanimously is shown by the affidavits of 703 voters of that city to the effect that they were registered, that they went to the polls on election day to vote, and would have voted the Leonard Republican ticket, but that the commissioners illegally refused to receive their votes.

In quite a number of parishes the difference between the white Democratic vote at the primary and the vote cast for the Democratic candidates at the election is very slight.

Blenville—Primary, 1,214; election, 1,276; difference, 62.
Grant—Primary, 329; election, 358; difference, 29.
Jackson—Primary, 632; election, 686; difference, 54.
Tangipahoa—Primary, 1,151; election, 1,177; difference, 26.
Assumption—Primary, 1,822; election, 1,916; difference, 92.
The registration of 1888 of these parishes was as follows: Blenville, blacks, 982; Grant, blacks, 561; Jackson, blacks, 469; Tangipahoa, blacks, 1,115; Assumption, blacks, 3,143.

It is evident that the colored men of those parishes do not vote the Democratic ticket. These facts justify the conclusion that 87,891 Republican votes were cast at the late election. The returns give to Leonard 23,831 votes, and to Breauz 11,301 votes, total, 40,135. Consequently 47,656 votes were stolen from Leonard, the Republican candidate for governor, and given to the two Democratic candidates in the following proportions: to McEnery, 7,306; to Foster, 40,350.

In twenty-nine parishes the aggregate vote given to McEnery at the election was 3,620 less than that received by him at the primary. This of course was a loss of white Democratic votes. The returns of election give him 46,739 votes, an increase of 3,683, which must come from colored votes. The decrease in white votes, 3,620, had to be made up also from colored votes, aggregating 7,306. The remainder of the stolen votes, 40,350, were given to Foster.

The people of Louisiana do not need to be told how this was done. They are familiar with all the sickening details of the various elections which have been held in this State since the Democratic party usurped power, but the Republicans of the North may ask how this great steal was effected. It was effected by intimidation, by violence, and by open manipulation of the machinery of the election. In this connection it is important to note the fact that on the face of the returns the immense majorities of Foster appear to have been given by parishes where the whites are few and the colored voters are very numerous.

The election law of the State vests the control of all elections in the governor of the State. He appoints returning officers for each parish, removable at pleasure, except Orleans Parish. This power was exercised to its utmost extent by Governor Nichols, and he took great pains to appoint returning officers in each parish who could be relied upon to obey his instructions. In nearly every parish a new returning officer was appointed, and in some parishes several changes were made before a suitable man was found. These appointments were made during the campaign and down to within a few days of the election.

The returning officers fix the election precincts for their respective parishes and appoint three commissioners for each precinct. The law requires the commissioners of election to be selected from opposing political parties,

but this provision was disregarded. In one parish (Caddo) the judge of the district court made peremptory a mandamus requiring the returning officer to appoint commissioners for the Republicans, but that officer treated the judgment of the court with contempt, and in that parish, as in all other parishes of the State, except Orleans, the Republican party was denied representation at the polls.

In most of the parishes the commissioners of election ran things to suit themselves in the interest of Foster. No one except members of their own faction was allowed to be near the boxes, and the count was made secretly. No Republican was permitted to witness it, and in many parishes no McEnery Democrat was allowed to witness the count. All votes cast for the Leonard ticket were counted for Foster ticket except in some few precincts where the Leonard vote was divided between Foster and McEnery. All this is well known throughout the State. The adherents of the Foster faction have openly asserted for months that they intended to win by the election machinery no matter what the majority against them might be.

The facts with regard to the election are notorious and can be proved beyond all doubt by the testimony of Democratic witnesses and by record evidence if an investigation can be had. The majorities to be given to Foster by the commissioners were it seems agreed upon in advance, as such majorities in distant parishes were publicly announced in New Orleans papers which went to press before the election commenced.

It is unnecessary to state facts in detail at this time. Enough has been published by the Democratic press of the State to show that the late election, as conducted and returned by the Foster election officers, was a stupendous and glaring fraud.

It would seem that the Foster faction should have contented themselves with perjury, forgery, theft, and fraud; but in some parishes that would not suffice. The parishes of Lafayette, St. Martin, and Terrebonne were terrorized by armed bands on election day and for several days previous thereto. In St. Martin and Lafayette no colored man was allowed to vote. In Terrebonne, as an act of courtesy to Hon. H. C. Minor (so the bulldozers express it), the colored voters on his plantation were permitted to vote, and at two other precincts a few colored men were allowed to vote; but the mass of the colored men were not permitted to vote.

Several days before the election the leading colored men of the parish were driven out of it, and throughout the parish the negroes were threatened, assaulted, and effectually bulldozed.

In many other parishes bulldozing, while not so undisguised and open prevailed to a considerable extent. In the three parishes just named the Republican ticket headed by Hon. A. H. Leonard was, by violence, deprived of at least 5,000 votes, and the total loss from this cause throughout the State must have been from 20,000 to 30,000 votes.

We have stated that the 47,656 Republican votes given to McEnery and Foster by the election commissioners were stolen from Leonard. Such is the fact. The Breauz ticket named by H. C. Warmoth and other Federal officials was itself a fraud. The Warmoth-Breauz faction was the ally of the Foster faction. The Breauz ticket was put in the field to aid the Foster faction and better enable the Fosterites to commit their stupendous frauds. That ticket was practically not in the race, and Warmoth and his henchmen did not intend it to be seriously in the race.

It is a mistake to suppose that the Breauz ticket seriously affected the party so far as the votes are concerned. The returns give Breauz 11,301 votes. The machinery of election was in the hands of his allies and friends. He was certainly allowed his full vote. He was allowed much more than his full vote. In sixteen parishes of the State he did not receive a vote. In two parishes he received in each 1 vote, and in one parish he received 2 votes. In the parish of Pointe Coupee, where Breauz claims his residence, and where he is presumably best known, he received only 31 votes, while Leonard received 2,069 votes, carrying the parish by a majority of more than 600 over all other candidates.

In the following parishes the count was fair, with the following result:

Parishes.	Leonard.	Breauz.
Assumption	1,721	None.
St. John	1,273	18
St. James	1,285	296
Tensas	1,264	190
West Baton Rouge	828	28
St. Charles	996	52
Lafourche	1,080	66
Livingston	214	None.
Washington	315	D.
St. Helena	263	22
Vermillion	203	7

With regard to above parishes it must be remarked that while the count was fair, still in Tensas fully 2,000 colored voters were kept from the polls. In Lafourche, which adjoins Terrebonne, the intimidation effectually resorted to in the latter affected the colored vote of the former and caused a loss of fully 500 votes to the Leonard ticket. In St. Charles two boxes were stolen, which, if counted, would have increased the Leonard vote 300 to 400. We deem it unnecessary to present further evidence on this point. The Republicans of Louisiana know that the Warmoth-Breauz custom-house combination has no following except among Federal officeholders and employees of the Government. The Republicans of Louisiana know that H. C. Warmoth, collector of the port of New Orleans, wanted to defeat and did all he could to defeat the Republican party of this State because that party, mindful of his past record, would not trust him, and because that party, knowing that his followers were confined within the walls of the custom-house, ignored his self-asserted claim to leadership.

If the ability of ex-Governor Warmoth had been equal to his desire he would have done us much harm, and might have aroused our anger, but he was not able to do us any serious injury and deserves only contempt.

Considering the vast patronage at his disposal, the large salaries which he and his chief marshals receive from the Government, the number of employees whose employment depends on his will, the contributions extorted from them, and considering further that the Federal Administration was (as he claims) at his back, surely the spirit of the collector should not be proud when he contemplates the 2,150 votes cast for his candidate in the city of New Orleans, and recalls his frequent boasts that his influence with the Republicans of Louisiana was all powerful.

Those who know him must find it strange that any political leader should have been deceived by the vain pretensions of this political charlatan who fancies that he is waging desperate war when he simply blows his own trumpet.

We find it even more strange that a Republican President indorses tacitly at least his appointees here, who in the New Orleans Republican, a newspaper, edited by A. R. Burdick, owner, and owned and published by H. C. Warmoth, collector; W. L. McMillen, surveyor; A. S. Badger, appraiser; S.

M. Eaton, postmaster, and other officials) openly rejoice in the defeat of the Republican party, and advocate the disfranchisement of the negroes.

What the individual opinions of the President are with regard to these matters we can only surmise. It would seem, however, that he should consider the interest of the Republican party of the nation which would be jeopardized if the expressed opinion of his appointees should be even tacitly accepted by him. The votes of colored people in the Southern States are not counted, but the votes of the colored people in the Northern States are counted. The Republican party can not elect a President without the assistance of the colored voters of the North. Their assistance may be withheld if they realize that their brethren in the South have been ruthlessly abandoned by the National Republican party and that its leaders favor the disfranchisement of the negro.

The adherents of the Foster faction, confessing the crimes by which the political control of the State was gained, attempt to justify their action by asserting that it was necessary in order to maintain what they are pleased to term Caucasian civilization and to preserve Christianity. Is Caucasian civilization simply the development of mere brute force and low cunning? Has "the Lord of humankind," the proud Caucasian, fallen so low in Louisiana that he can not compete with the recently enfranchised negro in a fair contest? Can it be that in the struggle for existence the whites, because of the superior intelligence of the blacks, can exist only by resorting to violence and fraud? To preserve Christianity! Can blasphemy go further? What! Preserve Christianity by violating its purest, holiest principles!

Was it to preserve Christianity and maintain Caucasian civilization that a former governor of the State suspended the laws until Francis T. Nicholls could be counted in as governor by a fraudulent majority of nearly 90,000, or was that action taken in order that the then incumbent should be (as he was) by his successor translated to a seat on the supreme bench? Was it to preserve Christianity and maintain Caucasian civilization that Francis T. Nicholls, acting as governor, used as he did the power vested in him? Or is Governor Nicholls to share in the spoils? Will he be as some predict appointed by his successor chief justice of the supreme court, or be sent, as others say, to the United States Senate?

Are the chiefs in this conspiracy to capture a great State—now that the crime is supposed to have been successfully consummated—engaged in their pious devotions, or are they tumultuously struggling and clamoring for their proportion of the booty? Are the rank and file occupied in building schoolhouses and churches, or are they anxiously looking to see where they come in?

The so-called reasons advanced by the Fosterites as justification for their crimes are absurd, flimsy pretenses.

Christianity and civilization are menaced in Louisiana, but they are menaced by the outrages and the crimes committed here by the Democratic party. The rights and liberties of all the people of the United States are threatened by these outrages and crimes.

Louisiana is without a government republican in form. It can not long remain in that condition without serious danger to the Republic.

The Federal Union can not long exist unless free institutions are maintained in each and every State. If violence and fraud are to be permanent in Louisiana, the other States of the Union must soon be contaminated. Let us hope that these truths will be realized by the nation. Let us hope that some action may be taken which will restore to the people of Louisiana the government guaranteed to them by the Constitution of the United States. The facts herein stated can, we repeat, be established before any fair tribunal empowered to hear and decide. It is within the power and it is clearly the duty of Congress to investigate the recent election in Louisiana. Do not mock us with the Democratic shibboleth that there can be no interference with the action of a sovereign State. The question lies deeper than that. The question is this: Is the government which exists in Louisiana republican in its form? Do the people of Louisiana enjoy a government such as is guaranteed to them by the Constitution of the United States?

That is a Federal question, a question of national importance. It will not dawn at the bidding of the assassins of liberty, backed though they be by the hypocritical time-servers of the North, who say they are Republicans in the North, but would be Democrats if they lived in the South. Such Republicans we hold in utter contempt. A true Republican is a Republican wherever he may be. We demand that an investigation of the late election in Louisiana be made by a Congressional committee to be vested with full power. What response will be given to that demand remains to be seen. Meanwhile let us bear whatever the future has in store for us with such patience, resolution, and dignity as we may command. Let us remember that "they also serve who only stand and wait." Let us remain steadfast in the faith, true to the rights of man, true to liberty, true to the principles of the Republican party—for though the triumph of these principles may be delayed, it will come in the providence of God with the revolving years.

The Republicans of Louisiana do not despair of the Republic. Though the fruits of victory have been wrested from us by force and fraud, still the work done, the sacrifices made, and the dangers incurred by us in the recent campaign were not in vain. The Republican party of this State is organized. It has been purged of the time-servers, mercenaries, and traitors, whose baleful influence has so often in the past blighted our councils. It is in many respects in a better condition than it ever has been. It is here, and it is here to stay. It will grow stronger and stronger every day. It must receive accessions from sugar-planters, rice-producers, lumbermen, riparian proprietors, and others whose interests imperatively require the success of the Republican party. It will receive accessions from many who in the past have acted with the Democratic party, but who have grown weary of the means and methods by which the ascendancy of that party has been maintained in this State; from many who realize the truth that men who bulldoze those whom they believe are unable to protect themselves will bulldoze their own wives and children; that those who steal ballots will steal anything else they can get away with; that those who will forge election returns will forge checks; that those who usurp offices to which they are not elected will appropriate all that they can; and that the continued domination of such men must disgrace and degrade the State beyond redemption.

In conclusion, we urge the governor and lieutenant-governor-elect to demand justice from the Legislature when that body assembles. We urge all members elected to the General Assembly who have been counted out to contest for their seats. We urge all Republicans who have been elected to offices for which they were candidates to institute suits therefor. Such proceedings may be vain, but whatever the result may be all that can be done should be done.

By order of the committee.

L. J. JOUBERT, Secretary.

MISSISSIPPI.

Article 12, section 244 of the State constitution, is so framed as to allow the registrars to admit persons to register whom they wish registered and refusing those of different politics, as they may choose. If a person can not read any portion of the constitution, he may register if he "can understand the same when read to him," or "give a reasonable interpretation thereof." This places the power of registering entirely in the hands of the registrars, and the most flagrant wrongs and discriminations are practiced thereunder.

Again, in article 12, section 241, the requirement to have paid all taxes due for two years prior to the 1st of February in the year in which he offers to vote and produce "satisfactory evidence that he has paid said taxes," is hardship and is worked against all those whom it is intended to affect, for the reason that colored people have but little means of preserving their tax receipts for such length of time, and having lost them, country people can not get "the evidence" without traveling to the county site for some statement from the tax collector that the taxes have been paid. Then if the voter is not the man wanted to vote, some small balance is found against him—sometimes only 13 cents, but he can not vote, all the same.

Elections in this State are conducted by a central power or board, the governor, attorney-general, and secretary of state constitute the board; they appoint the election commissioners for each county, and the county commissioners appoint the election officers at each voting place in the several counties to hold the election. The three officers that constitute the State board are all Democrats and they invariably appoint the three county commissioners upon the recommendation of the Democratic county committees. They refuse to recognize the recommendations of the Republican county, district, or State committees, and the persons that are appointed to represent the Republicans are generally ignorant or Republican only in name. In the seventy-five counties there is less than a half a dozen active Republicans appointed by the State board.

While it is claimed that these provisions are against illiteracy, both white and colored, the administration of them and discrimination under them is altogether against the colored side. In fact, the obstacles to be overcome and the hardships which have to be undergone to enable a colored man to vote, are so many that few colored people care to undertake the task, and practical disfranchisement is the result, and the colored man as a voter is practically eliminated in Mississippi.

The form of law is changed and the guaranties of the amendments to the Constitution are set aside and avoided by a constitution as could not have been by statute, and the promise of political rights and the franchise given the negro by the United States Government to protect his manhood and freedom is made a farce and a failure, and this, too, by a constitution never adopted by the people.

No amendment embodying this wholesale disfranchisement submitted by the Legislature to a vote of the people could have been adopted, hence to perpetuate this great wrong upon the rights and privileges of the colored people they were enacted by a convention and put in force by an ordinance, and never voted upon by the people. We are living to-day under a constitution never adopted by the people, and under the law of force, powerless to help themselves as a sheep in the shambles they have to submit to these acts of tyranny and oppression.

Where to look for relief colored people know not. Their rights have well-nigh vanished, made to travel in "jim crow cars," and are humiliated in every conceivable way, until now, from short crops and the low price of cotton, destitution prevails on every hand, and the negro is reduced to a state only a little better than slavery itself. It is a doleful picture, but it is true.

[New York Daily Tribune, Thursday, September 18, 1890.]

JUDGE CHRISMAN'S UTTERANCE IN MISSISSIPPI CONVENTION:

Speaking on the proposed franchise amendment, on September 8, Judge Chrisman said: "It is no secret that there has not been a full vote and a fair count in Mississippi since 1875—that we have been preserving the ascendancy of the white people by revolutionary methods. We have been stuffing ballot boxes, committing perjury, and here and there carrying elections by fraud and violence until the whole machinery for elections was about to rot down."

[The Sun, Friday, September 12, 1890.]

MISSISSIPPI'S CONVENTION—JUDGE CALHOUN SAYS ITS PURPOSE IS TO RESTRICT NEGRO SUFFRAGE.

JACKSON, September 11.

Judge Calhoun, president of the constitutional convention, occupied the floor for nearly two hours to-day in support of his electoral-college plank, which has been fully described in these dispatches.

The judge reviewed all the franchise plans submitted to the convention, and insisted that none but the Campbell plan and that which he had presented himself, but of which he disclaimed the paternity, would insure white control in the State. It was a law of Divine ordination, he said, that the white race can not tolerate divided sovereignty, and any Legislature would have the stamp of idiocy upon it that would assemble such a body as this, with the enormous attendant expense, with an object short of this. Let the truth be told, if it bursts the bottom out of the universe.

The speaker did not share the apprehension of those who thought that any change of the constitution that would have the effect of depriving a great number of negroes of the right to vote, would involve the State of Mississippi in a conflict with Congress. He thought there was no probability of such a conflict, as it was generally conceded among lawyers that the fundamental conditions of the act of 1870 were unconstitutional, and that Mississippi had a right to impose educational or property qualifications as other States, provided there was no discrimination on account of race or color. "But," he continued, "if the worst comes to the worst, and we lose some of our representation in Congress, we can stand it complacently if allowed to manage our local and State affairs undisturbed."

Even the Presidency, he said, was a matter of insignificance compared with local self-government. He did not propose to mince matters and hide behind a subterfuge, but if asked by anybody if it was the purpose of the convention to restrict negro suffrage, he would frankly answer: "Yes, that is what we are here for." The fiat had gone forth that fraud, force, and intimidation must cease, and if the convention failed to insure white supremacy by peaceful methods, he would, in case a negro was hereafter killed in a political riot, regard himself and every member of the convention as accessory to the murder.

The speaker then made an elaborate constitutional argument to prove that the plan he favored was republican in form. This plan divides the State into thirteen gerrymandered election districts, eight of which will have white majorities, and electors of these districts shall elect all State and county officers, and the senate and the Legislature shall alone be elected by the people.

SOUTH CAROLINA.

In South Carolina is seen the culmination of partisan malevolence and adroit juggling with the inherent rights and needs of citizenship. Political power is centered in the executive of the State, and the people are denied a voice in the management of elections. They are practically precluded from exercising any choice in the selection of election officers or from redress in correcting abuses. The machinery is entirely in the hands of the dominant party, and Republicans, in the management of elections, are not only excluded from any participation, but they are shut out from all knowledge about the registration, being even prevented from having the inalienable right of challenge, inspecting the conduct of the election, or witnessing the count.

There is but one supervisor of registration for each county, who is appointed by the governor. The three supervisors of election for the State

offices and the three supervisors of election for the Federal offices are appointed by the governor and they select the subordinate election officers. They are always of the governor's party and size up to the standard required for the work to be done. The opposing party is denied the right of selection and debarred even the privilege of suggestion, while any protest would be futile. All boards of review are composed likewise of unmixed partisans. So the entire framework of the election machinery of the State is the creation and creature directly and indirectly of the despotic executive.

The election law upon its face is a cunningly and heartlessly devised scheme to stifle opposition and perpetuate the dominant rule. There is no provision for, nor has there been any attempt to have, a registration of the voters since 1882, and all voters then qualified to register who failed to do so are prohibited from registering and have since been and are now absolutely disfranchised. The attorney-general of the State in a formal opinion has declared that this unexampled status is without cure or remedy.

The only place or time for the registration of voters coming of age or moving into the State or for transferring certificates in case of change of residence or their loss, is at the supervisor's office in each county on the first Monday in each month up to the July preceding the election in the following November. This registration is closed before the campaign opens and interest has been aroused. No new books of general registration are provided for in the law, nor have they been procured and the old ones are so torn, worn, erased, and mutilated as to be unreliable and even unintelligible.

The only new books provided for are those for the various precincts which are sent to the different polls and in which are supposed to be copied by the supervisors the names of the voters of the respective polls. Neither the general county registration books or these copied precinct registration books are allowed to be seen by the public, and there is no way of ascertaining who are or who are not registered. And Circuit Judge Izlar has decided that the public has neither the right to see these registration books nor to have them inspected or transcribed; so that voters go to the polls utterly in the dark as to whether their names are in the registration books beyond the presumption that follows the possession of the registration certificate and a blind faith in the supervisors. Should the serial number upon the book and certificate differ or there be a variance in the name, age, or residence, the right to vote may be forfeited. The publication of the names of the registered voters has never been made, and Republicans are purposely, studiously, and irrevocably kept from knowledge about this constitutional and inalienable right.

With this dismal and dubious entrance across the threshold of the elective franchise the helpless voter has to run the gauntlet of innumerable and constantly varying difficulties and pitfalls. If he desires to register, transfer his certificate to his new residence, or obtain a duplicate for the lost one he must go to the supervisor's office on one of the first Mondays of the month, whatever be the distance, inconvenience, lack of means or facilities for traveling in a sparsely settled country, where the supervisor's office may be from 30 to 70 miles from the extremity of the county, with no certainty that the supervisor will be in his office and with the conviction that, if undue interest is manifested in registration by Republicans, they will be delayed and the hours of closing welcomed if not hastened, so they will have to come again and again until they weary and become disheartened.

And as the law provides that a change of residence requires the possession of a new certificate, its effect upon the negroes who are so largely farm laborers, frequently changing their place of work and temporary home, is manifest. The ordinary and supposed purpose of registration is to locate the voter and prevent repeating. But this is the least and last object sought by the South Carolina law. Its real design is to make voting difficult, and to distract, confuse, and hamper Republicans.

The primary right to vote is based on the possession and presentation of the certificate. Without that, if he be a Republican, he is disfranchised. This flimsy piece of paper, so difficult to get, so easily lost or mislaid, is the prerequisite for voting and the voter's only passport, providing he is a Republican.

If, by good fortune and painstaking, the Republican voter has thus qualified himself, then, according to law, he must go alone, with no one to aid or detect if he is misled or cheated between a barricade and the election boxes, and place the eight ballots in the appropriate boxes in the presence of hostile managers of election, who believe there is no sin in deceiving or defrauding a political enemy and that any advantage taken of such a voter is wise policy and justified by the situation. The law purports to be regardless of the interests of the illiterate and dim-eyed when, after providing the boxes shall be labeled, it says these managers shall, upon the demand of the voter, point out to him the desired ballot box, but forbids giving him any other information. But this treacherous provision is of but little service if the voter can not read or disarranges his eight ballots, and may be a pitfall if these managers misinform or otherwise trick him. Ordinarily it would not be rash to impute such designs to such managers of election who know they will be safe in trapping the unwary, especially as it would be less of a strain on the conscience than engaging in the more grossly fraudulent practices expected of them if the exigency demands it. And yet, in spite of this handicap upon the illiterate, this law was framed by a State whose constitution prohibits any law being passed which establishes an educational qualification for the elective franchise.

In addition to these inherent vices in the election laws of South Carolina, there are glaring wrongs in the grotesque gerrymander of the Congressional districts, which range in population from 120,000 to 210,000, and extend in one instance to over 200 miles in length, dividing counties and splitting townships to make the contiguous territory connections, and in the location of the polling places, most conveniently with small size in Democratic counties, and most inconveniently where the Republican vote is heavy, with oftentimes 1,000 to 1,400 voters in a precinct to fare as best they can with the dilatory tactics and harsher methods peculiar to Southern elections.

To recoup the Democrats and discount the hardships and drawbacks inflicted on Republicans, the voters of the dominant party have their franchise privileges daintily provided for and facilitated. They are rarely seen about the registration offices, being saved the trouble and annoyance of visiting these offices by having their certificates kindly and thoughtfully sent them when desired, or, if they are indifferent, furnished to the captains of their clubs or some worker who will see to their distribution. And past experience has taught them, if they have forgotten or mislaid their certificates, some handy representative of the supervisor will be present to fill up a blank certificate duly signed by the supervisor. But what need for a Democrat to have a certificate, seeing there is no Republican allowed to be present to observe what transpires and neither candidate or challenger to witness the course pursued? And though the law provides that no one but the managers shall be present in the polling places, this does not prevent the partisans of the managers having easy and welcome access.

While Republican ballots would no more be allowed within the precincts of the managers than would slips tainted with smallpox germs, the Democratic tickets are everywhere at hand, and the correct ones are placed on the top of the appropriate boxes so as to avoid mistake and be easily accessible to the faithful.

As a fitting supplement to the act of voting under the general difficulties mentioned, as well as the varying devices and obstructions which partisan

ingenuity suggests, there comes the fatal count and declaration of the result of the election. This, at all the State polls, it should be borne in mind, takes place in a room from which all Republicans are excluded, including the candidates, while at the Federal polls the only Republican permitted to be present is the United States supervisor. But he is kept at such a distance from the ballots that he can not distinguish them or know a good deal that is done with them while being assorted; for, under the law, they must all be of the same quality of paper and of the same size, color, and type, with no distinguishing marks or devices.

Under such conditions only the crudest and least effective methods can be employed by Republicans to ascertain their vote and determine the result. But the capstone of this legally constructed election edifice is the provision regarding the drawing out of the ballots in the box in excess of the names on the poll list. There is no limit to the number of spurious ballots the box may contain without violating the poll. When the tissue ballots were used it was the bona fide ballots largely which were withdrawn and destroyed, leaving the fraudulent ones to be counted. But without the use of those villainous ballots the arithmetical advantages in this scheme, even fairly conducted, where the boxes are generously stuffed, is sufficient.

Following and winding up this travesty on election proceedings comes the canvassing of the result by the county and State returning boards. These officers are likewise and invariably members of the dominant party. They can be as summary and arbitrary in their action as they please, and an amendment to the original law confers on them despotic judicial powers. They are a law unto themselves, and there is practically no redress from their findings.

This outline of the constituted election proceeding in South Carolina is a bare statement of the methods pursued under the provisions of the law, and the obstacles set up to a free and untrammelled franchise. Upon its face it is violative of the fundamental principles of honest elections, and in some particulars is in direct conflict with the State constitution. The vicious provisions and practices referred to are inherent in the law.

But lying back of these exists the Pandora box of evils and excesses that are the natural product and accompaniment of election excitement. These effects and dangers exist everywhere, but they are intensified in a State where race prejudice increases the normal passions and public opinion sanctions election frauds and cruelties, especially where there is no public press to condemn nor dread of prosecution. The natural propensity of the unscrupulous politician has unrestrained sway. To catalogue the practices pursued in a State where the Kuklux conspiracy was born and wontonly flourished and the tissue-ballot iniquity was invented would be a revolting tale.

The effect on Republicans of this repulsive and repressive law has been that year by year it has crushed out hope and spirit until at last, though remaining true to their party even in its apparent desertion of them, they have become disheartened and apathetic. Perhaps not over a tenth but surely not over an eighth of the Republicans of the State are now qualified by the possession of correct registration certificates to vote. The Democrats are not in any better fix. Under the practice in vogue that has not mattered with them. But now they have two hostile camps. Heretofore their bitter warfare has been confined to their primary elections where registration is not required. But they are nearing a supreme struggle. When the final fight between these embittered factions takes place the enormities of this outrageous election scheme will be brought home to the faction which will have to contend against the same villainous machinery and methods that have ground to subjection the servile Republicans.

CHARLESTON, S. C., January 17, 1893.

DEAR SIR: Your bill to regulate elections in this State meets the hearty approval of all Republicans here, who have a voting majority of 30,000—but suppressed by the election machinery in force here.

There are eight boxes provided by law at each precinct: One for governor and lieutenant-governor, another for State senator, another for members of the house of representatives, another for State officers, another for county officers, etc.

It is provided that no one shall be admitted into the polling place except the voter, and any ballot put into the wrong box is not counted. As one-half of the loyal citizens can not read, the managers of election, by shifting the position of the boxes, induce the voter to put his ballot in the wrong box and it is thrown out.

When you remember that the commissioners of election are appointed by the governor and they appoint the managers at the several voting precincts, the counting out is an easy matter. The polling place for President and member of Congress is in another place, but there are two boxes there and the same deception and counting out takes place there. At this latter precinct the Democrats are admitted by a back door while a line of Republicans 200 feet long are denied admission, and when one of them gets in the time is taken up by the managers in asking him irrelevant questions, so that not one-third can poll their votes before the closing of the polls.

Berkeley County, which was cut off from Charleston because the Republicans had 10,000 votes to 1,200 Democrats, has returned five Democrats to the house of representatives.

The Seventh Congressional district, separated by a gerrymandering process and called the "black district" (because it contained ten Republicans to one Democrat), at the last election returned Mr. Elliott to Congress against Robert Smalls, the Republican candidate. A Legislature so elected has sent Hampton and Butler to the Senate.

On Edisto Island, where there are 1,200 votes, there is only one polling place, because there are 1,120 Republicans to 80 Democrats; and you can easily see that 1,200 votes can not be taken in 720 minutes (the poll opening at 6 a. m. and closing at 6 p. m.).

There has been no fair election here since 1878.

It is claimed that there is no discrimination, before the law, of races. In theory this is true, but practically the negro is not represented, except in the penitentiary, where he is leased out to phosphate mines and railroads for \$10 a month for the benefit of the State which refuses him representation in the Legislature and the jury box. And it will continue so until his ballot is counted. The penal laws have been made severe for his benefit, and convictions are easy because he is not represented in the jury box.

Respectfully,

Senator CHANDLER.

Mr. President, in reference to the cost of maintaining the supervisors and special deputy marshals, I submit the following:

Total cost of supervisors from 1877 to 1893, \$2,854,858.94; also of special deputy marshals, \$1,127,595.75. (See letter of Comptroller Bowler to Representative J. C. BLACK, March 19, 1893, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 29, 1893, speech of Mr. BLACK of September 28. See also Bragg-Durham report, Forty-

fifth Congress, third session, House Report No. 120, February 27, 1879.)

The expenses for 1892 appear as follows:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE FIRST COMPTROLLER,
Washington, D. C., January 19, 1894.

SIR: I have the honor to inclose herewith a statement showing the amount paid to supervisors and chief supervisors of elections in each judicial district of the United States or their services in connection with the Congressional election of 1892, as shown by the accounts on file in the Treasury Department. The amount may possibly be increased by the accounts of supervisors not yet rendered.

This statement, I believe, covers all the information you desire.

Respectfully yours,

R. B. BOWLER, Comptroller.

HON. WILLIAM E. CHANDLER,
United States Senate.

Statement showing the amounts paid to supervisors and chief supervisors of elections in each judicial district of the United States for their services in connection with the Congressional election of November 8, 1892, as shown by the accounts on file in the Treasury Department.

Judicial districts.	Chief supervisors.	Supervisors.
Alabama, northern district.....	\$205.57	\$345.00
Alabama, middle district.....	202.80	65.00
Alabama, southern district.....	521.00	870.00
Arkansas, eastern district.....	336.50	110.00
California, northern district.....	4,232.71	34,650.00
California, southern district.....	216.75	4,335.00
Colorado.....	102.00	2,000.00
Delaware.....	752.79	4,645.00
Florida, northern district.....	72.30	—
Georgia, northern district.....	14.25	—
Georgia, southern district.....	51.95	—
Illinois, northern district.....	17,705.78	68,938.25
Illinois, southern district.....	—	865.00
Indiana.....	3,309.05	5,830.00
Kansas.....	90.30	—
Louisiana, eastern district.....	900.85	7,750.00
Louisiana, western district.....	13.15	—
Maryland.....	577.30	17,700.00
Massachusetts.....	12,238.23	32,755.00
Michigan, eastern district.....	190.70	7,505.00
Mississippi, northern district.....	139.05	—
Mississippi, southern district.....	53.20	—
Missouri, eastern district.....	1,414.45	4,910.00
New Jersey.....	—	14,915.00
New York, northern district.....	15,576.84	34,427.50
New York, eastern district.....	23,664.18	43,000.00
New York, southern district.....	34,238.59	60,250.00
North Carolina, eastern district.....	282.30	—
North Carolina, western district.....	9.25	—
Oregon.....	88.87	1,170.00
Pennsylvania, eastern district.....	2,807.53	91,135.00
Pennsylvania, western district.....	253.40	5,920.00
Rhode Island.....	1,318.19	2,005.00
South Carolina.....	554.65	720.00
Tennessee, eastern district.....	31.50	310.00
Tennessee, middle district.....	17.75	1,835.00
Tennessee, western district.....	119.00	—
Texas, northern district.....	12.95	—
Texas, eastern district.....	—	340.00
Virginia, eastern district.....	623.70	1,750.00
Virginia, western district.....	2,079.95	—
Total.....	127,185.63	451,460.76

Mr. PALMER. Mr. President, the Senate was kind enough to listen to me a short time ago in the discussion of this question, and I think I shall make a few additional remarks at this moment.

This to me is an exceedingly interesting question. I think my estimate of its importance is equal to, if not greater than, that of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. CHANDLER]. That portion of his speech this morning which was directed toward the condition of the colored race in this country interested me very much, for it may be my fault or it may be my misfortune that so many years of my life were spent in political controversies involving the condition of that race that perhaps it has taken control of me to an extent that even I may not be aware of.

I recollect the history of the beginning of the Republican party. It was a party of accidental creation, not of premeditation; it was not the work of politicians, nor of great leaders; it was created by the spontaneous movement of the people of the Northern States, in which some people of the South participated. Its purposes were limited to a very important, but narrow field. Its purpose was, in the first place, to resist the reopening of the slavery agitation. That induced thousands of men who had belonged to the Democratic party—I speak now of Illinois particularly—men who desired to preserve the peace of the country and be rid of the dangerous strife which the reopening of the slavery controversy suggested, to join it. Its purpose was further developed as its assaults became more distinct to resist the extension of slavery. Later its purpose was to preserve the Union; and the destruction of slavery was an incident to the effort of the country to preserve the Union.

In 1861 I was in this city attending a session of that abortive

assembly called the peace congress. I met a gentleman from Kentucky who was once governor of that State, a Union man. He was deprecating the election of Mr. Lincoln as a great calamity to the country, and deprecating a war for the Union. He said no war could be waged for the defense of the Union which would not destroy slavery, because, he said, the presence of armies in the slave States would of necessity destroy slavery. I became satisfied of that by my subsequent experience. The destruction of slavery was a consequence of the war. It was a condition forced upon the country by those who sought to overthrow the Union, a necessary incident to the struggle for the preservation of the Union.

After slavery was destroyed, as I have said on a former occasion, the faith of the nation—I use the term in its proper sense—was pledged to the maintenance of the freedom of the slaves. The ballot was given to them in place of that protection which could only have been furnished them by armed men. It was the belief that it would be a defensive weapon. Though it might not accomplish all that was hoped for at once, nor within a decade, it was hoped that the time would come when the ballot—which is of itself a liberal education to a freeman, although it might be obstructed or might be hindered—would ripen into fruit, and the time would come when the free ballot, with all the difficulties that might be thrown in the way of its free exercise, would accomplish the result for which we all hoped so ardently and so earnestly.

The Republican party, in my judgment, up to the time of the adoption of the fifteenth amendment, was an accidental organization. There were many opinions and policies about which the members of that party did not agree, but then there was an agreement upon these questions. The radical trouble with the Republican leadership after that was that it gave to party what was meant for mankind. Suddenly, after emancipation and after suffrage was given to the black men, they were claimed as the retainers, as the perpetual servitors of the Republican party, and whatever might be the great public questions which interested the country, the negro vote was calculated upon as a fixed contingent.

Mr. President, within a few years in my own State, on one of those occasions, I believe it was the 1st day of August, when the negroes in my town were assembled together to rejoice over the anniversary of emancipation of the blacks in the West Indies, I heard a governor of Illinois and a Senator from that State—he is not now within the sound of my voice—say that the negro should vote the Republican ticket; and those gentlemen gave the reason for it, which was, that the Republicans emancipated them. That was held as a sufficient reason, in the judgment of those orators and statesmen, for maintaining that the colored race should support the policies of the Republican party, whatever they might be, upon the principle of gratitude for the services rendered by that party in their emancipation.

That was the cardinal mistake, not of the earnest antislavery men, I believe, but of the men who led, and the legislation now under consideration was passed, I think, with an entire misconception of the true duty of the Republic to the colored men. Undoubtedly there were difficulties in the suffrage in the South which can hardly be understood without some personal knowledge of the previous relations of the races. The negro, as I have said before, could hardly be declared to be sufficiently intelligent, as a rule, to exercise the right of suffrage wisely and the master race had not been accustomed to sharing with them in the participation of political power. There were embarrassments attending the condition of both races. It would have been the wise and the just policy at that time on the part of the whole country not to have abandoned the right of the blacks, but to have encouraged amicable relations between the two races and permitted them, as the result of experience, to work out their own salvation, if I may use that term in this connection, to gradually harmonize their interests, without any attempt at compulsion or force, except that necessary compulsion or that necessary force which every government possesses and ought to employ to protect its citizens.

The Senator from New Hampshire the other day spoke of the enormous naturalizations in New York, by which, he said, the Democrats gained power. The Republican party, if it claims to have emancipated the blacks and given them the right of suffrage, by an act of naturalization, which has no parallel in the history of politics, suddenly converted more than a half million negroes into Republican recruits, and continually employed the agencies which would hinder them from the free investigation of public questions and continually appealed to their prejudices and kept them in adherence to the Republican party.

The Senator himself to-day in his analysis of the state of the vote of the Southern States assumes that the Southern blacks, now entitled to proportional representation do not enjoy it, and assumes that if they did, the members of Congress elected

by the blacks would be supporters of the McKinley law, possibly, that they would be Republicans, and would follow the Republican party in any direction its leaders might point out. That is the radical trouble.

Mr. President, it is not that the love of liberty has decayed in this country; on the contrary, in my judgment, it is because we are gradually becoming one people, including this black race. The employment of irregular force, as this bill employs it, is useless. Whatever may have been thought before, it is useless now. The Senator from New Hampshire admits that this law has failed to accomplish the object for which it was passed. It exists, therefore, as a mere festering wrong, a mere menace without any possible advantage. Indeed it exists now mainly for party purposes.

I have said that the Republican party is no longer the party of mere liberty; and I propose to examine the question now. In the little painted kingdom, lately ruled over by a nominal queen, there is an area of about 6,000 square miles; the population is about 90,000. I perceive by a statement that the American population there is less than 2,000. I observe that that population owns 74 per cent of all the property of that little kingdom; that another white race owns \$6,000,000, another white European race some \$1,000,000 worth probably, and that the natives own eighty one-hundredths of 1 per cent, and that a portion of the population of this island, not 10 per cent of the whole population, as I have described who own the property, have overthrown this Government, have established a property qualification, and I understand they are about to issue a new constitution by their own authority or by the authority of the Provisional Government. Yet a few days ago I heard one of the distinguished leaders of the Republican party in this body say this mere commercial colony, which has acquired the property and subverted the Government of the natives, were Russells and Sidneys and Washingtons. This illustrates the wonderful changes which take place in the public mind. This is Republicanism; this is in harmony with the views of the party which now claims to be the champion of the rights and interests of the black race!

Mr. President, I opposed slavery always, so far as I can remember. I did not oppose slavery so much or alone for the reason that it enslaved the black man; I opposed slavery because it endangered the liberty of all men; I opposed it as an essentially radical devilish vice, and I desired to see it eradicated in order to secure the liberties of all the people of this country and of all countries. The specious argument that slavery was simply injurious to the black race ought to have been long ago rejected. Both races, who have been the victims of the system—because both were victims in some sense—demanded, and the interests of humanity demanded, that slavery should no longer exist on this continent. The same principles need application everywhere, and the rights of men, North and South, white and black, need that same careful attention and regard which commenced with the struggle for the abolition of slavery, and found its fruition in the fifteenth constitutional amendment.

I oppose the law which it is now proposed to repeal. I perhaps have spoken of it as being an element of party agency. That is placing my opposition to it upon grounds entirely too low. I oppose it because it is an assault upon popular liberty. Believing as I do that the people of the United States are capable of governing themselves, believing that the interests of every community are safest in its own keeping, believing as I do that no man was ever capable of governing another man—of course I make this statement with some proper limitations—that no man was ever good enough to be a master and that no man was ever base enough to be a slave, believing that this legislation is a mere menace, a useless, idle, insulting menace, to every community where it has been put in force, I can not do otherwise than assert the duty of Congress to repeal it.

For example, I mentioned the other day an incident of one of its features. Two men utterly worthless, except that they possess the mere quality of citizenship, may at least put in motion machinery which operates or may operate on every individual in the community which makes a master for me. It may be said that if I behave myself the master will not disturb me. Ah, but that is the question. It makes a master for me, makes a master for my neighbors, make a master for my fellow-citizens. That master is created by two persons in a populous district. It is true there are other forms of appointment; but from that time forth during that election day there are a number of men who go about who are created by the action of those persons, good or bad, and who are a standing menace to the perfect self-reliant liberty of each citizen. Is it worth while to make such a sacrifice for so little? How much do we receive in exchange for the surrender of that important right?

I hold the Senator from New Hampshire to his declaration that the law has failed. Can there be a more emphatic statement of its value than that involved in this admission—it has failed? It

has not accomplished the purposes for which it was enacted; and although the Senator with pathos, and, I must confess, with a certain measure of justice, denounces legislation which is intended to be practically subversive to individual rights, yet upon the law is written the words, "Failed, failed, failed." If this law remains on the statute book, will there still be mobs in Illinois or elsewhere? For, Mr. President, I am sorry to say that in my own State within a year or two there have been mobs. It has been so in Ohio; it has been so in Indiana. Will this law tend to suppress or extinguish this miserable, shameful mob spirit? The law has failed; it is not directed against that spirit, and a law which is useless is necessarily bad.

I repeat the proposition—meaning to limit it—a law which affects the conduct or control of men's conduct, or is intended to do so, which fails of the good purpose is necessarily a bad law. There is no possible method by which a law can be defended, and there can be no possible reason why a law should not be repealed if it is admitted that it has failed. It is the failure of laws which subverts society, and I think I know instances where the very fact of the passage of useless laws has done much to subvert or destroy popular confidence in legislation. It is like the crime of a judge or the crime of a public officer. The very crime itself is a crime against law and morality, and it is more than that, it is a crime against society.

I desired to say this much, for if the Senator had said he believed, or asserted, or what is more important, if he had proven that the election laws had been productive of benefit, there would be some excuse for their retention upon the statute books, but as they have failed, as these crimes, of which the Senator spoke so eloquently, have continued and still continue, as the colored race in the South is still without representation, as no good has been done by the laws, as they are regarded as offensive, as they are offensive in a measure, why keep them on the statute book?

I look forward, Mr. President, to other agencies by which these results are to be accomplished in the diffusion of education, by sound political principles, by the cultivation of the principles of self-reliance in the colored race.

I think myself that history has shown nothing so remarkable as the advance of the colored race. It is a remarkable fact that in most instances of enslaved peoples, in the struggle which secured them emancipation they have acquired the hardihood which enabled them to maintain their freedom, for, as a rule, a man who is willing to be a slave is a slave, and usually the nations in their progress toward freedom reach first the point at which they can resist despotism, and then the aggressive force which enables them to win freedom.

This race were free without their own intervention. Indeed, whenever I hear of an instance of organized oppression towards the colored race in the Southern States I imagine nothing can be more ungrateful, for while this great struggle was going on these negroes stayed at home and industriously struggled for the support of the families of their masters who were absent in battle. I know I can say for them that, while I would sometimes get them to give me information which might affect their masters, I never found one in my life who would do any harm or permit any harm or give information that might affect the mistress and the children. No race was ever so remarkable for the affectionate devotion they gave to the interests of the families of their masters as was this colored race.

A period of struggle seems to be a necessity of mankind. It is not possible to make men free in an instant; but I anticipate the time when the negro race on this continent will cease to be a source of trouble or embarrassment. To the Master a day, a year, a century, is but a short period in which to work out His mysterious Providence. I repeat that no historic race has made such advances or has done better than this race, which was made free by the acts of others. It will continue to advance.

It needs but to be assisted with education and with those aids which Christianity and civilization will give to it. It has not been benefited by these abortive efforts for its welfare, for a remarkable fact exists now, upon the concession of the Senator from New Hampshire. Although in many districts in the South the negroes are superior in point of numbers to the white race, these laws still have not secured them the rights which the law intended to confer upon them. The negroes have felt helpless; and, indeed, perhaps that is a good result, for I am inclined to believe that when a man finds that nobody will help him he will help himself. I am inclined to believe that the political coddling of this race has done more good than harm. But I hesitate about expressing my views on this point, for the matter has been a problem with me from the beginning.

Mr. HOAR. I should like to ask the Senator from Illinois a question. Would he recommend to the negro race to do what he supposes white men would do under the same circumstances? Suppose there happened to the white men in what is called the black belt in some States in the country what we believe, and

what I suppose the Senator, with his candor, does not deny, happens to the black men in regard to their votes. If the Senator lived down there he would take up arms and fight. He would not submit to it a year. He would not wait to see whether the law operated. Now, does he recommend to the black men, if they are satisfied that that is true, that they are deprived by fraud or violence or in any other way of their right to vote, that they had better take up arms and do what white men would do under like circumstances? The Senator is speaking of the negro helping himself. Does he advise that kind of helping himself?

Mr. PALMER. I would advise nobody; but if a time ever comes when the negro becomes impatient he will need no advice from me or anybody else as to what he will do.

Mr. HOAR. That is not the question.

Mr. PALMER. I have just said that men who consent to be deprived of their rights are deprived of their rights already. That the time will come when there will be either no organized injustice to this race, or they will resist it I have no doubt.

Mr. HOAR. Would the Senator advise that?

Mr. PALMER. I have not advised that.

Mr. HOAR. Perhaps the Senator does not want to answer the question.

Mr. PALMER. I would not advise them—

Mr. HOAR. If the Senator will say so, I will not press it.

Mr. PALMER. I will not say so.

Mr. HOAR. If the Senator is willing to answer the question I wish he would answer it.

Mr. PALMER. I will not say so. I can say what I would do, and that is about all I can say. I say the time will come when these questions will be settled rightly or there will be resistance. I am quite well aware of the fact that at present any formal advice to any particular race would be unwise in the beginning. I should not advise them to resist, but I think I know what I would do if I were in their situation. I do not think I should submit. I have not been taught submission. I suppose that in after generations of these black people they will cease to be taught submission; and I apprehend that when that time comes no resistance will be needed, for the principles of right and justice will prevail; they will assert themselves.

You may ask me if I would defend my life if I were assailed. I may answer yes, but I do not suppose that declaration would contribute in the slightest degree to my personal safety. I suppose that that which insures my safety against attack from the lawless is in some measure the fact that it is believed within a certain limit I would not submit to outrage. Men pass through their lives without ever having occasion to assert the right of self-defense, yet the knowledge of its existence and the belief that it will be asserted is of itself protection enough.

Mr. HOAR. I do not think the Senator quite answers my question yet. I should like to repeat it in this way: I suppose there were a Congressional district in Illinois where a majority of the white men, perhaps being of a peculiar religion or peculiar occupation or for some other reason were deprived, by these processes which have been so common in some parts of the country, of their right to vote by a minority, the law failing to help them, and they went to the Senator from Illinois and said to him, "Now, Governor Palmer, you are a brave and a wise man of great experience"—so far we will agree upon that—

Mr. PALMER. That is a very great compliment, which I hope I will deserve; I am not sure of it.

Mr. HOAR. And they say, "Now, what shall we do? Shall we stand this thing? We are deprived of our political rights, and whenever one of us is charged with crime of any gravity we do not have any trial or any judge or jury, but are strung up to the nearest tree, sometimes under circumstances of great cruelty. Now, what shall we do about it? We can take care of these men; we are in the majority; we can get some rifles, and we can defend ourselves and stop this thing if we declare to fight it. What would you advise us to do?" Now, I suppose there is no question that Gen. JOHN M. PALMER, of Illinois, that eminent and brave soldier of whom we have heard for so many years, would say "Of course; if you are Illinois men, with the blood of freemen in your veins, take your rifles and fight it out, and let these men understand they are acting at the peril of their lives." If a Southern negro came to the Senator with precisely the same story would he give him precisely the same advice? That is what I want to know.

Mr. PALMER. Perhaps I may fairly ask the Senator from Massachusetts whether he has made up his mind on the subject.

Mr. HOAR. When the Senator answers me, I will tell him. Answer me and I will answer you.

Mr. PALMER. I should say under those circumstances, "If you have a mind to submit to it, you may."

Mr. HOAR. That is not advice, because—

Mr. PALMER. That would be my advice. I would say: "If you choose to submit, do so." If I were going to define the ab-

stract right I would define it. If I were advising men as to what they should do under particular conditions, I should want to satisfy myself that I fully understood all the conditions, and I would then advise them according to my best judgment. Speaking for myself, with all the conditions in my mind which I have assumed, I should submit with very great reluctance.

Mr. HOAR. Will not the Senator say he would not submit with any kind of reluctance?

Mr. PALMER. Well, I do not think I would.

Mr. HOAR. That is it exactly.

Mr. PALMER. I do not think I would. But on two or three occasions in my life I have submitted to things that I did not want to submit to.

Mr. HOAR. And would not submit to again?

Mr. PALMER. In fact, I have laughed at jokes when I would rather have struck the man who imposed them on me, if I had not felt that it was not quite a safe thing to do.

Mr. President, I am not disposed to continue the discussion at any greater length, but I will make a statement in regard to what I believe to be the duties of these races, and that is to exercise mutual forbearance. For that advice they owe me nothing and need not accept it. I am dealing to-day with this legislation that does nobody any good, which is offensive, and is an assertion of a right which, like all other mere assertions of political power, is in its essence mischievous, because I believe the least possible restraining legislation, coercive legislation, most favors personal liberty.

While the Senator was out of the Chamber I paid him a compliment which, I hope, he will appreciate. I mentioned the fact that the Senator (who I understand is very earnest in his support of legislation like that which it is proposed to repeal) has spoken of a few thousand people in a distant island who have monopolized all the property and have usurped the Government and have secured control so as to exclude the 85,000 inhabitants from all share in political power. I want to know if that is consistent with these ideas of enforcing perfect equality and justice among the people in the Southern States?

Mr. HOAR. The Senator will pardon me; it is not consistent with any such thing. It is not true. It is consistent with nothing except the report of a prejudiced, one-sided person who was sent out there by a usurpation of the right of the people at home and in flagrant violation of our Constitution, and who went out there and made his report in flagrant violation of the evidence and the facts.

Mr. PALMER. I will state to the Senator that he hardly deals with me with as much candor as I expected.

Mr. HOAR. I will be a good deal more candid if the Senator will give me a little more time. There is a great deal of candor left.

Mr. PALMER. I understand there are facts nobody has attempted to controvert. One of those facts is that a population of less than 3,000 have acquired the control of four-fifths or three-fourths of all the property. They have improved their constitutions, and by excluding from them the native races, and have left the native races in possession of 1 per cent of the property of the islands.

That is according to the statements, not of Mr. Blount, but from sources I understand, of unquestioned reliability. In view of the laudation of the Republican party which my friend from New Hampshire [Mr. CHANDLER] indulges in so freely, I ask if it is an exhibition of the Republicanism of New Hampshire, of the Republicanism of John P. Hale, and the Republicanism of Charles Sumner, that this small handful of people shall take possession of that little kingdom, seize the largest proportion of the property, and by constitutions forced upon the king gradually circumscribe and destroy the rights of the native voters and in the end to subvert the government, and then claim, in the language of the Senator from Massachusetts, that they are to be compared with Russell and other distinguished devotees of liberty, more particularly with the great American, Washington himself?

Mr. FRYE. Mr. President, I know the Senator from Illinois [Mr. PALMER] is a brave man. I think he is a good man. I think, because he was once a Republican, that he averages a great deal better than the Democrats on the other side of the Chamber, and therefore I should like to talk to him a few minutes.

I should like to tell a twice-told tale, and then ask him to give me a frank answer to a frankly put question. I admit that it is a twice-told tale, but I do not believe the Federal election laws should ever be considered without its being told, because it is a tale which inspired this legislation, which compelled the United States Congress to enact these laws, and which ought to compel us to keep them on the statute books unless circumstances and facts have so changed that we are to-day justified in repealing them.

If the States can be depended upon now to do what is fair and

reasonable and just, then possibly it might do to allow the States to administer the election laws themselves if they please. If they can not be depended upon (and that is a question of fact to be determined by looking at their statutes to-day and their manner of enforcement) then the United States should retain its laws.

Now, the twice-told tale. In 1868 Gen. Grant was a candidate for the Presidency on the part of the Republicans and Horatio Seymour on the part of the Democrats. It was a great contest, attracting the attention and commanding the interest of all men in the Republic. New York was regarded as a pivotal State. Tweed was at the head of Tammany in that State. Tammany was ready to do anything under the sun, utterly regardless of conscience or law, to carry the State for Horatio Seymour. I do not believe Tammany has changed her spots a jot from that hour to this. I believe, from the statements made by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. CHANDLER] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], that the Tammany of to-day is just as corrupt, just as wicked, just as determined to avail itself of every violation of law possible to accomplish its purposes as it was in 1868.

Now, what did they do at that time? The election was to come on. The court of common pleas had been the court accustomed to naturalize foreigners into American citizens; about 9,000 a year on an average. There was a very respectable judge at that time presiding over the court, too respectable for Tammany. Therefore, for the first time in the history of New York politics and the New York judiciary, they made use of the supreme court, with Judge Barnard as its presiding judge, a candidate in that very election for reelection, and the other court of the State of New York, with Judge McCunn as its presiding judge, also a candidate for reelection in the same election. These two courts started in October 6 to naturalize, and in that month they made over 40,000 foreigners into American citizens with not twenty days in which to do it. In the supreme court, under Judge Barnard, they naturalized over 2,000 in a single day. I heard a witness testify who was before the court while this process of naturalization was going on—

Mr. HAWLEY. Twenty-five hundred and twenty-two in a day?

Mr. FRYE. Twenty-five hundred and twenty-two in a single day. One of the leading members of the New York bar testified that he succeeded finally in getting into Judge Barnard's court while this process was going on. He saw at least 150 men brought into that court room at one time. They had two or three little tables, with a Bible on the center of every table. The men form an inside circle and touch their fingers on the Bible, another circle was formed around, and so on, the men reaching their fingers out towards the Bible, and Judge Barnard administered the oath, and 150 citizens were made in less than two minutes of time. Nineteen thousand men were admitted in Judge Barnard's court in that month of October, and some 16,000 or more, it was found on investigation subsequently made, who did not appear on the record. Judge McCunn's court was the same. Both judges were afterwards impeached. Judge McCunn died pending impeachment proceedings. I think Barnard went off from the court.

Who were the witnesses? There were ten standing witnesses to 8,200 applicants. There was a Patrick Goff, who was a standing witness to 2,100 applicants for citizenship. Patrick Goff was afterwards sent to the State's prison, and stayed there eight years. Patrick Goff one day in Judge Barnard's court was a witness to 370; the next day, October 10, to 385; the next day was Sunday, and the next day, the 12th of October, to 356. John Moran was a witness to cover 1,800 different applicants. Thousands were admitted to citizenship without any witnesses at all. Witnesses gave their names in these two courts as Commodore Vanderbilt, as Chauncey Depew, and so on, men known perfectly well to the court, and yet no attention was paid to it.

Any quantity of false names were given. Thousands were admitted to American citizenship who never went into the court at all as applicants. Tammany at that time was provided with red slips, to be furnished to applicants of its own selection, which read: "You will naturalize the bearer." These, passed to the judges, commanded certificates, and the bills were charged to Tammany, and Tammany paid them. There were eight witnesses who testified that they themselves scattered 10,000 of those certificates amongst the people in New York to vote upon, and there had never been a single one of them in the courts of that State for naturalization.

I have been a member of one of these committees, and therefore it is familiar to me. There was one witness I remember perfectly well, Henry Lyle, who declared that he himself sold 600 certificates, all signed and all ready for delivery, except with the name of the citizen left in blank. He sold them for \$5 apiece, and Tammany paid the actual cost back to him that the court would have charged for naturalizing these persons as American

citizens. Superintendent Kennedy, of the police department, found 3,000 of these blank certificates in one liquor saloon, which had been left there, all signed and all ready for delivery.

Mr. DAVIS. With the seal of the court?

Mr. FRYE. With the seal of the court, the name of the judge, and everything prepared for a naturalized person. They sent over 4,000 into the State of Connecticut, signed in blank. They sent them out to the city of Cincinnati, signed in blank, all ready for delivery. There were over 60,000 of those papers issued by those two courts, and issued in blank, ready to be delivered to the person applying. They sold them for a dollar apiece, for \$2 apiece, and turned in a glass of whisky to the men who purchased it as a benefit for the purchase made.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. To seal the contract.

Mr. FRYE. Again, Tammany had eighty gangs of repeaters, eight in a gang, nearly all of them pickpockets, thieves, murderers; all of the criminal classes. They had eighty headquarters for the eighty gangs, one of the headquarters being at the house of a leading member of the Tammany ring at that time, not Tweed, but the leading member below him. Those gangs were registered all the way from ten to twenty-five times each in the city of New York. The testimony was beyond question that those men voted from ten to twenty-five times each, one being known to vote twenty-five different times in the city of New York on that day. They registered thousands of men in the city of New York from vacant lots which never had a building on them; they registered thousands of men from liquor saloons, from law offices, from dwelling houses that did not have half a dozen in the family—an innocent family, with twenty or thirty or forty men registered from that house who never had seen it in their lives.

Well, New York was carried for Horatio Seymour by this sort of business, but the United States was thoroughly aroused when the report came. The Union League Club of New York at once commenced operations to have the matter investigated. They sent a memorial to Congress and an attorney in charge of the memorial. Congress listened. An investigating committee was appointed in the House with Lawrence at its head, known as the Lawrence committee. That committee spent months in the city of New York, investigating more thoroughly and more carefully than any other committee ever did before. They made their report to the National House of Representatives.

When the people of the United States read the report they knew that the foundation of this Republic was being shaken. They knew that if that thing was tolerated this Republic was an experiment and undoubtedly soon would be a failure. It was discussed in the British Parliament at the time, and it was declared by a distinguished member that the Republic was tottering and would fall. And it was tottering and would have fallen if nothing had been done. On the strength of the report of the Lawrence investigating committee the Federal election laws which you propose to repeal to-day were enacted and became a part of the statutes of the United States.

Does the Senator from Illinois believe that it was the duty of the United States to take cognizance of this awful, this monumental, this horrible carnival of crime against the ballot in the great Empire State of New York, or does he think that the United States transcended its duty and attempted to crush free-men when it enacted those laws? I pause for a reply.

Mr. PALMER. I answer that the instance put by no means justified the election laws. The fact that there was crime in New York furnished no reason for subjecting every other Congressional district in the country to the suspicion of fraud and the placing over them of supervisors and masters. The redress of that wrong was within the power of Congress to be exercised by a legitimate means directed to that end alone. That is the answer I make. Nothing of that sort would justify placing the whole country under surveillance.

Mr. FRYE. I am surprised at the answer. The Senator is not so good as I thought he was. I think he is no better than the average Democrat. I think, as happens with new recruits frequently, he is even worse. I supposed the distinguished Senator would say promptly that the United States would have been derelict in its duty if it did not see what could be done to protect this grand Republic, for which the Senator had himself fought and bled. But no; he says Congress was not justified in paying attention to this horrible wrong against American citizenship, for now the citizen of a State under the Constitution of the United States is a citizen of the United States, and as such this Republic owes that citizen some duty.

Now, the Senator from Massachusetts the other day, in speaking of the election law, called the attention, I think, of the Senator from Illinois to the fact that it operated well, that it had served the State of New York and the United States as it was hoped it would serve them. He alluded to a report of the committee of which Mr. Cox was at the head. I say that unques-

tionably it did serve well the great State of New York and this Republic. There were 60,000 of these false naturalization papers in the hands of voters, many of them innocent voters. They were liable to arrest and imprisonment for voting a fraudulent ballot. An undertaking was promptly made, when the Federal law was enacted, to recover those false papers from the people who held them. They were all recovered except 1,200. Thirty thousand of these were in New York City, and only 1,200 left today. Has there been no good accomplished? Twenty-eight thousand eight hundred fraudulent naturalization papers were taken from the hands of the voter. Is that nothing to be accomplished? See what Mr. Cox says about it. I have the report before me. I am terribly disappointed that the Senator from Illinois replied to me as he did, for I supposed he would say just exactly the opposite. Mr. Cox says in his report:

The law was intended to provide not only against fraudulent votes, but that no person really entitled to a vote should be refused. The political organizations concurred with Mr. Davenport in this arrangement. It proved a decided success, and the result was what all who have any knowledge of this New York election—

This is the election of 1876, I believe—

have concurred in confirming, that there was comparatively no fraud, and the attempts made to repress it were welcomed by both parties and carried out in good faith.

Does the Senator still say that Congress ought not to have enacted a law which had taken the city of New York and brought it up out from that hell of corruption in 1868, forced a declaration from a Democratic committee that in the election of 1876 there was comparatively no fraud, and the attempts made to repress it were welcomed by both parties and carried out in good faith.

Again the committee says:

The committee would commend to other portions of the country and to other cities this remarkable system, developed through the agency of both local and Federal authorities acting in harmony for an honest purpose. In no portion of the world, and in no era of time, where there has been an expression of the popular will through the forms of law, has there ever been a more complete and thorough illustration of republican institutions. Whatever may have been the previous habit or conduct of elections in those cities, or howsoever they may conduct themselves in the future, this election of 1876 will stand as a monument of what good faith, honest endeavor, legal forms, and just authority may do for the protection of the electoral franchise.

Now, Samuel S. Cox was a good Democrat, firm in the faith, accepted all the Democratic doctrines, and yet empowered by Congress to investigate, he investigated, and made this declaration. Seven years after the enactment of the Federal election laws he says again:

From the moment the supervisors are appointed; from the moment that the lists are purged; from the moment that the applications are examined; to the very last return of the popular expression, this election shows the calm mastery of prudence. For this due credit should be given to men of both parties, and especially to the corporation counsel, Mr. Whitney, and United States supervisors.

Now, I supposed when I asked the Senator that question he would say, "Yes, it was the duty of the United States, but times have changed. Civilization has been advancing. The ballot is more sacred now than it was then. The States have advanced in the race, and you can to-day safely trust them, and therefore you do not need these Federal election laws." That is what I supposed would be the answer of the Senator from Illinois, and there I had intended to join issue with him. I had proposed to discuss at length the laws in the several States, especially in the South. I will not do so at this late hour in the day, but I wish again to call the attention of the Senator of the State of New York.

In 1871 there was a committee of seventy in that State made up of thirty-five Democrats and thirty-five Republicans. What for? To see if that great State could not be taken out from under the control of the Tweed-Tammany ring; to see if laws could not be enacted which would protect the ballot in State elections as well as the ballot had been protected, as was thought by Mr. Cox, in the Federal elections. That committee had a law drafted. Mr. Davenport drafted it. It was sent to the Legislature at Albany. It was finally adopted. Governor Hoffman refused twice to sign it, but finally consented, and it became a law. That law, similar in many respects to the United States law, remained on the statute book from 1872 until two years ago. It was a wise, a wholesome, and a judicious law; and it is claimed in New York that the State elections under the State law were as free from fraud and corruption as the Federal elections under the Federal law.

Mr. HOAR. In the districts where the Federal law applies?

Mr. FRYE. Yes, of course, where the Federal law applies. Now, Tammany again came to the front and obtained once more the control of the New York Legislature. What did they do? Of course they did just exactly what they did when Tweed was at the head of Tammany. They needed just exactly what Tammany needed then—power to corrupt the ballot box, and they immediately proceeded to reform the law which had stood upon

the statute book, which had been the admiration and the praise of good citizens of New York for nearly twenty years. They proceeded to take that law, which was entirely nonpartisan, and make it a partisan law. Then came an election under the State law, not under the laws which the Senator from Illinois desires to repeal, but under the State laws improved by Tammany. What is the result?

The Senator from New Hampshire and the Senator from Massachusetts the other day in graphic language gave many of the results of that election in points where Tammany determined to control. I have here in my hand Democratic witnesses. Ordinarily I would not think them of so much value, but where they are testifying against their own party I take them as unimpeachable.

Mr. GRAY. When you want to prove anything against them you have to resort to it?

Mr. FRYE. When I want to prove anything against themselves.

[From the Brooklyn Eagle.]

A CONSPIRACY TO WORK FRAUD.

The Brooklyn Eagle, of course, is a Democratic paper.

The object of the criminals who have set themselves in rebellion against the law and the courts here is to prevent the fraudulent registration list from being copied and published. That object has been attained. Time enough to get it and publish it between now and election does not remain. Publication after election could directly have no effect upon the election, although it may have the effect of throwing out the whole poll of the town, by order of the courts. The fraudulent registration at Gravesend and elsewhere has been effected for a distinct purpose. The purpose is to enable the machine, by dishonest and unlawful votes, to count in a majority over the honest and lawful votes of the people. The machine's boast is that "it can count down any majority less than 10,000 against its candidates," and this boast is made openly and defiantly. The challenge to honest and lawful voters, then, is to poll more votes by over 10,000 for the men of their choice than can be cast or counted for the men of the machine's choice. An honest election will therefore have to be secured by a tremendous preponderance of expression in its favor, unless the men who are fraudulently registered can be prevented from voting. The people clearly understand the situation, and if they are really aroused they will be equal to it.

From the New York World, Democratic:

OPEN AND FLAGRANT CRIME.

It is open and flagrant crime. It is an attempt on the part of a boss to set aside by brute force the election laws and all other laws, to nullify the orders of the supreme court, and to usurp government in his own person. The matter lies wholly without the boundaries of election controversy. It is revolt against all authority. It is rebellion against the State of New York. There is but one thing to do in the matter. Whatever the courts may succeed in doing toward releasing the imprisoned men or securing something like an election in Gravesend, John Y. McKane and all who have abetted him in this crime must be indicted, tried, and sent to prison for long terms. If the machinery of the law is not competent to accomplish that, and is not vigorously used to that end, then order is at an end in Kings County, and civilized popular government has given place to anarchy, directed by a usurping despot. There can be no quibbling or shuffling in a case like this. There can be no toleration shown for such a crime against all that is fundamental in our government. There can be no shirking on the part of any law officer without shame to him and to the community that tolerates him. The case is one for the governor's attention and the attorney-general's. It touches the vital things of government.

I read no more of that. I want to print an article from the New York Herald. I will not stop to read it, but it is as vigorous as the others in its denunciation of the frauds in the last election, after the change of the law which had stood so long on the statute book—

Mr. GRAY. What year was that?

Mr. FRYE. Last year. I submit the article from the Herald:

M'KANE DISREGARDS CIVIL RIGHTS.

Boss John Y. McKane, of Coney Island, seems to have outdone all the infamous acts of his fellow-members of the gang that controls Kings County. His wanton arrest of the fourteen men whom Lawyer Gaynor sent to Gravesend to procure copies of the lists of registered voters caps the climax of impudent arrogance and brutal disregard of the rights of citizens that have marked his career since he first became a ruler in the land. Fraud and corruption have admittedly controlled recent elections in Gravesend. McKane knows it better than any one else, and he knows that without these invaluable aids he would be shorn of much of his power. Lawyer Gaynor, who is a candidate for the supreme court bench, publicly declared his intention to put an end, if possible, to the illegal practices, and he set about doing it in a businesslike manner. The law and the courts were on his side, and all that was left for McKane was to rise superior to the law. He has done this in the present instance with temporary success. He may continue his defiance until after election day, but after that there will be an accounting. Lawyer Gaynor is a hard fighter, and at the outset he promised to land some one in State prison. The chances seem to be in his favor.

Also, from the Evening Post:

NOTHING SO SERIOUS SINCE THE WAR.

[From the Evening Post, Mugwump.]

The developments of the last few days must have convinced thousands of voters that they will go to the polls to-morrow under more serious conditions than have characterized any other election in this State since the war. Not only has the Democratic party put a criminal in the field for a seat on the bench of our highest court, but it is seeking to accomplish his election by criminal methods. The defiance of law and the outrages upon the private rights of reputable citizens which a deputy boss in Kings County is able both to order and to sustain day after day in the open interest of fraud at the polls, are proceedings which must be charged upon the Democratic political organization of the State. Behind McKane and McLaughlin stand Governor Flower, Lieutenant-Governor Sheehan, and Senators HILL and

MURPHY. There is no escape for them, or for their party from the full responsibility for the crimes against American government which McKane is committing.

John W. Goff was assistant district attorney, and he says in relation to it:

TRICKS OF THE WORKERS.

I can truthfully say that nothing has occurred in this city since my boyhood, when I remember the stupendous frauds practiced by the Tweed régime, more barefaced than the frauds committed at the last election. In the assembly district presided over, in the interest of Tammany Hall, by one of our officials, where the population would rightly average about 7,000 voters, nearly 13,000 votes were cast. There were over 4,000 votes cast illegally in that district alone. Wholesale colonization and repeating did it.

In some places holes were cut in walls so that workers in the adjoining buildings could communicate with voters in booths and instruct them which ballot to deposit. This is evidence which we have.

Now, if I am right that Tammany will not hesitate a single moment when in power to retain that power by violence against the rights of American citizenship and frauds upon the ballot, and they have the Legislature of their State in their power and control as they did two years ago, does the Senator from Illinois think that it is safe to trust the elections to them and to the laws of the State?

Mr. President, this matter of the ballot ought to be sacred to American citizens. It is the foundation stone upon which this Republic rests. If it is rotten and corrupt, the edifice will certainly fall in time, and this attempt every now and then to corrupt the ballot will come home one of these days like a cyclone or a whirlwind, bringing destruction in those States where it is permitted.

Mr. President, I do not agree that these election laws ought to be repealed. I would consent perhaps cheerfully to their repeal were I confident that the States would do their duty. But when I find a great State like that of Mississippi enacting into a solemn constitution a provision that a voter must be able to read the constitution of his State or interpret it to the satisfaction of a Democratic examining committee, I dare not trust the State of Mississippi.

Mr. GRAY. Or Massachusetts?

Mr. FRYE. Massachusetts has no such law.

Mr. GRAY. It has.

Mr. FRYE. No State on the face of this earth ever had such an iniquitous constitutional provision.

Mr. GRAY. It has a more stringent law, and I will show it to the Senator.

Mr. FRYE. It has nothing more stringent than that.

Mr. GRAY. Certainly it has.

Mr. FRYE. There is no Senator on the floor of the Senate who can perhaps interpret the Constitution of the United States to the satisfaction of an examining committee. Senators differ in their construction of the Constitution every time they are on their feet discussing a constitutional question.

Mr. GRAY. I will show the Senator when he gets through that the State of Massachusetts has a more stringent law.

Mr. PALMER. May I say to the Senator from Maine that that very much resembles the constitution of Hawaii, established by the Christian colony.

Mr. FRYE. If the Senator from Illinois will wait a short time until the evidence which has been taken has been authorized to be made public, I shall be very happy then to undertake to give him some light on the Hawaiian question.

Mr. PALMER. I simply asked as to the resemblance between Mississippi and Hawaii.

Mr. FRYE. I think Hawaii would not suffer in the comparison.

Mr. BATE. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Maine yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. FRYE. I do, with pleasure.

Mr. BATE. In regard to that question, I desire to call the attention of the Senator from Maine to what Massachusetts says in her law. I read from Title 2, "Qualifications of voters," page 1156, Statutes of Massachusetts, 1893:

Every male citizen of 21 years of age or upward, not being a pauper or person under guardianship, who is able to read the constitution of the Commonwealth in the English language, and write his name, etc.—

Shall have the right to vote.

That is all I have to say, sir.

Mr. FRYE. And if there had been added to that constitution, "or if he could interpret it to the satisfaction of the committee" the Senator would find that it had made a mighty change in its possibilities.

Mr. GRAY. Will the Senator from Maine allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. FRYE. With pleasure.

Mr. GRAY. Does not the Senator from Maine see that the provision of the constitution of Mississippi which he just quotes as compared with the provision of the statute of Massachusetts

just read by the Senator from Tennessee is a liberalization of the qualifications for voters. In Massachusetts a man to vote must be able to read the constitution in the English language, and in Mississippi if he can not read the constitution yet can understand its provisions he may vote, though he can not read.

Mr. FRYE. Oh, the Senator talks exactly as if he was in sober earnest.

Mr. GRAY. I am in sober earnest, and you ought to be.

Mr. FRYE. What? That the constitution of Mississippi is more liberal than the constitution of Massachusetts?

Mr. GRAY. In that respect; certainly.

Mr. FRYE. More liberal to whom?

Mr. VOORHEES. Infinitely more.

Mr. GRAY. Infinitely more. If the Senator can not understand the English language himself he ought not to be able to vote in either State.

Mr. FRYE. The Senator would not wish to vote if he could not understand the English language; but if I were a colored man in the State of Mississippi and wished to put my vote into the ballot box, and could not read the Constitution—this is where the liberality comes in—all I have got to do is to interpret it to the satisfaction of the Democratic officers.

Mr. GRAY. Yes. Well?

Mr. FRYE. Is that more liberal?

Mr. GRAY. Certainly, it is. In Massachusetts there is no hope for him; but when he can not read in Mississippi, if he can understand he can vote.

Mr. FRYE. If he can interpret the Constitution.

Mr. GRAY. It is that much more liberal, at any rate.

Mr. FRYE. This is the clause of the constitution of Mississippi:

On and after the 1st day of January, 1832, every elector shall, in addition to the former qualifications, be able to read any section of the constitution of this State, or he shall be able to understand the same when read to him, and give a reasonable interpretation thereof.

Mr. HOAR. It lets in the Democrat and keeps out the Republican.

Mr. FRYE. Of course, it lets in the Democrat and keeps out the Republican. It was intended to do so, and nothing more. I think the Senator from Delaware himself knows that.

Mr. GRAY. If the Senator will allow me; I do not want to interrupt him without his permission.

Mr. FRYE. Oh, certainly; I yield.

Mr. GRAY. Now comes in the question of partisanship. He is talking now about the administration of law, concerning which, as a matter of fact and personal knowledge, he can know nothing; but I am talking about the provisions of the two constitutions. I submit to the Senator and to every man within the sound of my voice if I was not justified when I said that the provision of the Mississippi constitution, as it was read by the Senator from Maine, is more liberal towards the voter than the Massachusetts statute and constitution.

In Massachusetts, if he can not read the constitution in the English language, that is the end of it; he can not vote; "go your way." No matter how good a citizen he is, no matter how intelligent he is, no matter if he can understand it when it is read to him, he can not vote. But in Mississippi, if he can not read it, yet, if he can understand it when it is read to him, he may still vote. I ask if that is not a more liberal provision?

Mr. FRYE. If he can not read it, if he can understand it and give a reasonable interpretation, Democratic partisan officers being the judge of the reasonable interpretation—

Mr. GRAY. Oh, no.

Mr. FRYE. The Senator may laugh. The Senator says I do not know anything about the administration of the laws in Mississippi.

Mr. GRAY. No; of the constitution of Mississippi.

Mr. FRYE. I know a good deal more about it than I wish I knew.

Mr. HOAR. Will the Senator from Maine allow me to say that that clause was denounced by eminent Democrats in the constitutional convention of Mississippi as a fraud or trick on the voter? The majority of the people of that State are colored. The majority of the people of that State are Republicans, and in order to prevent them from voting this plan was devised that no man should vote who could not read. Then it was said, "Why, that will exclude nearly 50 per cent of the white Democrats of Mississippi whom our national statistics show can not read;" and therefore they put in a clause that if a man can expound the constitution to the satisfaction of these officers, who are all Democrats, they will let him in, and if he does not satisfy these officers, who are all Democrats, they will keep him out.

It is as miserable a trick to exclude Republicans and let in Democrats at the discretion of these officers as it was said to be by the eminent and honest Democrats in that constitutional convention. That is the whole of it.

Mr. GRAY. If the Senator from Maine will allow me, I have always understood that the creed of the Senator from Massachusetts embraced the article that it was always a trick when he suspected that a Republican was to be excluded and a Democrat voted, and that it was not a trick, no matter what device was resorted to, when a Democrat was to be excluded and a Republican voted.

Mr. HOAR. The Senator answers the statement of leading Democrats in his accustomed fashion by a personality about me. That is his style.

Mr. FRYE. I am entirely willing to yield the remainder of my time to the Senator from Delaware and the Senator from Massachusetts. They both can occupy it to much better advantage than I. I confess when I took the floor I did it for the purpose of asking the Senator from Illinois a pretty long question, without the remotest idea of going any farther than that question, and I have been led along by my own perhaps somewhat intense feeling about this matter. I shall not pursue the discussion any farther to-night. I had desired to-morrow to address the Senate on a subject connected with this, and probably shall take the opportunity, if I can get it, to do so.

Mr. PALMER. I ask permission to devote a few moments' attention to the Senator from Maine. I understand he complains that the naturalization laws of the United States have been abused for the purposes of fraud. The natural suggestion, then, would be to amend the laws and remove the temptation and the possibility of fraud as much as possible. The conditions he describes in New York would not be affected by the election laws. They are simply evidence of fraud, successful fraud, and that could not be prevented by any existing law.

As to the next proposition, does the Senator hold that because fraud existed in New York, about which I know nothing—the Senators from New York will no doubt defend their State as I would defend Illinois, if the imputation applied to Illinois—does the Senator mean to intimate that because of those frauds in New York this law ought to be extended over the whole forty-four States of the Union? Is it not possible by legislation to amend the naturalization laws so as to afford no opportunity for the methods of fraud he describes? I could myself make a suggestion that would occur to any Senator, I think, that, if the Federal judiciary are to be trusted invariably, the power of naturalization be given to the Federal judiciary. Let it be given to them if that would of itself protect and prevent the abuses the Senator describes. If the naturalization laws had been honestly administered, I apprehend he will concede that the whole superstructure of fraud of which he complains would have fallen; there would have been no foundation for it. Because those laws were abused, therefore, must this law be wholesome in its operation?

Mr. President, I think one of the dangers to which our system is subjected is the constant practice on the part of lawmakers to endeavor to meet extreme cases by extravagant and violent provisions of law. The great State of New York is one of the most intelligent and patriotic States of the Union. Is it true that the institutions of that State are subverted? Is it true that there are not honest people enough in the State to see that their own laws are properly and honestly enforced? Has corruption taken such complete possession of the whole body of the people that there is no hope except by the stern interposition of Federal power?

The Senator from Maine made a remark which it strikes me has answered this problem. He said that the communities in which these violations of law are permitted will ultimately suffer the consequences that always follow such examples. Is it true that the people of New York neglect their duty? Is not that the reason why we are constantly expected to give despotic powers to governments in order to compel men to do their duty? If the law-abiding people of New York would do their duty and enforce the laws of their own State there would be no occasion for the exercise of this despotic power, because it is despotic in its very nature, for two private citizens may put the whole machinery in motion.

So, the cases put by the Senator do not justify the law. I know nothing of those cases. If he describes them accurately they are disgraceful; they are dangerous; but is this the remedy for them? Is there not a remedy in the fact that the people interested will themselves interfere for their own protection?

The Senator says that there were organizations in New York intended to protect the purity of elections, and that they were successful. The Senator says that the people of New York permitted this dangerous organization which he describes as Tammany to get possession, and that Tammany, notorious for its fraud, notorious for its efforts against good government, came again into power. How did it happen that Tammany came into power again? If the Senator has described Tammany truly, and if a class of people are so corrupt and rotten that despotism would be their natural and proper condition, then Tammany

came into power by the consent of the people of New York, and let them bear the consequences. Illinois has not been guilty of these wrongs. Indiana, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Michigan, and all those States have been guilty of no wrong. Why then put them in the hands of leading strings or make it possible for any two individuals to create a horde of officers?

Mr. President, the law under consideration lacks another element. It lacks the element of courage. If those who favor such a law themselves believe what they say, let them take the control of the election for members of Congress into the hands of the Government itself by just and equal laws and not resort to this miserable abortion by which two persons can set this vast machinery in motion.

Mr. HARRIS. If there be no other Senator who wishes to proceed with the argument on the bill this evening, I will move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. CHANDLER. Will the Senator from Tennessee withhold his motion for a moment? The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. HAWLEY] will be in the Chamber in a few seconds.

Mr. HARRIS. Has the Senator from New Hampshire any suggestion that he wishes to make?

Mr. HAWLEY entered the chamber.

Mr. CHANDLER (to Mr. HAWLEY). Do you want to go on to-night?

Mr. HAWLEY. If the Senate is to take up this measure at 1 o'clock to-morrow, as it did to-day, I should prefer to be heard then.

Mr. HARRIS. I do not remember that the consent arrangement extends to the hour at which the bill is to be taken up to-morrow. The voting commences at 4 o'clock to-morrow.

Mr. HAWLEY. Under the presumption that the bill will be taken up about 1 o'clock to-morrow, I myself should rather be excused from speaking to-day.

Mr. ALLISON. I think it may as well be understood now that the bill will be taken up for consideration immediately after the conclusion of the routine morning business to-morrow.

Mr. HARRIS. I make the request that the pending bill shall be proceeded with to-morrow immediately after the conclusion of the routine business of the morning hour.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. CALL. I should be glad if the Senator from Tennessee would modify his request so as to allow the bill reported from the Judiciary Committee by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. GEORGE] to be placed before the Senate to-morrow morning after the routine business.

Mr. HARRIS. I can not modify my request in respect to that or any other bill until this matter is disposed of.

Mr. CALL. Then I will ask unanimous consent that the bill to which I refer may be considered immediately after the morning business Wednesday morning.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair will first submit the request of the Senator from Tennessee. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. PLATT. What is the request?

Mr. HARRIS. It is that the pending bill be proceeded with immediately after the completion of the routine business to-morrow morning.

Mr. PLATT. What does my colleague say?

Mr. HAWLEY. That suits me.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Tennessee? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The Senator from Florida will state his request.

Mr. CALL. In the absence of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. GEORGE], who has a bill relating to a change in the boundaries of the judicial districts of Florida in charge, I ask that it be agreed that that bill shall be taken up immediately after the routine business Wednesday morning.

Mr. HARRIS. I wish to suggest to the Senator from Florida and other Senators that unanimous-consent agreements applying to days in *future* may become very complicated and very embarrassing to us. I beg to assure the Senator from Florida that when the time comes I shall certainly not interpose any objection to his having consideration of the bill he has indicated; but if Senators will look at our Calendar they will see that we have now three or four unanimous-consent agreements to consider separate measures at specific hours in *future*. It tends to confuse the business of the Senate; and while I shall not object in this case I give notice that I shall object hereafter.

Mr. GALLINGER. I beg leave to suggest to the Senator from Florida that, at the request of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST], Wednesday, after the routine morning business, has been set aside for the consideration of the bill providing additional accommodations for the Government Printing Office, a very im-

portant matter, which ought to be acted upon promptly. Nothing should be permitted to displace that consent.

Mr. CALL. I ask unanimous consent, in the absence of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. GEORGE], that the bill I have indicated may come up on Thursday morning after the morning business.

Mr. FRYE. I wish, while the Senator from Florida is on the floor, to ask him a question.

Mr. CALL. I shall answer it with pleasure.

Mr. FRYE. The Senator, about a week ago, when I read a letter touching an attempt of an election officer in Florida to prevent the voting of 276 men, the next day read a telegram from A. H. Dalembert, declaring it to be an anonymous letter, a fraud, a falsehood, and all that sort of thing. I wish to ask the Senator whether he has not since received another telegram in relation to that matter?

Mr. CALL. I have not.

Mr. FRYE. The gentleman whose letter I then read now writes me:

I was much surprised to see in the Morning News the extract which I found, and as Mr. Dalembert had wired Senators CALL and PASCO, I at once wired them the following:

"Statements contained in the letter read by Senator FRYE in Friday's RECORD are unqualifiedly true and can be proved by twenty witnesses."

Did the Senator from Florida receive any such telegram?

Mr. CALL. I did not, Mr. President.

Mr. HIGGINS. In respect to the request of the Senator from Florida [Mr. CALL] I will state that I have been in communication with parties who object to the passage of that bill. I do not know what my course will be upon the bill when it comes up, but I am not prepared to have it taken up now. I am loth to interpose an objection, but I suggest to the Senator from Florida that he wait until next Thursday and make his proposal then rather than now, so long a time before the day he desires to have set aside for the purpose.

Mr. CALL. Do I understand the Senator from Delaware to object to my request.

Mr. HIGGINS. I say that I do not desire to object, but I suggest to the Senator to delay his application until next Thursday.

Mr. CALL. I should be very glad, on account of the Senator from Mississippi, to have the time definitely fixed. He is not now in the Chamber. He has requested the Senator from Texas [Mr. COKE] to take charge of the bill, and in his absence I shall be glad to have it fixed for Thursday.

Mr. HARRIS. I beg leave to suggest to the Senator from Florida that the Senator from Mississippi being in bad health, whenever he shall appear here and ask for the consideration of the bill at any hour of any day that it is possible in the convenient transaction of the business of the Senate, his appeal will not be ignored and he can get consent for a hearing; but the practice of going four, five, six, or eight days ahead and by unanimous consent agreeing that a particular hour of a particular day shall be devoted to the consideration of a single matter, is a dangerous, an inconvenient, and a bad practice.

I promised the Senator from Florida when I was on the floor a few moments ago that I should not object in this case, and I shall not; but I give notice that upon all future occasions when such propositions are made, looking to days and days ahead, I shall interpose an objection.

Mr. HOAR. I should like to make a statement for the consideration of the Senator from Florida, if I may be permitted.

The bill to which the Senator from Florida refers has passed the House of Representatives; it is the report of a majority of the Judiciary Committee, and is a bill of such nature that the Senator may be quite sure that a majority of the Senate will see that it gets early and proper consideration. It is not one of those bills liable to fail, like some unimportant private bills, because crowded out by other things. So it is a mere question of a few days.

There is a very eminent lawyer in Massachusetts, with whom I have been very well acquainted for thirty years, who has had a good deal of business for clients in Florida, who have large interests there. He is very zealously in favor of the bill. He came to see me and made the strongest statement in its favor that I have heard from any quarter. I received a telegram from him about an hour ago in which he says:

Since I saw you I have been in Florida and have got more facts in regard to the Florida court bill. I shall be in Washington in a few days, or something like that, and will see you again.

When I got that telegram, supposing that the elections repeal bill would take up to-day and to-morrow, I went to the Senator from Delaware [Mr. GRAY], who is considering the question whether he shall oppose the court bill or not, but who, I suppose, would incline against it, and appointed a meeting of that gentleman with him. I should like to have that meeting take place.

I do not know what the gentleman has to report, whether it will change my mind or the mind of the Senator from Delaware, but I should like to have that meeting take place before the bill comes up, if it can be conveniently done. I presume that gentleman will be here on Tuesday or Wednesday. I suggest to the Senator, therefore, in the interest of the bill, not to press for a disposition of it at this time, because it is one of those bills which, of course, will be taken up very soon. The Senate will not disregard the wishes of the Senators from Florida to have the bill come up very soon.

Mr. CALL. I accept the suggestion of the Senator from Massachusetts, and withdraw the request.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. HARRIS. 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 seventeen minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 4 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, February 6, 1894, at 12 o'clock, m.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 5, 1894.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY.

John R. Walker, of Missouri, to be attorney of the United States for the western district of Missouri, vice George A. Neal, whose term expired January 27, 1894.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL.

Joseph O. Shelby, of Missouri, to be marshal of the United States for the western district of Missouri, vice John P. Tracey, whose term expired February 4, 1894.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS.

Augustus Zehring, of Ohio, to be collector of customs for the district of Cuyahoga, in the State of Ohio, to succeed Marcus B. Gary, resigned.

RECEIVERS OF PUBLIC MONEYS.

James P. Ascarate, of Las Cruces, N. Mex., to be receiver of public moneys at Las Cruces, N. Mex., vice Quinby Vance, resigned.

Moses R. DeGroff, of Pineville, Mo., to be receiver of public moneys at Springfield, Mo., vice Horace R. Williams, term expired.

Simpson S. Reynolds, of Grainfield, Kans., to be receiver of public moneys at Wa Keeney, Kans., vice Hill P. Wilson, to be removed.

Vincent L. Snelling, of Lakeview, Oregon, to be receiver of public moneys at Lakeview, Oregon, vice Charles U. Snider, whose term of office expired January 24, 1894.

REGISTERS OF LAND OFFICES.

John D. Bryan, of Las Cruces, N. Mex., to be register of the land office at Las Cruces, N. Mex., vice Samuel P. McCrea, whose term of office expired February 3, 1894.

Edward B. Evans, of Des Moines, Iowa, to be register of the land office at Des Moines, Iowa, vice Nicholas R. Kuntz, to be removed.

Robert M. Veatch, of Cottage Grove, Oregon, to be register of the land office at Roseburg, Oregon, vice John H. Shupe, to be removed.

PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY.

Artillery arm.

First Lieut. Luigi Lomia, Fifth Artillery, to be captain, February 3, 1894, vice Zalinski, Fifth Artillery, retired from active service.

Second Lieut. John D. Miley, Fifth Artillery, to be first lieutenant, February 3, 1894, vice Lomia, Fifth Artillery, promoted.

Infantry arm.

First Lieut. Carver Howland, Fourth Infantry, to be captain, February 3, 1894, vice Quinn, Fourth Infantry, retired from active service.

Second Lieut. Stephen M. Hackney, Sixteenth Infantry, to be first lieutenant, February 3, 1894, vice Howland, Fourth Infantry, promoted.

POSTMASTERS.

Mary M. Force, to be postmaster at Selma, in the county of Dallas and State of Alabama, in the place of Mary M. Force, whose commission expires February 27, 1894.

D. Shepard Shine, to be postmaster at Orlando, in the county of Orange and State of Florida, in the place of Ingram Fletcher, resigned.

William T. Gougar, to be postmaster at Kankakee, in the

county of Kankakee and State of Illinois, in the place of Jay L. Hamlin, whose commission expired January 7, 1894.

Thomas D. Karnes, to be postmaster at Fairbury, in the county of Livingston and State of Illinois, in the place of Benjamin E. Robinson, resigned.

Jeremiah Foley, to be postmaster at Kendallville, in the county of Noble and State of Indiana, in the place of James R. Bunyan, whose commission expired December 21, 1893.

George W. Ingerman, to be postmaster at Noblesville, in the county of Hamilton and State of Indiana, in the place of Nathaniel T. Royer, whose commission expired January 8, 1894.

Willis G. Neff, to be postmaster at Greencastle, in the county of Putnam and State of Indiana, in the place of James McD. Hays, whose commission expired January 8, 1894.

John J. Curran, to be postmaster at Burlington, in the county of Des Moines and State of Iowa, in the place of James N. Martin, whose commission expired January 20, 1894.

Walter Elder, to be postmaster at Clarion, in the county of Wright and State of Iowa, in the place of James C. Harwood, whose commission expired January 8, 1894.

C. W. Ravlin, to be postmaster at Laporte City, in the county of Black Hawk and State of Iowa, in the place of John McQuilkin, whose commission expired January 8, 1894.

Theodore P. Worsley, to be postmaster at Nevada, in the county of Storey and State of Iowa, in the place of Frank D. Thompson, whose commission expired January 8, 1894.

John Lewis, to be postmaster at Franklin, in the county of Saint Mary and State of Louisiana, in the place of Junietta M. Bonney, resigned.

Levi W. Wood, to be postmaster at West Gardner, in the county of Worcester and State of Massachusetts, in the place of Edward F. Potter, whose commission expired January 16, 1894.

William S. Askren, to be postmaster at Bolivar, in the county of Polk and State of Missouri, in the place of Benjamin F. Leonard, whose commission expired January 28, 1894.

Joseph B. Kimenour, to be postmaster at Belvidere, in the county of Warren and State of New Jersey, in the place of Elias M. Fleming, whose commission expired January 20, 1894.

Andrew J. Johnson, to be postmaster at Larimore, in the county of Grand Forks and State of North Dakota, in the place of A. P. Rounseville, whose commission expired January 9, 1894.

George W. Perry, to be postmaster at Greenville, in the county of Darke and State of Ohio, in the place of Isaac G. Heller, whose commission expired December 20, 1893.

Frank S. Harding, to be postmaster at McMinnville, in the county of Yamhill and State of Oregon, in the place of Jacob C. Cooper, whose commission expired December 20, 1893.

John M. Purdy, to be postmaster at Doylestown, in the county of Bucks and State of Pennsylvania, in the place of James W. Bartlett, whose commission expired January 21, 1894.

John H. Donnelly, to be postmaster at Vergennes, in the county of Addison and State of Vermont, in the place of John N. Norton, whose commission expired December 20, 1893.

Adrian W. Wisner, to be postmaster at Olympia, in the county of Thurston and State of Washington, in the place of Val A. Milroy, whose commission expired December 20, 1893.

James Conklin, to be postmaster at Madison, in the county of Dane and State of Wisconsin, in the place of George E. Bryant, whose commission expired January 27, 1894.

Thomas Jenkins, jr., to be postmaster at Platteville, in the county of Grant and State of Wisconsin, in the place of Martin P. Rindlamb, whose commission expired January 16, 1894.

WITHDRAWAL.

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate February 5, 1894.

William H. Thompson, whose nomination was sent to the Senate on the 30th of January, 1894, to be postmaster at Blue Rapids, Marshall County, in the State of Kansas.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 1, 1894.

SURVEYOR-GENERAL.

William P. Watson, of Seattle, Wash., to be surveyor-general of Washington.

RECEIVER OF PUBLIC MONEYS.

John Y. Terry, of Seattle, Wash., to be receiver of public moneys at Seattle, Wash.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY.

Charles Allen Jones, of Nevada, to be attorney of the United States for the district of Nevada.

REGISTER OF THE LAND OFFICE.

Raymond Miller, of Sheridan Lake, Colo., to be register of the land office at Pueblo, Colo.

POSTMASTERS.

Charles S. Ashley, to be postmaster at New Bedford, in the county of Bristol and State of Massachusetts.

Daniel D. Sullivan, to be postmaster at Fall River, in the county of Bristol and State of Massachusetts.

Cornelius Sullivan, to be postmaster at Riverside, in the county of Cook and State of Illinois.

William H. Minor, to be postmaster at Streator, in the county of Lasalle and State of Illinois.

Patrick Stuart, to be postmaster at Lasalle, in the county of Lasalle and State of Illinois.

David P. O'Leary, to be postmaster at Evanston, in the county of Cook and State of Illinois.

J. W. Hinchon, to be postmaster at Algona, in the county of Kossuth and State of Iowa.

F. A. Brown, to be postmaster at Storm Lake, in the county of Buena Vista and State of Iowa.

Joseph Wright, to be postmaster at Rock Falls, in the county of Whiteside and State of Illinois.

Richard Lane, to be postmaster at Dodgeville, in the county of Iowa and State of Wisconsin.

Theodore Knapstein, to be postmaster at New London, in the county of Waupaca and State of Wisconsin.

J. W. Randolph, to be postmaster at Estherville, in the county of Emmet and State of Iowa.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 5, 1894.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS.

John J. King, of Alabama, to be collector of customs for the district of Mobile, in the State of Alabama.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS.

Julius A. Taylor, of Tennessee, to be attorney of the United States for the western district of Tennessee.

Robert U. Culbertson, of Texas, to be attorney of the United States for the western district of Texas.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MONDAY, February 5, 1894.

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m. Prayer by the Hon. WILLIAM EVERETT.

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

FORT MIFFLIN, PA.

The SPEAKER laid before the House a letter from the acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a communication from the Attorney-General relative to the expenses of the chief clerk in the Department of Justice in the matter of the sale of certain lands near Fort Mifflin, Pa.; which was referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

UNITED STATES TREASURY NOTES.

The SPEAKER laid before the House a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a communication from the late Treasurer of the United States, reporting the facts concerning a sealed package of United States Treasury notes received by the redemption division for redemption, and asking that a bill be passed for his relief; which was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

FIREPROOF WAREHOUSE AT NORFOLK NAVY-YARD.

The SPEAKER laid before the House a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting an estimate of appropriations submitted by the Secretary of the Navy for a fireproof storehouse at the navy-yard, Norfolk, Va.; which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

MILITIA FORCE.

The SPEAKER laid before the House a letter from the Secretary of War, submitting an abstract of the militia force of the United States for the year 1893; which was referred to the Committee on Militia, and ordered to be printed.

AWARD TO EXHIBITORS AT COLUMBIAN EXPOSITION.

The SPEAKER laid before the House Senate joint resolution (S. R. 58) to provide suitable cases for medals awarded exhibitors at the World's Columbian Exposition; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

NORTHERN PACIFIC RAILWAY.

Mr. MCGANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution which I send to the desk.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of a resolution; which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk proceeded to read, as follows:

Whereas all persons employed in private establishments or upon public works, when not held in actual slavery, have always had the right to sever their connection with such service—

Mr. OUTHWAITE. Mr. Speaker, I will say just here that I do not think there are a sufficient number of members present in the House to consider a resolution of that importance, and I will object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is made.

PROTEST OF MASSACHUSETTS LEGISLATURE AGAINST CERTAIN SCHEDULES IN TARIFF BILL.

Mr. MORSE. 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:

A resolution of the Massachusetts Legislature protesting against the passage of certain schedules in the Wilson tariff bill as destructive and fatal to industries of Massachusetts.

Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, we have but a limited time, and I shall object to anything but the regular order.

MILITARY PRISON AT FORT LEAVENWORTH, KANS.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the Committee on Military Affairs be discharged from the further consideration of Executive Document 88, relative to the military prison at Fort Leavenworth, Kans., which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and which should have been referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

The SPEAKER. That is in order after the reading of the Journal. The Clerk will report the title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting an additional estimate of appropriations, submitted by the Secretary of War, for the military prison at Fort Leavenworth, Kans.

The SPEAKER. This was erroneously referred to the Committee on Military Affairs. That committee will be discharged, and it will be referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the call of committees for reports, and that gentlemen having such reports may present them at the Clerk's desk.

There was no objection.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

The following reports were handed in at the Clerk's desk, referred to their appropriate Calendars, and otherwise disposed of as indicated below:

DIVISION OF KENTUCKY INTO TWO JUDICIAL DISTRICTS.

Mr. GOODNIGHT, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported back, in the nature of a substitute for H. R. 6, the bill (H. R. 5598) to divide Kentucky into two judicial districts, and to fix the times and places of holding courts therein; which was read a 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.

House bill 6 was laid on the table.

ADVERSE REPORT.

Mr. GEISSENHAINER, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, reported back adversely the bill (H. R. 166) to provide a more perfect organization for the United States Naval Observatory, and for other purposes; which was laid on the table, and the accompanying report ordered to be printed.

BANKRUPTCY.

Mr. WOLVERTON, from the Committee on the Judiciary, submitted the views of the minority on the bill (H. R. 4609) to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy; which were referred to the House Calendar, and ordered to be printed.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. PEARSON, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled the bill (H. R. 4259) for the relief of certain settlers upon the Iowa Reservation, Oklahoma Territory; when the Speaker signed the same.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows: To Mr. WHITING, for ten days, on account of important business.

To Mr. PIGOTT, for a few days, on account of sickness in his family.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the title of the special order.

The Clerk read as follows:

Miscellaneous Document No. 75, expressive of the sense of the House of Representatives relative to Hawaiian affairs.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege, and in doing so I ask to make a statement in reference to the RECORD. Before the beginning of the debate on the tariff discussion—

Mr. BURROWS. Will not the gentleman from Tennessee have the kindness to forego the presentation of this matter now, as the time for debate upon this matter is limited, and so many gentlemen desire to speak? The matter to which he alludes will take some little time.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. I have no desire to call it up at this time, except this, on Friday, I think, the spirit if not the letter of the rule has been violated in a publication in the RECORD. It was repeated in the proceedings of Saturday, published on Sunday, and in all probability more violations will appear in the RECORD. I desire to call it up this morning in order that attention may be directed to it. It is simply the publication in the RECORD of matter which ought not to be published in the RECORD. I will not offer to bring it up now in deference to the suggestion of the gentleman on the other side.

Mr. BURROWS. Let it be called up and considered as pending.

HAWAII.

Mr. BURROWS. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JOHNSON] desires to occupy more than an hour. I ask unanimous consent that he may be permitted to address the House for an hour and fifteen minutes, to be charged to our side.

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. If I may be permitted, I yield two minutes and a half of my time to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE] is recognized for two minutes and a half.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, in that brief time there is one remark which I did not have time to make when my time expired and which I desire to add to my speech of Saturday evening. For the last twenty-five years, since the days of reconstruction began, after the close of the war the "shibboleth" in the South, the political war cry that has downed all opposition, that has downed the Republicans, the Populists, and all other parties, and that has made the South invariably come up of late years with a solid Democratic delegation in Congress, has been the cry "a white man's government."

Now let us hear no more about a white man's government. On the one side of this controversy is a dissolute colored female. She has none, utterly none, of the glamour which attaches to royalty and to persons of noble birth. Her father was a colored barber. On the other side, contending for the right to rule these islands, are not only white men and women, but nearly or quite all the virtuous and intelligent white people of the islands. And yet, strange to tell, at the command of their master, Grover Cleveland, his supporters in the House and in the Senate, staunch Southern Democrats, the loudest shouters for a "white man's government," disregard all of their ancient traditions about white supremacy and the white man's government.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. I call the gentleman to order, and demand that his words be taken down; those in which insulting and impudent language is addressed to members of this side of the House.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the language of the gentleman complained of.

The Clerk (reading from Mr. MORSE's manuscript) read as follows:

On the other side are not only white men and women, but nearly or quite all of the virtuous and intelligent white people of the islands. And yet strange to tell at the command of their master, the great Grover Cleveland, the cuckoos in the House and in the Senate, staunch Southern Democrats—

Mr. OUTHWAITE. The language to which I except is that which speaks of members of the House and the President—

Mr. BURROWS. It is for the Chair to pass on the language.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. I simply wanted the Chair to know the part to which I called attention as out of order.

Mr. COGSWELL. When exception is taken to words spoken

in debate the rules prescribe that the words be taken down, as has been done in this case; they do not prescribe that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. OUTHWAITE] shall comment on the language before it has been ruled upon by the Chair.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. COGSWELL] will permit me to say that I was not commenting on the language. I was merely calling attention to the words to which I objected. I did not propose to comment on the language.

Mr. MORSE. In reading my manuscript I left out the word "cuckoos," which has been read by the Clerk.

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not think the language parliamentary.

Mr. BURROWS. I move that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE] be permitted to explain.

The motion of Mr. BURROWS was agreed to.

Mr. MORSE. I will say that in reading the manuscript I left out the word "cuckoos." I do not know whether that will make any difference in the ruling of the Chair. I omitted that word in the reading, because I did not wish to give any unnecessary offense. Will that make any difference in the ruling?

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not think that any gentleman on the floor of the House has the right to speak of members of the House and Senate as being controlled by "their master," the President. He does not think that language parliamentary.

Mr. MORSE. Well, I will recall so much as is unparliamentary. I bow with entire respect to the ruling of the Chair. I withdraw the words, "at the command of their master," to which the Speaker objects.

Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky. How will the language read now?

Mr. MORSE. It reads now—

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. I do not think this is a matter for the gentleman to state. Let the Clerk read it.

Mr. MORSE. Then the Clerk will have to have my manuscript.

The SPEAKER. The House accorded the gentleman from Massachusetts the right to explain.

Mr. BURROWS. I understand that the gentleman from Massachusetts withdraws the words which the Speaker regarded as unparliamentary. Do I understand that the gentleman does so? [addressing Mr. MORSE.]

Mr. MORSE. I do, sir.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE] has expired. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JOHNSON] has the floor.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, the second of the two resolutions reported to this House by the Committee on Foreign Affairs in connection with this Hawaiian matter (which resolutions are now before this body for discussion and consideration) reasserts the Monroe doctrine and the traditional American policy against the intervention of European powers in American waters. With respect to this policy there is, I imagine, substantial agreement among men of all shades of political opinion in this country. The resolution also declares that it is inexpedient for the United States either to annex the Sandwich Islands or to establish a protectorate over them. Upon this subject there is ample room for a wide and honest difference of opinion. Some of the greatest statesmen and wisest diplomats that the country has ever produced have favored the annexation of Hawaii.

The last Republican President took this view of the matter, and sent to the Senate a treaty of annexation which, however, was somewhat tentative in its terms. The present Executive on coming into power, took the opposite view of the question, and withdrew this treaty from the consideration of the Senate. The subject is now largely a matter of ancient history. I was not surprised the other day, however, to hear the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs [Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky] in the course of his speech in this body argue the question of annexation at considerable length, and I observe that all the gentlemen on the Democratic side of the Chamber who have spoken on the pending resolutions have sought, like the member named, to distract the attention of the House and the country from the burning question of the hour, which is the conduct of Mr. Cleveland in Hawaiian affairs, by discussing the subject of annexation and by attempting to fasten odium upon a United States minister who represented the Republic at Honolulu nearly a year ago.

Mr. Speaker, I am not to be diverted from debating the real, the genuine matter at issue by any such side-bar efforts as these. The question before this House and before the country which will not "down" at the bidding of any gentleman is this, Has or has not the present Administration conducted itself wrongfully in its relations with the Sandwich Islands? But, Mr. Speaker, the feature in this resolution to which I particularly desire to attract the attention of the House is the following language, which

I will read and which I respectfully submit is somewhat remarkable in its phraseology:

*Resolved, That we heartily approve of the principle announced by the President of the United States, that interference with the domestic affairs of an independent nation is contrary to the spirit of American institutions; and it is further the sense of this House * * * that the people of that country should have absolute freedom and independence in pursuing their own line of policy.*

Mr. Speaker, this is the most exquisite piece of satire that I ever saw in my life. It certainly compares favorably with the best things that Junius or Swift ever penned. As a specimen of ridicule, it is well calculated to excite the envy of a Voltaire. For bitter and cutting sarcasm there is no document extant that equals it, unless it be the reply of President Dole to the insolent demand of the American minister for the capitulation of the Provisional Government. The adroitness with which the Committee on Foreign Affairs have, through the medium of this language, inserted the knife under the Executive ribs, and smilingly twisted it, will, I imagine, neither be lost upon the House nor upon the country. I say "smilingly twisted it," for there is not a member on this floor who does not know that the committee could not possibly have been in a serious mood when it formulated and reported this happily worded resolution. It not only damns the Executive with faint praise, but it even reproaches him with great subtlety for his hypocrisy in this Hawaiian matter, for while it ostentatiously approves of the principle which he announced, it cautiously abstains from approving the acts which he committed against the friendly Provisional Government of the Sandwich Islands.

There is no one, sir, so dull but that he can readily perceive that in the reprobation of interference in the domestic affairs of an independent nation contained in this resolution a direct blow is aimed at Mr. Cleveland for his unwarrantable effort to overthrow the Provisional Government and establish a discredited and dishonored monarchy in its place.

Mr. Speaker, I imagine that the Chief Executive will be perfectly delighted when he comes to examine into the ingenious phraseology in which this resolution is couched. I have no doubt that his heart will be filled with pride and with gratitude toward the Committee on Foreign Affairs for this ringing, defiant, and unequivocal vindication of his Hawaiian policy.

I am not able to say, sir, who is the author of this peculiar resolution. It may be that it emanated from the serene smiling and self-satisfied gentleman who is chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. I do not assert this to be true. I only state it of course as a matter of remote conjecture; but, whoever wrote it, it can safely be affirmed of him that he is a born diplomat. He is evidently a gentleman, sir, who understood well how to use the English language, and who has not hesitated to make the most of his opportunity; when the Provisional Government gives Minister Willis his passports in return for the diplomacy which he has recently been practicing with a sledge hammer in the Sandwich Islands, passports which he has certainly earned and richly deserves, I shall take the liberty of submitting to the Executive, Republican though I be, the name of the author of this resolution as a person in all respects well qualified to succeed him in that delicate and important trust.

Whether the person from whom this resolution proceeded was a howling free silverite, who had been waiting to get even with the President for his interference in the legislation of the special session, or whether it came from some Democrat who felt that he had not been sufficiently remembered in the distribution of the loaves and fishes which have been doled out with regularity from the White House immediately after the casting of votes in Congress upon important public measures, I know not, neither do I care. It is sufficient, sir, for me to know that the author has done his work well, and that henceforth he can rest serenely proud and happy in the consciousness that at least the honors between the Executive and himself are pretty evenly divided. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. Speaker, it is hardly necessary for me to say to this House that I am not a prophet. There is but one prophet upon this floor, and that is the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. COCKRAN], who took two hours at a midnight session of the Democratic national convention at Chicago in 1892 to predict that if Grover Cleveland was nominated he would not be elected President of the United States at the ensuing general election.

Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, my attention has just been called to something the gentleman said with regard to the authorship of the resolutions.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. I certainly made some remarks upon that subject.

Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky. Will the gentleman state to whom he refers?

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. I distinctly stated to the House that I did not know who was the author, and I proceeded to treat

the authorship as a matter of conjecture; but I hesitated not to inform the House that I thought the gentleman who wrote the resolution was a man who understood the English language very well, and who had made the most of his opportunity in the use of it.

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky again arose.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. The gentleman will please remember that my time is running and is limited.

Mr. REED. I do not think the gentleman's time need be limited. We have plenty of time.

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. I do not know, Mr. Speaker, just in what line the gentleman is arguing, but—

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Well, Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman has not done me the courtesy to listen to my remarks he must not blame me if I deny him the courtesy of occupying a portion of my limited time. Resuming my remarks at the point where I was interrupted, Mr. Speaker, I will state, for the benefit of the members of this House who may not be very well acquainted with my genealogy, that I am not even the son of a prophet. I make no pretense to prophetic wisdom. Indeed, sir, I lay no claim to wisdom of any character whatsoever. But I nevertheless think that I know something of the temperament and characteristics of my countrymen, and I believe I hazard nothing in predicting here and now that when the intense feeling of shame and indignation which this Hawaiian policy of the President has awakened in all sections of the country and among men of all shades of political opinion has subsided the American sense of humor can confidently be relied upon to assert itself in the premises.

When the newspapers have written this policy up, or rather down; when Puck and The Judge and all the other funny papers have exhausted themselves upon it; when the politicians and the statesmen have talked about it to their hearts' content and the people have worn it threadbare in the corridors of the metropolitan hotels and in the cross-road stores in the rural districts, some American Gilbert and Sullivan, with a genius for music and a well-developed sense of the ludicrous will certainly arise and embalm this whole miserable fiasco in opera bouffe. [Laughter and applause.] And why not, Mr. Speaker? The theme is surely a very inviting one, and I submit to the House, and particularly to the Democratic side of the House, that there is no sphere within the entire range of human attainments in which the subject can be treated with such intense propriety as inside the realm of comic opera.

Why not, sir? I ask again. Mr. Speaker, we have had the charming little operas of Billee Taylor and Pinafore, we have been amused and entertained by the music of Olivette and the Mascotte, and our ears have been ravished by the delightful strains and the sparkling humor of Iolanthe and the Mikado. Each of these compositions has in its turn held a high place in the popular favor, but all of them have now become stale and unprofitable. Why not pander, then, to the public taste for novelty by superseding all of these old favorites with a brand new and strikingly original composition to be known and designated by the somewhat euphonious title of Liliuokalani? [Laughter and applause.] I am satisfied, sir, that an opera like this will prove to be a howling and tremendous success. I think we will soon be able to say of it, as was said of one of the thrusts that Hamlet gave to Laertes, in their bout at swords, that it "is a hit, a palpable hit." [Laughter.] I doubt not that it will shed imperishable renown upon its composers, turn out to be a profitable investment for its managers, and prove an inexhaustible source of hilarious entertainment to the great playgoing and mirth-loving American public. It will be one of those operas too, sir, which will admit of frequent repetition. It can doubtless be run with success for a great number of consecutive nights, and the stereotyped sign, "standing room only," will unquestionably be hung out on the nights of the performance long before the time arrives for the ringing up of the curtain.

Our handsome society beaux, with their hair divided on party lines and their faultless bodies arrayed in swallow-tail coats, and our sweet society belles, in décolleté dresses, God bless them! will crowd into the proscenium boxes to witness the performance. Lovely American women, with enormously amplified head gear, will condescend to sit in the front rows of the auditorium and give themselves completely over to the enjoyment of the play in unselfish disregard of the fact that that portion of the audience seated in their immediate rear is wholly unable to obtain even a momentary glimpse of the stage. [Laughter.] Noble American men, with the stale odor of cigarettes on their clothing and the faintest possible suspicion of cloves on their breath, will rise promptly at the end of each act and glide noiselessly down the aisles so as not to disturb the rest of the audience, and disappear in the cold night air "to see a man" in conformity with the time-honored American custom in such cases made and provided. [Laughter.] And the demigods of the

gallery, those irrepressible and discriminating critics of the play, will crowd into their airy perches at 15 cents per capita, and applaud the performance, just as the people in these galleries applauded the performance of the modest and unassuming statesman from Nebraska [Mr. BRYAN] one evening during the course of the tariff debate, after his nocturnal appearance had been advertised from the chair just at the close of the afternoon session of the House in response to an exceedingly parliamentary inquiry made by my friend from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER], and made, too, I have no doubt, against the expressed wishes and over the angry protests of the breezy statesman from the great Northwest. [Laughter and applause.]

When the curtain rises upon the first act of this new opera of ours, Mr. Speaker, I have no doubt that it will disclose a scene in the far-away Sandwich Isles. It will probably be a representation of the dusky queen seated in semibarbaric splendor upon her throne, her head decorated with huge ostrich feathers and her nose and ears adorned with great brass rings in the act of promulgating a new constitution for the enlargement of the liberty of her subjects and the promotion of Christianity and civilization throughout her realms. [Laughter.] I fear that owing to the limited area of the stages of our opera houses, especially in the rural districts, it will be impossible to give an accurate representation of the landing of that enormous army of marines which shot the life out of the royal dynasty of Hawaii on that eventful January day, but it is believed that, with a proper amount of red light and a liberal supply of Chinese firecrackers, it may be possible to give some adequate portrayal of that terrible scene of bloodshed and slaughter which ushered the Provisional Government into existence. [Great laughter.]

Gentlemen on this floor, Mr. Speaker, who are *habités* of the theaters and the opera houses of this city, but who condescend incidentally and at odd hours to figure as Representatives in this Chamber [laughter] will bear me out in the statement that all opera is divided mainly into solos and choruses. At particular stages of the performance certain actors who possess both the courage and the voice must advance unattended to the footlights and there, without any assistance from the rest of the company, warble their lays alone. Now, how would it do, Mr. Speaker, to have in this comic opera of ours a character, to be designated as "My Commissioner," come forward to the footlights, arrayed in a wide sombrero hat, and bearing a great white sheet of parchment under his arm, embellished with an enormous red seal, and wound about with half a dozen bolts of red tape, and warble in a jubilant strain, and through the medium of a strong tenor voice a solo commencing, "I am the Lord High Paramount." [Great laughter.] Mr. Speaker, if it be necessary, in order to round out to its perfect proportions this little opera that we should have something in the spectacular line, the praiseworthy incident of the hauling down of the American flag will amply answer our purpose. There have been times, Mr. Speaker, in the history of this Republic when the hauling down of this flag was attended with some little degree of danger and expense, and the general consensus of opinion among patriotic Americans has always been that it was rather a disreputable thing to do.

I submit, however, that in the light of recent events the experiment can now be performed without any very great amount of personal hazard, and that, at least in certain high places, the act does not seem at present to be regarded as involving any very great degree of moral turpitude. By all means, sir, let us give the incident of the lowering of the country's flag, an incident so flattering to the national vanity, a conspicuous place in this comic opera of ours. It will tend to ennoble our youth, to inculcate in them exalted sentiments of patriotism, and to inspire them with a high sense of the obligation which they owe to their country. It will certainly have a direct tendency to arouse the adult portion of the audience to a perfect frenzy of patriotic emotion and enthusiasm.

Mr. Speaker, it might not be a bad idea, too, for the manager of the play to arrange for the display to the audience from some conspicuous place on the stage, in altero relieve letters, just as the national ensign comes down, that memorable utterance of a great Democratic official, which once so roused the patriotic sentiment of the country, "If anyone attempts to haul down the American flag shoot him on the spot."

I think, sir, that at this stage of the performance an encore can confidently be expected from the now thoroughly delighted audience, and just imagine, if you can, Mr. Speaker, what a motley and incongruous crowd it will call to the footlights. Behold, if you please, the impersonator of that sovereignty which presides at the White House over the destinies of 70,000,000 of free and prosperous people, coming before the curtain to respond to this encore, leading by the hand the delineator of the dusky Queen of the Sandwich Islands, bowing right and left in grateful if not graceful acknowledgment of the applause; and followed by the other leading lights of the company, including

the impersonator of the recent political convert from my own fair State, who seems to have descended from Republicanism and the bench to Democracy and a seat in the Cabinet just in time to contribute a strong flavor of popularity to the Hawaiian policy of his distinguished chief. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. Speaker, it will be conceded, I think, on this floor that any opera having for its theme the policy of Mr. Cleveland in Hawaiian affairs, which fails to contain at least an incidental reference to this House, can not, in the very nature of things, be a complete success.

Our musical composition ought, therefore, to contain a representation of that Damon and Pythian like friendship, that implicit and generous confidence which has subsisted between the Chief Executive and this body from the very inception of his Hawaiian policy down to the moment when, in an outburst of kindly emotion, and doubtless from the sincere conviction that the House was amply able to attend to it without his aid, he impulsively dumped the whole of the rubbish into the legislative lap. There might also with propriety, Mr. Speaker, be a representation of this body engaged in debate on the Hawaiian question, in which representation there might be presented the spectacle of a bellicose gentleman importunately vociferating from behind a fierce white moustache for recognition upon a question of high privilege, only to be knocked into his seat in the sovereign name of parliamentary law by another bellicose gentleman, standing on an elevated platform, and manipulating a trip hammer with the resolute air of a man determined at whatever hazard to preserve decorum, and to maintain the constitutional rights and prerogatives of this House. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. Speaker, the closing scene in this opera, however much it may be lacking in other essential particulars, will at least commend itself to the audience on account of its strict fidelity to historic truth. It will, therefore, of necessity portray the signal triumph of Mr. Cleveland's Hawaiian policy in the humiliating and unconditional surrender of the Provisional Government, and the complete restoration to her throne of the mild-mannered Queen, whose heart hath ever been, and I doubt not will ever continue to be, the abiding place of all that is gentle and forgiving in her sex.

And now, Mr. Speaker, let us ring down the curtain on this opera of ours. Let us dismiss the audience and, passing from the arena of humor into the arena of disputation, where the subject in hand can be treated with that seriousness which its importance demands, let us see if we can place the responsibility for this miserable Hawaiian policy where it rightly belongs.

Sir, as the Representative in this Chamber of an intelligent and patriotic constituency, I charge that this Administration has sought to invest its official purpose in the Hawaiian matter with secrecy and mystery; that it has attempted to cloak its official acts from the scrutiny of its countrymen; that it has endeavored to deceive the people of the two countries most concerned, and has been prevented from carrying out this object in the one country only by the vigilance of the press and the people, and in the other by the admitted diplomatic superiority of the leader of the Provisional Government, who has all along held the scheming American minister in the hollow of his hand, and has forced him to drop to the low level of a pettifogging lawyer in his official correspondence, because he was unable either to deny or to justify the well-founded charges of diplomatic bad faith which were preferred against him.

I charge that this Administration, having been elected as the servant of the people, has in this matter sought to set itself up as their master; that it has shown itself possessed of all of the arrogance of Louis XIV without having any of the virtues of that renowned monarch; that it has defied the press, treated the people with contempt, and ignored the legislative branch of the Government which it was its duty to consult.

I charge upon this Administration that without the consent and advice of the American Senate, and hence in plain violation of the spirit and letter of the Constitution, it sent a person whom it has been pleased to style "my commissioner," but upon whom were conferred powers equivalent to those of an ambassador, to a government whose head it saluted as "my great and good friend," with instructions to frame against this Government an indictment which is false in fact, and which no amount of persistence and mendacious reiteration can ever make true.

I charge upon this Administration that it sent its minister to grovel at the feet of a bloodthirsty queen, a queen who, according to the statement of this very minister, surrounded herself in her retirement with the worst and most vicious element of her Empire for her advisers, and to tender to her its sympathetic regrets that she had been deposed from her throne by a class of her subjects who, according also to the testimony of this very minister, comprise the most intelligent, the most progressive, and the most enlightened of all the citizens of her realm.

I charge upon this Administration that it sent this minister to a friendly government—a *de facto* and existing government—with words of amity upon his lips, but with secret instructions to immediately conspire for its overthrow and destruction, and that this minister did actually so conspire, thus doing the very thing which it falsely charged had been done against a Hawaiian Government by the representative of a preceding Administration, and to put into the saddle a government which, if this minister is to be believed, would no sooner have been seated until it would have attempted to ride roughshod over the very constitution for the infraction of which it was originally hurled from power.

I charge upon this Administration that it committed a wrong and a crime when it sent its representative to a friendly government to insultingly demand that it surrender to a barbarous Queen—a demand, sir, the only effect of which was to call forth from President Dole an answer so firm, conclusive, and patriotic that it touched a responsive chord in the breast of every American citizen, and evoked an applause which never died away until it had traversed the entire civilized globe.

But, Mr. Speaker, I charge this Administration, in conclusion of this branch of the subject, with the commission of an act far more reprehensible than any which I have yet named. I charge it with having carelessly and negligently, if not wantonly, put in jeopardy the lives of men in whose veins coursed American blood. The Administration, sir, had ample opportunity to know something of the crafty, unscrupulous, and bloodthirsty nature of this Queen; it had plenty of time to observe her and to study her. It had seen her plotting and intriguing to overthrow the constitution of 1887, which she had sworn to support. It had seen her yield in this endeavor only when she found that persistence would call forth a storm which she would be powerless to resist. It had seen her, when amnesty was insisted upon as the condition of her restoration, reject the condition and with all the fury of a savage beast demand the blood of her rebellious subjects. It had seen her day after day and night after night persist in this demand for the period of an entire month, resisting alike appeals that were made to her humanity and the advice of her most valued counsellors. It had seen her whirl suddenly around when she found that the price of her persistence would be the loss of her throne, and immediately retract her demand—not because she had honestly and in good faith abandoned her purpose, but simply as a ruse, and that she might postpone the time for the accomplishment of her design until a more favorable opportunity for carrying it out should arrive.

Mr. Speaker, nobody has ever accused this Administration of showing any sense or judgment in connection with this Hawaiian matter, but it ought to have known, and it doubtless did know, that this apparent change of heart on the part of the Queen was insincere, that her mind was the seat of malevolence and revenge, and that her word could not be relied upon. It ought to have known that, once restored to her throne and with the members of the Provisional Government completely in her power, the American vessels would no sooner have steamed out of Honolulu Bay until she would have pounced upon her victims as a cormorant pounces upon its helpless prey, and would have hurried them with fiendish impatience to the block, there to inflict upon them a punishment as terrible as that administered by the Chinese executioner; as horrible as that inflicted by the bloody guillotine of the French Revolution. Mr. Speaker, an opportune time for the Administration to have called a halt in its Hawaiian policy was at the very moment this Queen first demanded blood. The blunders previously committed by it might then have been forgiven if not forgotten by the American people. This was the fitting opportunity to take counsel of those whom it had all along ignored. Here was the place for it to inquire whether after all its views were not "so extreme as to require further instructions," instructions from its own conscience, if it possessed a conscience in this matter, and, if not, then of Congress and the people of the United States. And yet, with full knowledge of this Queen's treacherous character, the Administration still persisted in endeavoring to restore her to power and thus put these men of American birth at her mercy.

Sir, I congratulate the President of the United States on the failure of his policy, a failure for which he was in no wise responsible, and for which the American people will certainly acquit him of all blame; for I affirm here and now, and I weigh my words well when I say it, and speak without being carried away by the impetuosity of debate, that had he succeeded in his plan, and had this Queen, on being restored by him to her throne, taken the lives of any of these men the patient American people would have arisen in their might and demanded his punishment under the Constitution and the laws, and the world, for the first time in its history, would have witnessed the spectacle of an American President successfully impeached. Sir, it was for aggressions not wholly dissimilar to those which the President has committed at every step of his Hawaiian policy, that one

English monarch was brought to the block and another driven a trembling fugitive from the land over which he had previously reigned supreme.

Mr. Speaker, the first of the two resolutions reported by the Committee on Foreign Affairs to the House is in the following language:

Resolved, First, that it is the sense of this House that the action of the United States minister in employing United States naval forces, and in illegally aiding in overthrowing the constitutional Government of the Hawaiian Islands in January, 1893, and in setting up in its place a Provisional Government, not republican in form and in opposition to the will of the majority of the people, was contrary to the traditions of our Republic and the spirit of our Constitution, and should be and is condemned.

Sir, the allegations contained in this resolution are not true. They have been contradicted by the great preponderance of the evidence. They have been denied by the press of the nation, including many leading papers of Democratic faith, and are not believed by the people. Many members upon the Democratic side of this Chamber do not believe that the American minister instigated the overthrow of the Hawaiian Queen and aided in the establishment of the Provisional Government. When the special session of Congress was convened last summer, there were many of our friends on the other side of this House who made the air of Washington vocal with their declamations that they would never, never vote to repeal the purchasing clause of the Sherman act. They assigned as one reason for this resolution that with that clause wiped from the statute book, no legislation friendly to silver could ever be obtained while Mr. Cleveland was in the White House. But, Mr. Speaker, when the time arrived to vote upon the repeal of this provision, a sudden change came o'er the spirit of their dreams, and these gentlemen cast their votes in the affirmative. I am watching now with some curiosity, sir, to see whether or not history is to repeat itself in this Hawaiian matter. I am anxious to see whether in this affair, as in the other, there are to be some miraculous conversions—conversions as sudden and unexpected as that of Saul of Tarsus. If so, it will simply be another striking exemplification of the overpowering personality of the inmate of the White House, and of the utter incapacity of the Democratic members of this body to resist his influence, even when their consciences tell them that he is wrong.

Mr. Speaker, I firmly believe that these charges against Minister Stevens are false. They are very largely dependent for their support upon the report of James H. Blount. That report is prejudiced and *ex parte*. Much of its evidence is given in response to the leading questions of an adroit lawyer. There was no opportunity for a cross-examination of the witnesses, and the men whom it assailed were given no chance to testify in their own defense. It is the presentation of a grand jury, and not the verdict of a petit jury, rendered after each side has been heard, in the evidence and by counsel, and after an impartial charge by an able judge.

It has been contradicted by a great mass of witnesses, by Minister Stevens, by the member of the Provisional Government, by numberless residents of Hawaii, including teachers and missionaries, by the officers of the American Navy, by tourists, and by a great preponderance of the evidence now being given before the Senate committee of investigation, as this evidence leaks out to us. It has been urged by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. McCREARY] and the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. RAYNER], as proof of Mr. Stevens's complicity in the Hawaiian revolution that the latter, in his letter of March 8, 1892, to Mr. Blaine, then Secretary of State, predicted that a revolution would some day break out against the Queen, and these gentlemen have quoted from this letter in such a way as to leave the impression that he therein asked permission to aid such revolution. Sir, it is not at all surprising that the American minister foresaw that a revolution was inevitable in Hawaii. Outbreaks had frequently occurred there before. Any one familiar with the forces at play in the islands could easily have made the same prediction. This prediction proved no guilty participation on Mr. Stevens's part. But the very document the gentleman quotes in part to convict the American minister is, when the whole is quoted, strongly in his favor, for it shows that he was asking for instructions as to his right to restore the Queen in the event of her dethronement, and not for instructions which would permit him to aid in her overthrow. I quote the omitted parts of this letter, which are as follows:

UNITED STATES LEGATION, Honolulu, March 8, 1892.

SIR: In view of possible contingencies in these islands, I ask for the instructions of the Department of State on the following, viz:

If the Government here should be surprised and overturned by an orderly and peaceful revolutionary movement, largely of native Hawaiians and a provisional or republican government organized and proclaimed, would the United States minister and naval commander here be justified in responding affirmatively to the call of the members of the removed Government to restore them to power or replace them in possession of the Government buildings? Or should the United States minister and naval commander confine themselves exclusively to the preservation of American property, the

protection of American citizens, and the prevention of anarchy? Should a revolutionary attempt of the character indicated be made, there are strong reasons to presume that it would begin with the seizure of the police station, with its arms and ammunition, and this accomplished, the Royal Palace and the Government building, containing the cabinet offices and archives, would very soon be captured, the latter building being situated about one-third of a mile from the police station. In such contingencies would it be justifiable to use the United States forces here to restore the Government buildings to the possession of the displaced officials? Ordinarily in like circumstances the rule seems to be to limit the landing and movement of the United States force in foreign waters and dominion exclusively to the protection of the United States legation, and of the lives and property of American citizens. But as the relations of the United States to Hawaii are exceptional, and in former years the United States officials here took somewhat exceptional action in circumstances of disorder, I desire to know how far the present minister and naval commander may deviate from established international rules and precedents in the contingencies indicated in the first part of this dispatch.

But it is said, Mr. Speaker, that the American minister was in favor of the annexation of Hawaii to the United States, and that he addressed a letter to Mr. Blaine, our Secretary of State, November 20, 1892, upon this subject. This is undoubtedly true. Mr. Gregg, the American minister to Hawaii, entertained similar views in 1854 and wrote a letter of a similar character to Mr. Marcy, at that time Secretary of State.

But, sir, this falls far short of establishing the fact that Mr. Stevens aided in the revolution which put the Provisional Government in power. You may search this letter of his in vain for any intimation that he desired annexation in any other way than by the free consent of the royal government then prevailing in the Sandwich Islands. Again, it is asserted that our minister promised the revolutionists that he would recognize them when they had succeeded and established their authority.

Again, the evidence claimed to be criminative is really exculpatory in its character. Mark you the accusation, Mr. Speaker; it is that there was promised recognition *after* the new government should be established, not *before* it was established. The condition precedent to recognition required by the principles of international law was exacted by the American minister. He simply declared to the insurgents the law of nations. If, in point of fact, he ever made this promise, it was simply as if he had read to them from the pages of Vattel or Wheaton. It is also complained that the marines of the United States were landed at Hawaii, and this is the great complaint that is made and is also the evidence which is claimed to be the most conclusive that Mr. Stevens aided in the dethronement of the Queen. These troops, sir, were landed at the request of American citizens. It is said that the insurgents requested it, and that they made this request in writing and declared therein that they were incapable of protecting themselves. But, sir, I care not if this be true. The reason they assigned is wholly immaterial. The vital question is, what was the motive of the American minister in asking that the marines be sent ashore, and what was his purpose in landing them?

He declares that he did this act solely for the protection of the lives and property of American citizens in Honolulu. His written request to the commander of the Boston that the marines be landed stated that the landing was asked for this purpose. The order of Capt. Wiltse, of the Boston, for the embarkation of the troops, directed to Lieut. Swinburn, so declared. The troops were admonished before they left the ship to remain neutral when they reached the shore. They saluted the royal standard as they marched up the streets of the city. Part of them were left at the American embassy, part at the American legation, and the remainder of them marched to the suburbs, where they failed to get quarters, and were then marched back to Arion Hall, where they remained concealed during the progress of the revolution, much more concealed than had been the case with other troops landed for the protection of American lives and property on the occasion of previous disturbances in the island.

The evidence is conclusive, sir, that these United States marines took no part whatever in the exciting events that transpired around them. They were not present for any improper purpose. They were only there in conformity to the law of nations, which gave to our citizens and their property in Hawaii the right to protection in such turbulent times against any possible violence which might result from the internal dissensions of the country. When Damon, one of the persons in sympathy with the revolution, asked the lieutenant in command of the marines whether they would be used for the protection of the revolutionists, the answer, sir, was promptly returned by that officer, "Wiltse's orders are that I remain passive." I know it has been claimed, Mr. Speaker, that Commodore Skerrett, of the United States Navy, said that the marines were well located if it was the design to menace the royal government, but poorly stationed if it was the purpose to protect American property; but, sir, it is shown that Arion Hall, where they were posted, was the only available place that could be secured for the troops, and besides, that point is quite centrally located with respect to the various American properties to be defended. Mr. Stevens, Mr. Speaker, was

absent when the Hawaiian revolution commenced. When he returned to Honolulu he found that the Queen had prorogued the legislature and had attempted to promulgate the new constitution; that the committee of public safety had been organized; that part of the Queen's cabinet had conspired with the insurgents, and that the revolution was in full blast. He has been blamed because he requested the landing of the troops before the hostilities had actually commenced, and after the Queen's government had assured him that it was able to protect American lives and property. Sir, reflect for a moment upon the delicacy and difficulty of the situation as it appeared to the eyes of our minister. He was to be the judge of the proper time for the landing of the troops and of the ability of the Queen to defend the lives and property of our people.

If he had delayed action until fighting actually commenced, this very delay might have defeated the object he had in view, the defense of the rights of our countrymen. Had the Queen's Government failed to keep its promise, as it doubtless would have done, since it was impotent to defeat the insurgents, much less to protect neutral life and property, the result would have been disastrous. Minister Stevens would have been held to a strict accountability by our Government, and had anything happened to American interests by his failure to act with promptness, he would have been recalled in shame and disgrace from his station. It is probably true, Mr. Speaker, as claimed by the gentlemen on the other side of this debate, that no other nation besides our own landed marines on this occasion; but it is also true, sir, that there were no troops of any other nation at Hawaii, except Japanese, and that the interests of our Government there were immeasurably greater and more exposed than the interests of that nation, or, in fact, of any other nation on the globe. Another charge, sir, against Mr. Stevens is that certain of the insurgents waited upon him and asked that he defer landing the American troops—a force, by the way, of about 150 men—and that he replied that he would not consent to any delay, but proposed to land at once. It will be observed, sir, that the American minister did not comply with the wishes of the revolutionists in this matter. Mr. Speaker, does this tend to show a conspiracy between Mr. Stevens and those insurgents? I imagine not. He seems to have ignored the request of the Queen not to have the troops landed at all, and of the revolutionists to delay the landing for a time. This would seem to indicate that he was acting not in the interest of either of these parties, not to please either of them, but solely upon his own judgment and with an eye single to the protection of American interests. The quickness of the recognition is urged, sir, as being suspicious, but when it was made the insurgents had an armed force at their backs, possession of about all of the Government buildings, except possibly the police station, for the surrender of which negotiations were then pending, and it was apparent that the Queen was powerless to resist, and that the revolution was a success. The royal Government had received recognition up to the moment that its overthrow was apparent, and then the Government which had dethroned the Queen was recognized.

It was important to the peace and tranquility of the islands that some government should be acknowledged, as soon as it appeared that it was in power. On the day following the recognition by Mr. Stevens recognition of the new government was made by the official representative of every nation which had a legation at Honolulu. Mr. Speaker, it is certainly a remarkable thing if the American minister aided in the overthrow of the Queen, and annexation of Hawaii to the United States was at once known there to be in contemplation, that not a single foreign government ever raised its voice in protest. Sir, no such a protest has ever been made.

But we are told, Mr. Speaker, that the Queen surrendered in writing to the insurgents, and that in this writing she declared that she gave way because of the menace of the United States minister and marines; we are also told that she was advised to adopt this course by Mr. Damon, who sympathized with the insurgents, and was a member of the advisory board of the Provisional Government when it was organized, and that President Dole of that Government received this written abdication without protest.

From all this it is assumed that the American minister and marines actually did aid in the Queen's deposition. Mr. Speaker, the evidence shows that before the interview at which the Queen signed this paper, duly authorized persons from the revolutionists had given her the ultimatum of the insurgents, and that Damon was not one of those authorized to act. At this interview the Queen was surrounded by such of her cabinet as had remained loyal to her. Anything that Damon may have said was simply the utterance of a bystander. The fact is that this wily and cunning Queen, probably by the advice of her counselors, adopted this form of surrender as one containing some possibility of her restoration to the throne by American hands or of

her procuring indemnity in American money. If President Dole ever received it, his failure to protest against the truth of this statement was not to have been expected. The surrender of the Queen was what he desired. A speedy end of the whole matter was in his mind.

A bloodless revolution, as well as a successful one, was the object. Quibbling with the Queen as to the ground she assigned for her capitulation would have been the height of folly. It would have led to delay. His silence under such circumstances can not well be tortured into an admission that those grounds were well assigned.

Mr. Speaker, another thing which exculpates Mr. Stevens: Immediately upon his recognition of the Provisional Government it addressed him a note, asking that he join the United forces to its own, and that the United States officers take charge of the forces thus consolidated and direct them for the preservation of the public order.

This the American minister declined to do. Some days after this, after the commissioners of Hawaii had departed for the United States to negotiate, if possible, a treaty of annexation with our Government, at the request of the Provisional Government, then in complete control of everything and amply able to maintain itself, he hoisted the American flag over the Government building and aided in the preservation of order, leaving the Provisional Government, however, to direct and control the affairs of the island, and acting only in subordination thereto. It is not necessary for me in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, to say anything in reply to the charge that the members of the Provisional Government hurried to the United States soon after their triumph to negotiate with us a treaty of annexation. Their motive in revolting, and their promptness in urging such a treaty, are beside the question. Mr. Stevens was not responsible for their motives or conduct in this matter. It does not follow that he aided in their revolution, because they all along desired to become a part of our great Republic, and that soon after having obtained supreme control they sought to carry their cherished purpose into execution.

Mr. Speaker, I, for one, will not hold it against them that these men, many of whom were of American blood, sought to link their destiny to our own, and under the shadow of our starry flag to participate in the blessings which are secured and guaranteed by the Federal Constitution.

But, Mr. Speaker, assuming for the sake of argument that the American minister instigated the overthrow of the Queen's Government, what were the rights and powers of the Harrison Administration in the premises? It clearly possessed the right to disavow the minister's acts and to recall him, and to refuse to receive or submit to the Senate the treaty of annexation which was sent to it. All of these things could have been performed with propriety, and could have been done under the Constitution and laws of this land, and without engaging in any extra-territorial venture.

But, sir, I seriously doubt the propriety, I seriously doubt the right of President Harrison to have reached the strong arm of national authority down into Hawaii to interfere in the internal affairs of that country by overthrowing the Provisional Government, and restoring the Queen to the throne. To do this would have required the execution of an extra-territorial act, and would have had to have been performed over the protest of at least a large and powerful portion of the citizens of that country. But whether I am right or wrong in this proposition, there can be no question but that Grover Cleveland, when he came into power, possessed no such right of intervention. Why?

The question presented to him under the principles of international law related not to the circumstances of this Government's birth, nor to the rightfulness or wrongfulness of its origin, but solely to the fact of its existence, and to whether it had shown itself powerful enough to maintain its authority in Hawaii. Nor was the length of time this Government had been in existence conclusive. If it had been a *de facto* government for a week, or a month, it was as much entitled to respect, as much entitled to exemption from foreign intervention in its affairs as though it had been in existence for countless ages. Neither was the size of the Government material. Though sparse in population, weak in material resources, destitute of a navy, and possessed of only a diminutive army, if it was, nevertheless, able to stand alone in its internal affairs our nation had no more right to interfere with it than if its population was as dense as China, its material resources as great as our own, its navy as powerful as England's, and its army as strong as that which waged the Napoleonic war. Now, sir, as to the actual status of this Provisional Government when Mr. Cleveland was inducted into office.

It had then passed beyond the arena of experiment and had become an accomplished fact. It was a *de facto* government, with a president and four officers administering its various depart-

ments under the constitution of 1887, which it had adopted, and with an advisory council to aid these officers in the management of public affairs. Its process was running uninterruptedly to every part of the island. It was in possession of all of the public buildings and archives. The entire police force was under its control, and it possessed a body of armed and disciplined men strong enough to maintain it. Mr. Cleveland found the government powerful and supreme, with its foot upon the throat of the deposed Queen. He found that it had been recognized by nearly every civilized nation, that it had its representative at this capital, and that we had our accredited representative there, and that even a treaty of annexation with it was pending before the United States Senate.

Mr. Speaker, such had been the status of the Provisional Government for nearly two months at the time Mr. Cleveland was inaugurated. That Government had maintained this status for eight months when Blount made his report, and for an entire year when Willis demanded its capitulation.

What, sir, were the rights and powers of the present Executive with respect to this Government? He could recall the American minister and send one of his own political faith to succeed him. He could withdraw, as he actually did withdraw, the treaty of annexation pending before the Senate. He could send his agent down there, without the consent of the Senate, to collect evidence for his guidance in determining whether or not he would resubmit this treaty, providing he did not attempt to confer upon such agent extraordinary powers. But, Mr. Speaker, right here the rights and powers of this Administration ended. It had no right to review the Hawaiian policy of the preceding Administration, nor to interfere for the restoration of the deposed Queen.

The foreign policy of the nation was an entirety. For Mr. Cleveland to review and reverse it was simply to make that policy a piece of vacillation, irresolution, and imbecility, and to bring upon us the contempt of the diplomatic world. Why, sir, the folly of Mr. Cleveland's action in the Hawaiian affair is apparent when one stops to consider where it would lead. Mr. Harrison had recognized the existing government and claimed that it was rightfully established. If Mr. Cleveland could take the contrary view and reach the arm of Federal authority down to those islands and change the government back to its former status, what is to prevent the Vice-President, in the event he should become President by Mr. Cleveland's death, and should entertain the same views as Mr. Harrison held, from putting the Provisional Government back in power again? Then suppose a new President to be elected in 1896, who believes with Mr. Cleveland in the rights of the monarchy, may this President interpose in Hawaii's internal affairs and once more place the Queen back upon the throne?

But tell me, Mr. Speaker, why Mr. Cleveland should seek a pretext to attack this young Government, whose aspirations are all for a republic, and to interfere in behalf of a monarchy? The Sandwich Islands, sir, have unfortunately been for years the theater of frequent contentions and revolutions. Social order has been unknown there; political stability has been an alien. Time and again the forces of foreign nations have been called in to protect the lives and the property of their citizens. It is not surprising, sir, that such a condition of affairs existed. Indeed it would be surprising if such a condition had not been present. Side by side on those islands were two civilizations, a higher and a lower civilization. On the side of the higher civilization were ranged the intelligence, the progress, the thrift, the aspirations for enlarged liberty and for the realization of a great destiny for Hawaii. On the other side was ranged the monarchy, with its narrow, contracted view of human rights, with its semibarbarous face turned toward the past, unwilling to greet the dawning sun which was the precursor of the country's full and glorious day. From the very nature of things these two civilizations could not exist together forever. One was to survive and the other would have to perish.

Soon the crisis was precipitated; the revolution came; it was a bloodless one, but it was a revolution nevertheless, and the victors were as much entitled to the benefits of their triumph as though they had mounted into power over the lifeless body of every adherent of the Queen. The efforts of the Queen to violate the constitution she had sworn to support, to thrust upon the progressive element of her people a constitution that they loathed, was the immediate cause of the revolution. These people rallied; a committee of public safety was organized, a large public meeting was held, the action of the committee of safety was indorsed. Some of the Queen's cabinet conspired against her; she sought at the last moment to withdraw her action, but the revolution had started and it could not be turned backward. The insurgents seized upon the Queen, they compelled her abdication: they seized upon the archives and the palace of the Government; they obtained control of the police force, and they organ-

ized a determined little army. They established themselves, as I said before, in the good graces and in the good opinion of the civilized world, and secured recognition on every hand.

And now for a long year they have demonstrated their capacity to maintain themselves against all forms of internal aggression. Why, then, in the name of God, should the President of this free Republic, whose pride it is that it has always lent a helping hand to aspirations for liberty in all quarters of the globe, have seen fit, in disregard of the wishes of the great mass of his countrymen, irrespective of party, to attempt to frown down this higher civilization and interfere in behalf of a despised and rejected monarchy?

Mr. Speaker, the Constitution of the United States, which contains a division of the Government into departments and a system of checks and balances, designed by our fathers for the perpetuation of our liberty, provides that all ambassadors and ministers to foreign countries shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. I do not deny that President Cleveland had the right to send James H. Blount to Hawaii if he had not invested him with unconstitutional authority; but I do deny that he had the right to confer upon him the privileges and immunities which belong to ambassadors of the United States, and to send him there without such advice and consent. To be sure, Mr. Blount was styled a commissioner; but this determined nothing. The authority with which he was invested, and not the name by which he was designated, was the criterion for ascertaining his character and status. Tried by this rule, what man on this floor can say that James H. Blount was not practically and in effect a minister and ambassador to Hawaii from the American Government? That he was not confirmed by the Senate is universally known and admitted.

A single glance at his commission and letter of instruction reveals the extraordinary character of the powers given him and makes evident that they were those of an ambassador. I read from these instructions:

To enable you to fulfill this charge, your authority in all matters touching the relations of this Government to the existing or other governments of the islands and the protection of our citizens therein is paramount, and in you alone, acting in cooperation with the commander of the naval forces, is vested full discretion and power to determine when such forces shall be landed or withdrawn.

You are, however, authorized to avail yourself of such aid and information as you may desire from the present minister of the United States at Honolulu, Mr. John L. Stevens, who will continue until further notice to perform the usual functions attaching to his office, not inconsistent with the powers intrusted to you.

Here, sir, is contained in the instructions issued by the Secretary of State the statement that Blount's authority was to be paramount in all matters touching the relations of our Government with the existing or other governments of the islands. The United States minister already there was to remain, but was reduced in his power to the position of a mere clerk, everything being subordinated to the discretion and superior authority of this so-called commissioner. Why, Mr. Speaker, this is not all. A like instruction was sent to the United States minister. He was to be subordinated to Mr. Blount in all of these matters. A similar instruction was also sent to Capt. Wilse, the commander of the Boston, and the Navy of the United States was put under the command and control of Blount. The Government of these islands, the Provisional Government, was also addressed by the Secretary of State and informed that this alleged commissioner's authority was paramount in all matters affecting our relations with the Government of the Hawaiian Islands. The power to preserve peace and order and to protect the lives and property of American citizens was conferred upon him. There was given to him the authority, and that authority was subsequently exercised by him, to order the United States flag to be removed from the buildings of the Provisional Government.

The authority was conferred upon him, and that authority was also subsequently exercised by him to order the withdrawal of our marines and their embarkation on the United States vessel that was in the harbor of Honolulu. Sir, if these powers are not such as belong to ministers and ambassadors, then I should like to be informed what the powers of ministers and ambassadors really are. The precedents which have been cited in this debate in support of the action of the President in the appointment of Mr. Blount will not bear investigation. They are instances where ministers already confirmed by the Senate have been sent on temporary missions from their posts to neighboring governments, or where agents have been sent abroad by American Presidents upon missions without having extraordinary authority conferred upon them, or where gentlemen were sent without the consent of the Senate for the negotiation of treaties, but the treaties so negotiated were subsequently submitted for their confirmation to the Senate of the United States. None of these cases meet the case of Mr. James H. Blount.

Mr. Speaker, it has been suggested in certain quarters that

inasmuch as his Hawaiian policy has miserably failed and he has encountered only chagrin and mortification in its attempted execution, the Executive has suffered punishment enough in the affair and that the whole subject should, therefore, now be allowed to drop. Sir, this is a remarkable proposition. For one, I can not give to it my consent. It is not, as I have said before, the President alone, but the President acting by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, who can appoint ministers and ambassadors. This constitutional provision is plain and symmetrical. It should be preserved in practice, or all will fall into confusion. The action of the President should not be permitted to go unchallenged, and thereby ripen into a precedent to invite future aggressions. If the President can send a minister to Hawaii without confirmation by the Senate, he can do the same thing with respect to any other foreign power. It is the solemn duty of Congress to resent these invasions of its constitutional domain, to the end that the constitutional lines of demarkation may be retained and our peculiar form of government preserved, and I earnestly hope that the National Legislature will do this in language which is plain and unmistakable.

Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States had prejudged this whole Hawaiian question when he came into power. He had decided then that it should be made to appear that Minister Stevens had aided in the Queen's deposition; it was his purpose then to reestablish her on the throne by menace, or, if necessary, by force. It was his fixed purpose then to discredit President Harrison's Administration in the premises. This treaty of annexation was doomed from the very moment he first heard of its existence. In this resolution, sir, he was ably seconded by his Secretary of State, who had no disposition to stand by the reputation of that Administration whose official head had defeated him for the Presidential nomination at the Republican convention of 1888, and who had made it impossible for him ever to become a candidate for President on the Republican ticket long before he ever cast his lot with the Democratic party. [Applause on the Republican side.] The annexation treaty was hurriedly recalled from the Senate, by way of removing the first impediment which lay in the pathway to the accomplishment of these designs. Mr. Speaker, I have said that force was contemplated. What, sir, do I mean by force? Let me illustrate.

If a man at the lone hour of midnight, when the world is wrapped in slumber, approaches me from behind and strikes me a violent blow on the head, from the effects of which I fall insensible at his feet, and then rifles my pocket and leaves me unconscious and helpless, this is force in the strongest sense, force in its most positive exemplification; but if a man approaches me in broad daylight and in a great center of population, where the sound of my voice could summon me assistance, and without the least violence, either actual or attempted, upon my person, extorts from me my purse by the threat of bringing against me some false and disgraceful accusation, this also is force.

Force is that which interferes with a man's volition. It is duress. It is coercion. It is whatever compels an individual to do that which in its absence he would not do of his own mind. Tried by this definition of force, who is there on this floor with hardihood enough to deny that Mr. Cleveland intended to employ it in Hawaiian affairs? But, nevertheless, he knew something, sir, of the sentiment of the American people. The Queen had sent her emissaries here to make us believe that the Provisional Government had been established by the aid of our minister. But Mr. Cleveland knew that the overwhelming weight of credible evidence was the other way.

The official correspondence of Minister Stevens, the official letter addressed by Secretary Foster to the President, the letter addressed by the President of the United States to the Senate when he transmitted to it for consideration the treaty of annexation, were all to the contrary; and Mr. Cleveland recognized the absolute necessity of securing some kind of evidence whereby the public sentiment of the country might be reversed and which would justify him in any aggressions he might see fit to resort to in Hawaiian affairs. Right here, sir, is to be found the explanation of Mr. Blount's mission to Honolulu. The Administration resolved upon doing three things: first, that it would reestablish the Queen by menace, and, if necessary, by force; second, that it would conceal its purpose from the American people, for fear they would interpose to prevent its execution; third, that it would, through the medium of James H. Blount, secure *ex parte* and partial evidence to be used as a pretext for its action and in defense of its aggressions.

If Mr. Blount was not sent to the Sandwich Islands for the purpose named, will some gentleman be kind enough to tell me for what purpose he was sent there? Was he sent there for the purpose of taking evidence which would enable the President to form an enlightened judgment as to whether or not he would re-submit the treaty of annexation to the Senate? Why, sir, you can not recall a single utterance the Executive has ever made, you can

not point to a single line in any instrument he has ever written, which supports any such a theory as this. You may look carefully through all this vast and voluminous correspondence on Hawaiian affairs, and not one syllable will you find which can possibly be tortured into any such a construction. As I said a bit ago, this treaty of annexation was doomed the very instant Mr. Cleveland heard of it. He never intended to resubmit it. Why, sir, in the very letter of instructions given by the Secretary of State to James H. Blount when he started upon his Hawaiian mission I find the following language:

The withdrawal from the Senate of the recently signed treaty of annexation for reexamination by the President leaves its subject-matter in abeyance; and you are not charged with any duty in respect thereto.

Here, Mr. Speaker, is a plain and direct admission by the Secretary of State that there was no connection whatever between James H. Blount's trip to Honolulu and the resubmission of the annexation treaty to the United States Senate.

Was Mr. Blount sent to Hawaii to collect and transmit to the Executive evidence which would enable him to give judgment as an arbitrator in a controversy pending between the Queen and the Provisional Government?

If so, will some gentleman kindly inform me when and where the Provisional Government ever appointed Mr. Cleveland an arbitrator? Was the appointment verbal or written? When and where did Dole and his associates ever have an opportunity to submit evidence under the arbitration, or even to cross-examine any witnesses who testified against them before Blount? What, pray, were the terms of the submission, and what guarantees were ever given that the parties would abide by the decision when rendered?

Mr. Speaker, I am aware of the fact that the Secretary of State, in his instructions to Mr. Willis, used the following language:

You will then advise the president of the Provisional Government and its ministers of the President's determination of the question which their action and that of the Queen devolved upon him.

But I am also aware that when President Dole called attention to this unwarrantable assumption of the Secretary, and indignantly denied that arbitration had ever been thought of, the Secretary, speaking for Mr. Cleveland, hastened, in his subsequent correspondence with Mr. Willis, to concede that no power of arbitration had ever been conferred upon him. Then, Mr. Blount was not sent down to Hawaii for this purpose. Well, was the Blount mission simply undertaken for the collection of material from which the historian of the future might be able to draw when he came to record in enduring form an accurate account of the Hawaiian revolution of 1893? Was James H. Blount's report to be a mere contribution to historical literature?

Sir, I imagine not. Once more. Did not the President of the United States know, as well as he knew he lived, that after the Provisional Government had firmly established itself in power, had been recognized by all the leading nations of the globe, and had the Queen completely at its mercy, a simple request upon his part that it should surrender up its life and restore the monarchy, and which request the Provisional Government should understand it was at perfect liberty either to grant or refuse, without any dread of menace or force from the Executive in case of refusal, would be laughed to scorn?

Can it be possible that the President went to all the trouble and expense of getting Mr. Blount's report simply in order that he might predicate upon it so meaningless a thing as a mere good-natured request for a capitulation which he certainly knew would be declined? Did he intend to do so foolish a thing, a thing that he knew would be wholly nugatory? Did he want to make himself the laughingstock of the entire civilized world? Was he longing to see his pet diplomatic venture left suspended in midair like the coffin of Mohammed? No, Mr. Speaker, Grover Cleveland did not intend to enact a comedy. He meant business. He intended to put Liliuokalani back upon her throne by menace and by force, and he desired the partial and *ex parte* evidence collected by James H. Blount that he might utilize it in the vindication of such a policy.

Who can read the letter of Mr. Gresham, given to the public after Congress had adjourned its special session, after the fall elections had been had, and see his statement that Mr. Blount had shown beyond question that Stevens had overthrown the Queen's government; who can read the further statement that nothing but the putting of the Queen back upon her throne would satisfy the ends of justice, without perceiving at a glance what was in the mind of the Administration, without coming to the conclusion at once that menace and force were to be employed? Who can read the message of President Cleveland, sent to this Congress when it convened, in which he reaffirmed the sentiments of Mr. Gresham's letter, in which he declared that a wrong had been done by us in Hawaii which should be undone by us, and that we should restore as far as practicable the status existing there at the time of our forcible intervention, and not recognize

the fact that coercion was intended by him in the accomplishment of his purpose? Why, sir, look just for one minute at the instructions which were given by the Secretary of State to Mr. Willis:

Having secured—

He says—

the Queen's agreement to pursue this wise and humane policy, which it is believed you will speedily obtain, you will then advise the Executive of the Provisional Government and his ministers of the President's determination of the question which their act and that of the Queen devolve upon him, and that they are expected to promptly relinquish to her her constitutional authority. Should the Queen decline to pursue the liberal course suggested, or should the Provisional Government refuse to abide the President's decision, you will report the facts and await further instructions.

Willis was to advise the Provisional Government "of the President's determination of the question" and "that they are expected to promptly relinquish to her her constitutional authority." Sir, if these are not words both of assumption and menace, then I have studied the English language in vain. And why should Willis, in the event the Provisional Government refused to yield to this demand, "await further instructions?" If no coercion was contemplated, why not have instructed the American minister to report the refusal if the Provisional Government refused his demand, and to pursue the matter no further, as the President did not contemplate resorting to measures which were of an extreme character? What was the need of Mr. Willis awaiting "further instructions"? Look now, if you please, Mr. Speaker, at the language actually employed by the United States minister in making his demand that the Provisional Government should surrender. After addressing President Dole and his associates in the exact language of his instructions, which I have just quoted, he proceeds as follows:

And now, Mr. President, and gentlemen of the Provisional Government, with a deep and solemn sense of the gravity of the situation, and with the earnest hope that your answer will be inspired by that high patriotism which overcomes all self-interest, in the name and by the authority of the United States of America, I submit to you the question: Are you willing to abide by the decision of the President?

Was ever menace so thrown into the form of an interrogatory as here? Why this expression of "a deep and solemn sense of the gravity of the situation"? Was there "gravity of the situation" present to the Provisional Government, then thoroughly established in power and capable of crushing any internal disturbance which might arise, if it were free to exercise its own volition with respect to this demand and in no danger of pressure from outside in the event of its refusal to yield? And why was this demand made "in the name and by the authority of the United States," if not to convey the impression that the great American people were arrayed against the provisional officers and thus coerce them into submission? Mr. Speaker, this whole infamous conspiracy is as plain as day. The American minister, acting by the advice of the Executive, knew when he made this demand that he confronted men who were conscious of Blount's unfavorable report; who were familiar with the contents of the unfriendly Gresham letter to Cleveland, and of the hostile message of the latter to Congress; who were informed of his own secret interviews with the Queen, and of his intriguing against them, although duly accredited to them; who knew that there rode in the harbor a vessel of the United States whose marines could be commanded in an instant for their destruction. Seeing them thus environed with circumstances of perplexity and discouragement, this representative of Mr. Cleveland sought to still further impair the freedom of their will and awe them into submission by the employment of the menacing language which I have just quoted. It was expected that under such surroundings the men thus assailed would surrender; but they were equal to the emergency and stood their ground. The delay of the Queen to accept Mr. Cleveland's terms and the publicity the affair was gaining in this country saved them. At any time before public sentiment in the United States had been roused, this refusal to yield, sir, would have been followed up by an exhibition of force by Mr. Willis that would have compelled the abdication of the Provisional Government.

Mr. Speaker, it has been said in the debate that Minister Willis is a reputable person. Possibly so, but he has been acting an exceedingly unfortunate part in this Hawaiian affair. He has been conspiring against the Government to which he was accredited, which received him with cordiality, and which he saluted with professions of amity. I can pronounce no severer stricture upon him than by reading an extract from Vattel's Law of Nations, which the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. McCREARY] introduced into the debate the other day, doubtless without stopping to reflect upon the use to which it could be applied. Its relevancy, however, to this discussion will, I am quite confident, now be quite manifest. The extract is as follows:

As to what concerns the prince to whom he is sent, the ambassador should remember that his ministry is a ministry of peace, and that it is on that footing only he is received. This reason forbids him engaging in any machinations; let him serve his master without injuring the prince who receives

him. It is a base treachery to take advantage of the inviolability of the ambassadorial character, for the purpose of plotting in security the ruin of those who respect that character, of laying snares for them, of clandestinely injuring them, of embroiling and ruining their affairs. What would be infamous and abominable in a private guest, shall that be allowable and becoming in the representative of a sovereign?

Ah, but say gentlemen on the other side, the President instructed Willis to say to the Queen if she asked whether after her restoration he would maintain her on her throne, that he could not employ force without the consent of Congress. Again, they tell us that in his message sent to this Congress at the commencement of the present session the Executive used this language: "With a view of accomplishing this result," meaning the restoration of the monarchy, "Within the constitutional limits of executive power, and recognizing all our obligations and responsibilities growing out of any changed conditions brought about by our unjustifiable interference, our present minister at Honolulu has received appropriate instructions to that end." Mr. Speaker, in the first place the House will carefully note that this instruction to Willis to tell the Queen that force could be employed to maintain her after she was restored only by the consent of Congress, never was imparted to the Provisional Government. It was not intended to be communicated to it. It was the Presidential plan to leave it under the impression that force was to be employed. It will be observed in the second place that neither these instructions to the American minister or the message to Congress were ever promulgated until very late in the day—until long after the indignant American people had called a halt to the policy of the Executive, and until that policy had miserably failed in execution and was breaking into fragments about Mr. Cleveland's head. It is well enough for the President now to protest that he never intended to use menace or force; it is well enough at this late day for his apologetic and half-hearted supporters upon this floor to join him in this virtuous protestation.

Sir, when I observe all of this ostentatious denial, I am forcibly reminded of a scene in Shakespeare's great tragedy of Hamlet—the scene in which Hamlet lies with his head in Ophelia's lap, and scrutinizes intently the countenance of his mother while the players are enacting the tragedy of his father's death. You will remember, Mr. Speaker, that at a certain point in their performance the play queen makes to the play king the most profuse and extravagant professions of affectionate loyalty, and that at this juncture Hamlet interrogates his mother as to her opinion of the play, and elicits from her the answer, "The lady doth protest too much, methinks." [Laughter and applause.] And so, sir, when I hear these tardy but vociferous disclaimers of intended menace and coercion, I can not refrain from turning towards the distinguished occupant of the Executive Mansion and with a slight paraphrase upon the language of the queen, saluting him with the exclamation, "The President doth protest too much, methinks!" [Laughter and applause.]

Sir, even if the President did not contemplate menace or force in Hawaii, still he had no right to send an American minister to the Provisional Government with instructions to meddle in any manner in its internal affairs. What right had Mr. Willis even to advise with the deposed Queen or to encourage her to expect restoration? Did he not know that this would disturb the orderly conduct of affairs by the existing government, that it would have a tendency to excite public anxiety and distrust? Had Mr. Cleveland forgotten the recall at our own request of the British minister for advising one of his countrymen by letter just before a recent Presidential election to cast his influence for a certain political party?

Mr. Speaker, if Mr. Willis had attempted such conduct as this with any first-class power it would have given him his passports in less than twenty-four hours; it would have driven him from its domain in disgrace. Our relations with that power would have been strained by the incident and war might have been one of the results.

I denounce on this floor the arrant cowardice of this Administration, which, because Hawaii was a weak and feeble state, sought to do in its internal affairs that which it never would dare to do with any leading nation of the globe. [Loud applause.]

The Constitution of the United States, Mr. Speaker, confers upon Congress the power to declare war. This is not simply the power to make a clerical entry—to record an existing condition. The power to declare war is much broader than this. It involves the idea of volition and determination. It must be construed to mean that Congress may determine what shall be a cause of war. But if the Chief Executive is to intervene in the internal affairs of other governments through instructed ministers without the consent of Congress, and thus precipitate war whether Congress desires hostilities or not, of what avail is this constitutional provision? The conduct of Mr. Cleveland in this affair of Hawaii is nothing less than a violation of the letter and spirit of the Federal Constitution, and an unwarrantable inva-

sion of the prerogative of the legislative branch of the Government. Congress should promptly rebuke it. The lines of constitutional demarkation must be preserved. The act of the President should not be permitted to stand as a precedent for future aggressions. If the Chief Executive can do this thing to Hawaii he can do it to any other power, a power for instance which is courageous enough and strong enough to resent the act and lead us into circumstances of embarrassment and danger.

Mr. Speaker, I have charged that the Administration intended and practiced secrecy in dealing with the Hawaiian affair. Now for the proofs—for that Representative who has the hardihood to stand upon this floor and make a charge against the Executive which he can not sustain by evidence is unworthy of the confidence of his colleagues, or of the support of the constituency which honors him with a seat in this Chamber.

Why was not the name of James H. Blount submitted to the Senate for confirmation? Was it because the powers conferred upon him were not of such a character as to require the consent of the Senate? No, it was because the President desired to keep the true nature of his mission concealed. If that nomination had been sent to the Senate it would have awakened inquiry. The questions would have been asked: What is the purpose in sending Mr. Blount to Hawaii? What is the nature of the instructions given him? Have we not already a minister at the Sandwich Islands? Inquiry would have begotten answer and answer would have begotten debate, the press would have gotten hold of the matter, and the policy of the Administration would thus have been strangled in its very inception.

Here was the first step in the policy of concealment. What was the next step? This Congress assembled in special session in the early part of last August. Mr. Blount had been for months in Hawaii engaged in the accomplishment of his mission, yet not a single word on this subject did the President of the United States utter in his message to Congress.

That session of Congress lasted for three long months. During this time the mission of James H. Blount to Hawaii was completed, and his report was in the possession of the Executive; but still the silence was unbroken upon this matter which so deeply concerned the rights of the American Congress and of the American people. The lips of the man in the White House were sealed as tight as the lips of the unimpassioned Sphinx which looks out with immobile countenance upon the dreary waste and awful solitude of the Egyptian desert.

After Congress had adjourned, and after the results of the fall elections had become known, this silence was at last disturbed, and there was given to the public that remarkable letter of Secretary Gresham, stating the conclusions he had reached from reading the report of Blount, and that nothing would satisfy the demands of justice which stopped short of the restoration of the monarchy in the Sandwich Islands.

Mr. Speaker, I affirm here and now that this letter never would have been given to the public at this time if the President and his Secretary of State had not then believed that Mr. Willis had already accomplished his mission and that the Queen had been placed back upon her throne. The American minister had been in Hawaii long enough to accomplish, in the ordinary course of events, what he went there to do. He had been a soldier, and was accustomed to act with celerity and to obey orders.

It was never dreamed that the Queen had thrown any obstacles in the way of the Presidential programme.

When you have obtained the consent of the Queen, which it is believed she will readily give—

is the language of his letter of instructions, delivered to him when he departed for Honolulu.

Here is the key to the whole situation. It was thought that the Queen had consented, that the minister had obeyed orders, that menace had been used, that the Provisional Government had capitulated, and that, having thus clandestinely accomplished his purpose, the Executive could now afford to give to the American people such news as would prepare them to receive in a few days the intelligence that the monarchy was once more in existence.

But time passed on. The ungrateful Queen had jilted in his first impassioned overtures His Excellency the President of the United States; the Provisional Government had kicked and repelled him with scorn. Congress met in regular session. Nobody knew, except as a matter of conjecture, what had been done in that far-away isle which nestled upon the bosom of the great Pacific. It was known, of course, that Willis was there, but the nature of his instructions was unrevealed. The entire country had become profoundly interested in the subject. Public expectation stood on tiptoe to receive something definite from the Executive. It was confidently expected that Congress would no longer be ignored, that at last the light would be shed upon this

mystery. Sir, at last the message of Mr. Cleveland was received. It dwelt with unusual and needless prolixity upon the foreign relations of the United States, so much so as to invite adverse criticism from all quarters. But with respect to Hawaii it was ambiguous and misleading. True, it affirmed the Queen to have been overthrown by the aid of the minister of the United States, and declared that "the only honorable course for our Government to pursue was to undo the wrong that had been done by those representing us," and spoke of our minister "having received appropriate instructions to that end;" but, sir, these instructions were not made known to Congress and the people, and the President declared that he aimed to act in the matter "within the constitutional limits of Executive power" and with recognition of "all our obligations and responsibilities growing out of any changed conditions brought about by our unjustifiable interference."

Sir, the suppression of these instructions to Willis and the employment of these qualifying expressions in this message were designed to still keep the people in the dark as to the President's intention, and, in point of fact, they actually had this effect. In this message, too, the speedy transmission of additional information to Congress was promised, but this promise was not kept; and it was only after resolutions requesting that such information be supplied were passed by Congress that there was sent in that remarkable message of the 18th of December, 1893.

It was in connection with this message, sir, that the Presidential policy of concealment reached its climax. When this Executive communication was read from that Clerk's desk, Mr. Cleveland had in his hands that memorable letter from Mr. Willis, in which the American minister so graphically described the Queen's conduct at the time she was offered restoration to her throne on condition that she would extend amnesty to those who had brought about her deposition. In this letter the American minister made known to his chief that this amnesty had been refused, and that this bloodthirsty woman had declared that in the event of her restoration she would execute the members of the Provisional Government at the block, confiscate their estates, and banish their families from her Kingdom. Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States held this letter back from Congress and refused to make its contents public. There was certainly no good reason for its suppression. The circumstance it described was one of importance to Congress and the people. They were entitled to information concerning it. Why, then, was this communication withheld?

Mr. Speaker, there can be but one answer. The purpose of Mr. Cleveland is perfectly apparent. He held the information back because he believed that if the American people ever got wind of it they would be horrified beyond measure at the character of the Queen, and would call an indignant and imperative halt on a policy which would place men of American lineage at her mercy.

And, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Cleveland's impression in this matter was right, for I assert here and now that there never has been a single moment from the time of the inception of his Hawaiian policy down to this very hour when the sentiment of the entire country, without regard to party, would not have been arrayed against it had its character been known. Every single step he has taken in this matter is condemned by the people now that the facts have come out.

But, sir, there was another piece of deception attempted in this message of December 18. The President did not declare therein in so many words that Mr. Willis would not go ahead under his instructions and restore the Queen in the event she finally recanted and concluded to grant amnesty, but he intended to create this impression on the country, and he made use of language well calculated to accomplish his object. He undoubtedly endeavored to lull the public into the belief that his scheme for the Queen's restoration had failed, and that he had abandoned it, and would henceforth look to Congress to take the initiative in the matter. Mark, if you please, Mr. Speaker, the Executive's language: "I am convinced that the difficulties lately created both here and in Hawaii and now standing in the way of the solution through Executive action of the problem presented, render it proper and expedient that the matter should be referred to the broader authority and discretion of Congress." Again, at the conclusion of this message, sir, Mr. Cleveland makes use of the following language:

The check which my plans have thus encountered has prevented their presentation to the members of the Provisional Government, while unfortunate public misrepresentations of the situation and exaggerated statements of the sentiments of our people have obviously injured the prospects of successful Executive mediation.

I therefore submit this communication with its accompanying exhibits, embracing Mr. Blount's report, the evidence and statements taken by him at Honolulu, the instructions given to both Mr. Blount and Minister Willis, and correspondence connected with the affair in hand.

In commending this subject to the extended powers and wide discretion of the Congress, I desire to add the assurance that I shall be much gratified to coöperate in any legislative plan which may be devised for the solution

of the problem before us which is consistent with American honor, integrity, and morality.

Mr. Speaker, at the very time this language was employed the American Executive knew that the original instructions to Willis had not only not been recalled, but that they had been repeated to him very recently by the Department of State, and that he would carry them out at any moment the Queen changed her answer and promised amnesty.

It is well enough, Mr. Speaker, for the President to be frank and candid now. Recently we have received a message from him about every fifteen minutes, transmitting the latest correspondence that has been received from Hawaii. This is in broad contrast to the policy of concealment which prevailed while he thought there was a chance for the success of his scheme. No wonder, when further concealment is impracticable, when his policy is a subject for diplomatic contempt and popular reproach and is a complete and marked failure, that he now comes in and makes a clean breast of the whole transaction. What a remarkable display of *ex post facto* candor and virtue upon his part! [Applause.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. HARTMAN. I ask that the gentleman from Indiana be allowed fifteen minutes more to complete his admirable address. [Applause.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. I thank the gentleman, but I have already occupied too much time, and I will not trespass further on the patience of the House.

PRINTING FOR JUDICIARY COMMITTEE.

Mr. CULBERSON, by unanimous consent, submitted the following resolution; which was read, considered, and adopted:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary be, and are hereby, authorized to have printed and bound such documents and papers for the use of said committee as it may deem necessary in connection with subjects considered or to be considered by it during the Fifty-third Congress.

On motion of Mr. CULBERSON, a motion to consider the vote by which the resolution was adopted was laid on the table.

HAWAII

The SPEAKER *pro tempore* (Mr. OUTHWAITE). The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PATTERSON] is recognized for thirty minutes.

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, as the time allotted to me is very limited, I hope I may be allowed to proceed without interruption.

We are not dealing, Mr. Speaker, with the Government at Honolulu. We are not debating what is best for the Sandwich Islands. This discussion involves our foreign policy, the conduct of our own officials, and the honor of our flag. This great Republic, sir, can not afford to do wrong. It can not afford for its representatives, in its name, to do wrong with impunity.

I know that every American citizen will unite with me in the expression of the sentiment that the flag of the Republic should be the insignia of power throughout the world, affording everywhere perfect protection to American interests; that it should be the emblem of liberty to all the peoples of the earth; and that it should be a token unto all nations, however great or however small, of justice and honor.

Sir, behind every human transaction there is a motive. When the motives of men are once understood their conduct is susceptible of easy explanation. It will not be denied that the Administration of President Harrison, in pursuance of the imperial and aggressive policy of the Republican party, coveted the acquisition of the Sandwich Islands. It can not be denied that after the passage of the McKinley bill in 1890, the sugar planters of those islands suffered great loss and became exceedingly desirous of annexation to this country. And it can not be denied that Mr. Stevens, our accredited minister to the Government of Hawaii, was not only in accord with the Administration at Washington but that he was in thorough sympathy with the sugar planters of that country.

Sir, these motives throw a flood of light on the transactions now under discussion. Let the facts of the case pass in procession before the American people in the light of these motives, and they will come to but one conclusion.

In 1876 the Government of the United States entered into a treaty with the Government of Hawaii by which the customs duties on sugar importations from that country were remitted. At that time and up to the time of the passage of the McKinley bill in 1890 the duty on sugar averaged a little more than 2 cents per pound.

Now, what was the meaning of that treaty? It amounted to a bounty to the sugar planters of those islands to about \$5,000,000 annually. There is no more striking illustration in all our economic history of the effect of that kind of tariff taxation in which the American people have been afflicted than this treaty

with Hawaii. The immediate effect of that treaty upon the sugar planters of those islands was an enormous increase in the production of sugar.

Why, sir, in 1876 the entire production of sugar amounted to a little over 26,000,000 pounds, whereas the production in 1887 amounted to 213,000,000 pounds. From 1852 to 1876 the importation of Chinese, Japanese, and Portuguese laborers into those islands amounted to less than 3,000, while in the ten years succeeding the treaty the importations amounted to more than 39,000.

Sir, what was the nature of this transaction? It was to take from the pockets of the American people \$5,000,000 annually without putting one single dollar into the Treasury. But for the treaty, the sugar planters of the Sandwich Islands would have paid into the Treasury of the United States \$5,000,000 annually, which would have been refunded to them by American consumers, and thereby American consumers would have contributed that amount to the support of their Government, but under this treaty not a dollar went into the Treasury, and the \$5,000,000 annually paid went as a bounty to promote the sugar industry in a foreign country. [Applause.]

Mr. VAN VOORHIS of New York. Is not all that done away with by the Wilson bill?

Mr. PATTERSON. I said I did not care to be interfered with, and I hope the gentleman will observe the polite request I made at the beginning of my remarks.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the effect of the McKinley bill was to place a bounty of 2 cents per pound on sugar produced in the United States. As the Sandwich Islands were beyond our territorial limits, it amounted to the repeal of a bounty of \$5,000,000 paid annually to the sugar planters of those islands. The effect of this new tariff law was immediate and disastrous to the sugar industry in that country.

Even before the McKinley bill was enacted into a law the Hawaiian sugar planters took alarm. Minister Stevens, in his letter to Mr. Blaine, dated April 28, 1890, says:

* * * The aspect of the "sugar question" in Congress at Washington strengthens the opponents of the existing ministry and continues to depress and alarm the Americans here and those who hold that the United States is the best ally and the real hope of the Hawaiian Kingdom.

Ah, Mr. Speaker, the desire to put the hands of those sugar planters into the pockets of the American people lies at the bottom of this transaction.

Again, Mr. Stevens, in his letter to Mr. Blaine, dated September 5, 1891, says:

* * * The repeal of the sugar duty by the United States has struck the principal material product of Hawaii a very severe blow, and with the most favorable estimate it now looks as though bankruptcy must be the inevitable fate of more or less of the sugar-planting firms and corporations.

Again, in his letter to Mr. Blaine of March 8, 1892, he says:

* * * I may add that the "annexation" sentiment is increasing quite as much among the white residents and native Hawaiians and other workmen who own no sugar stock as with the sugar-planters.

Again, in his letter to Mr. Blaine of April 2, 1892, he says:

In the mean time "the annexation" sentiment has grown rapidly. Quoting those who would seek annexation by first creating a republic, to the larger number and more responsible citizens, the chief property holders, who wish to use only specific measures, they would carry all before them, provided the latter could get any encouragement that the United States would take these islands as a Territory.

Sir, this correspondence shows the growth of the sentiment in favor of annexation in these islands. Here is the motive and here is the whole scheme of the sugar-planters to secure a bounty from the Government of the United States, as shown by the correspondence of our accredited minister to the Hawaiian Government.

In his letter of November 20, 1892, to Secretary Foster, Mr. Blaine's successor, written after the Presidential election, written after the people of the United States had decreed that the Republican party should pass from the control of this Government, our minister comes out and boldly advocates annexation.

In that letter Mr. Stevens says:

I think it understating the truth to express the opinion that the loss to the owners of the sugar plantations and mills, etc., and the consequent depreciation of other property by the passage of the McKinley bill, wise and beneficial as that measure is proving to be to the vast interests of the United States, has not been less than \$12,000,000, a large portion of this loss falling on Americans residing here and in California.

Here, Mr. Speaker, are the real motives which promoted, and the true conditions out of which the revolution in Hawaii grew. Here was the enormous reward which the sugar-planters were to receive if annexation could be brought about. Here was the motive behind the junta of thirteen which secretly organized on the 14th of January following, and here was the motive which inspired our accredited minister to Hawaii.

Let us now go a little nearer the main facts in issue. On the 14th of January the Queen threatened to proclaim a new constitution. Her ministers refused to join her in that proclamation.

The result was that she abandoned the attempt and so notified our minister. On Monday, the 16th of January, two or three thousand Hawaiian citizens, in sympathy with the government of the Queen, peacefully convened in mass meeting and declared their allegiance to her and to her government and their confidence in her good intentions.

Notwithstanding this was a peaceful meeting, on the self-same day at 2 o'clock another meeting was called by the junta of thirteen, at which the Queen was denounced, but no intimation was given of any purpose to establish a provisional government. Before that meeting was called the evidence discloses the fact that the junta of thirteen had a perfect understanding with the American minister that he would protect them and would land troops whenever they should request him so to do.

In less than an hour after this meeting was held this junta of conspirators requested Mr. Stevens, the American minister, to land troops at Honolulu for the ostensible purpose of protecting life and property; but for the real purpose of protecting them in their revolutionary designs. On the same evening, at 5 o'clock, the marines, fully armed and equipped, with a Gatling gun, invaded the city of Honolulu, took possession, and hoisted the American flag. At the time this occurrence took place, all was peace in the city. Men, women, and children were on the streets peacefully passing to and fro without any suspicion of danger.

Not only this, but on the same day the friends of the Queen, the citizens who were loyal to her Government, amounting to two or three thousand in number, had a peaceful meeting and declared their peaceful intentions. That very night this junta of thirteen men, every one of whom was a foreigner, or of foreign origin, met in the building adjoining the residence of the American minister, and there secretly unfolded their scheme for the organization of a provisional government.

This scheme was to be proclaimed on the day following. Ten of their number were designated as officers of the proposed government. They did this with an understanding and in pursuance of a previously arranged plan made with the American minister, to the effect that if they would the next day occupy the public building, and there read the proclamation and establish a provisional government, he (the American minister) would recognize it as the *de facto* government of Hawaii. Up to this time the deliberations and purposes of the junta were kept secret from the public. The next day they sent a man by the name of Wilcox to the public buildings to survey the field and to see whether their motives and purposes were known or suspected, and to report whether they could in safety approach and enter the building without being arrested.

When it was ascertained that the building was comparatively vacant and no one suspected what was going on, this junta of thirteen (the so-called committee of safety) divided up into small parties of two and three and went leisurely to the public building, so that peaceful citizens would not suspect their intention. Once there, one of their number proceeded to read the proclamation establishing the Provisional Government. So unsuspecting was the general public that not more than four or five men were present when the reading began.

Sir, look at the surroundings: West of the building were the marines, the Gatling gun, and the flag of the United States. There within 400 yards was the Queen's palace, where were stationed 50 of her troops. There, within 200 yards of the palace were the barracks, in which 272 soldiers of the Queen were stationed. There at the station house, within 400 yards were 224 other soldiers of the Queen.

At the time that proclamation was read an army of 546 soldiers, loyal to the Queen and under the command of an efficient officer, were in gunshot range of the spot at which the proclamation was then being read. The marines were so stationed that the Queen's troops could not fire into the conspirators without firing on the flag of the United States. The evidence shows that certainly before 5 o'clock on that evening, while the Queen was in full possession of her palace, the barracks, and the station house, and supported by an army of 546 men, our accredited minister to Hawaii deliberately recognized the Provisional Government as the *de facto* government of the islands. Subsequent to this recognition the commander of her troops peremptorily refused to surrender to the Provisional Government without instructions from the Queen.

At 6 o'clock that evening Mr. Damon, who is now vice-president of the Provisional Government, in company with one or two members of the Queen's cabinet, waited upon her and insisted that she should surrender to the Provisional Government and refer her claims to the Government of the United States. She consented, and then and there she entered a solemn protest, declaring that she yielded to "the superior force of the United States, whose minister plenipotentiary, His Excellency John L. Stevens, has caused United States troops to be landed at Honolulu, and who had declared that he would support said Provi-

sional Government." Under these conditions the commander of her forces capitulated.

At the very hour when the Queen yielded to the superior forces of the United States there lay in the harbor of Honolulu a ship chartered for the purpose of conveying the commissioners of the Provisional Government to this country. They departed for the United States on the 19th of January, just two days after the proclamation was read, establishing that government. Every one of these commissioners was either an alien or of foreign origin. While they were upon their journey our minister, in his impatience, and at the request of the Provisional Government, which was otherwise powerless, on the 1st day of February declared a protectorate over the inlands, and planted the American flag over the public building. This he promptly communicated to the State Department here in Washington.

The haste of these commissioners and of the Administration at Washington was something extraordinary. The commissioners had an interview with Mr. Foster, the Secretary of State, the day after their arrival in Washington. On the 11th of February the treaty of annexation was perfected and ready for the signatures of the contracting parties; on the 14th it was signed, and on the 15th President Harrison submitted it to the Senate of the United States in secret executive session.

Mr. Speaker, I have not the time to go, as I would like, into the details of this transaction. In submitting the treaty of annexation to the Senate, President Harrison said: "The overthrow of the monarchy was not in any way promoted by this Government." I appeal to every member of this House. I appeal to the great tribunal of public opinion to answer whether that statement be true. President Harrison sent that message to the Senate of the United States, when the protest of the Queen, solemnly declaring that she had surrendered her government and her army to the superior force of the United States, had been received by the State Department, and after he had received a letter from the Queen, in which she had given in detail all the circumstances connected with the overthrow of her government.

In view of these facts, and in view of the further fact that it was well known to his Government at the time he penned his message that the troops of the United States had been landed and that the flag of the United States floated in Honolulu, when the American minister recognized the Provisional Government, I say this statement of President Harrison is very extraordinary, to say the least of it. But it is not so extraordinary as the statement that Mr. Foster, the Secretary of State, made to President Harrison, in which he says:

At the time the Provisional Government took possession of the government building no troops or forces of the United States were present or took any part whatever in the proceedings. No public recognition was accorded to the Provisional Government by the United States until after the Queen's abdication, and when they were in effective possession of the government building, the archives, the palace, the barracks, the police station, and all the potential machinery of the government.

I say that in all this record there is not a particle of proof to the effect that the Provisional Government was in possession of the police station or the barracks at the time it was recognized by Minister Stevens. Notwithstanding Mr. Stevens was acting in concert with the conspirators, he never had the hardihood to make to the State Department such an assertion as this. Where, I say, did Secretary Foster find anything in connection with this transaction upon which to base this statement to President Harrison? It was not in the record; it was entirely voluntary on his part. It was either fabricated or he derived his information from the commissioners of the Provisional Government, who were aliens and enemies to the government of the Queen.

Sir, why all this haste? I repeat the question. Why all this haste? I answer, because on the 8th day of November preceding these events there had been a national election in this country, and Mr. Cleveland had been elected President of the United States. On the 4th day of March he was to be inaugurated, and on that day it was decreed that Democracy should control every Department of this Government. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

These gentlemen who were so impatient, these men who precipitated the revolution in Hawaii and perfected the treaty of annexation between Hawaii and this country in such hot haste, knew very well that when Grover Cleveland stood on the 4th day of March on the eastern portico of this Capitol, and there took oath to faithfully discharge the duties of President and to protect, preserve, and defend the Constitution of the United States, he would never give his consent to the annexation to this country of these leprous islands 2,000 miles away from our western shores. They knew that when Grover Cleveland took the oath of office he would never give his sanction to this nefarious transaction, a transaction more leprous than the Hawaiians, whereby a friendly government had been subverted. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

It will be borne in mind that the scheme of annexation was incomplete when Mr. Cleveland was inaugurated. The proclamation establishing a Provisional Government at Honolulu declared that it was to exist until a union could be brought about with the United States. The Queen in her protest had solemnly declared:

I yield my authority until such time as the Government of the United States shall, upon the facts being presented to it, undo the action of its representative and reinstate me in the authority which I claim as the constitutional sovereign of the Hawaiian Islands.

The United States on the 4th day of March had taken no action on the claims which the Queen had so confidently referred to this Government. These matters were all incomplete. Let me draw a parallel. In 1890 this Republic entered into a solemn treaty with the imperial Government of Germany and with the imperial Government of Great Britain by which a savage king by the name of Maliteoa was to be maintained on the throne of the Samoan Islands and was to be protected in the enjoyment of his throne. That treaty, as bad as it was, had been approved by the American Senate.

The present Administration has not said one word about its objectionable character, and it has been executed according to its terms. This Government in conjunction with Germany and Great Britain is to-day maintaining Maliteoa on the throne of Samoa. Not only this, but there was another savage who aspired to the throne, and the Government of the United States, in conjunction with those of Germany and Great Britain, not only maintains Maliteoa upon the throne, but it has captured the pretender and imprisoned him upon one of the Marshall Islands, and he and his chiefs are there to-day prisoners of war, maintained and supported by these governments.

However harshly this transaction may be criticized, however objectionable it may be from an American standpoint, the present Administration has to submit to it because the treaty under which one savage king is maintained on the throne and another savage king and his chiefs are maintained as prisoners of war is an executed treaty.

But this treaty with the Provisional Government of Hawaii was never executed. When Mr. Cleveland was inaugurated he did exactly what President Harrison should have done. He selected a distinguished gentleman to go to Honolulu and investigate for him the facts in the case. Whom did he select for this important mission, Mr. Speaker?

Can we ever forget, sir, the most extraordinary scene that ever took place upon this floor, when after twenty years of service in this House James H. Blount, the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, was about to retire to private life?

Democrats and Republicans unanimously arose in their places and tendered him an ovation such as was never before known to have been tendered to any retiring member of Congress, giving their generous testimony to his ability, his impartiality, and his high integrity. This was the man the President selected for the important mission to Hawaii. It has been said, but I believe that it is now abandoned, that there was no precedent for sending Mr. Blount to Honolulu. Here are the precedents, coming down from the day when President Madison sent Governor Mitchell to Florida to the time when Mr. Blaine sent Mr. Tresscott to South America, showing that the President in sending Mr. Blount to Honolulu was following in the footsteps of his predecessors.

When Mr. Blount had reported the result of his investigations to the State Department the President appointed Mr. Willis minister to Hawaii and accredited him to the Provisional Government. The task of the President and his accredited minister in respect to the Hawaiian mission was an exceedingly delicate one. Thoroughly satisfied that the Queen's Government had been subverted by the unlawful and unauthorized interference of the American minister and that justice required that the wrong should be repaired, yet there was no constitutional power to use force and no disposition on the part of the President to do so.

The Provisional Government had been established expressly to exist until union could be effected with the United States. The Queen, on the other hand, had surrendered to the superior force of the United States, and had confidently submitted her claims, whatever they were, to the justice and the magnanimity of this Government. In view of this condition of affairs it was but natural that the President should believe that when the Provisional Government was notified that annexation to the United States was impossible, it would fall of its own weight. When so informed, its existence was terminated by the terms of the proclamation under which it was established.

I do not deny that it was the desire—and I say that he was right—I do not deny that it was the desire of the President, with all these facts before him, to restore the *statu quo* as it had existed before the 17th of January, if he could do so by friendly suggestion

and without the use of force; but I do deny that the President ever contemplated or threatened to use force in order to accomplish that result. He only interposed the offices of this Government for that purpose.

Before doing so, however, he interposed to shield from punishment the gentlemen who composed the Provisional Government on the ground that the American minister had acted in concert with them in bringing about the subversion of the Queen's Government, and therefore he regarded it as his duty, by his interposition, to see that neither punishment nor harm came to them. In this he failed, partly because of the obstinacy of the Queen, and partly because of the determination of the Provisional Government to maintain at all hazards its authority.

Having failed to accomplish this peaceful result, the President referred the whole matter to Congress.

[Here the hammer fell.]

On motion of Mr. SNODGRASS, by unanimous consent, the time of Mr. PATTERSON was extended ten minutes.

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, there is one branch of this case which has filled me with astonishment. I can not let this occasion pass without referring to another and a different policy of the Republican party.

Let us run a parallel, if you please, between the Hawaiian Islands and the State of South Carolina. The Hawaiian Islands are foreign to this country. They are no part of it. A few American adventurers, it is true, have gone over there in quest of fortune, and, so far as I am concerned, permit me to say in this connection my sympathies go out toward white men in all countries where they are struggling for the ascendancy.

But, sir, can you forget, can I forget, can this country ever forget that this same Republican party, that now so piteously pleads for white supremacy and Christian civilization in the Hawaiian Islands, only a few short years ago deliberately turned South Carolina, one of the Southern States of America, one of the original thirteen States, the land of Pinckney, the land of Sumter, the land of Marion, the land of Moultrie, the land of my ancestors, over to the domination of a race inferior to, and less progressive than, are the Hawaiians? That epoch in the existence of the Republican party has gone into history, but it never repents and never forgives. No longer ago than the Fifty-first Congress it deliberately attempted by means of the force bill to reinaugurate the condition of affairs in the Southern States which existed twenty-five years ago.

Sir, that party has the hardihood to stand before the country and before the civilized world and prate and cant about "Christianity and civilization," and a "white man's government" 2,000 miles away in the Pacific Ocean! Mr. Speaker, I have no language to give expression to my abhorrence of such hypocrisy. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Just one word more. The foreign policy of this Government ought not to be aggressive. What business have we with the Sandwich Islands? They are too big for a county and too small for a State. Why should we incorporate the Hawaiians, Chinese, the Japanese, the Portuguese, and the South Sea Islanders residing on those islands with our country?

Annexation with such distant islands and such an incongruous population is alike contrary to our established policy and to our interests. We want no territory, unless it be territory out of which we can carve a sovereign and independent State. When the time comes we would like to have our neighbors in Canada voluntarily unite with us, as an integral part of this great Republic, because they are white men, standing with us in the front line of civilization, who would rapidly assimilate with our institutions.

But, sir, there is another view of this question. This country is republican. It has no imperial policy. It is to our interest to make treaties with the countries of the East; to make treaties with China, with Japan, with Corea, and all the other Eastern countries. American enterprise will cut its way through the Isthmus of Darien, and we are beginning to look abroad to those countries for the expansion of our commerce. It is our policy to assure them of our pacific intentions. They must understand that we are not an imperial and aggressive power. They are apprehensive of England, of Germany, and of France, who are ambitiously extending their domains into all quarters of the globe. It is our highest duty as a republic to pursue the paths of peace, of justice, and of honor, giving to all other countries the assurance that they can establish commercial relations with us without danger to their autonomy. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

[Mr. WHEELER of Alabama withholds his remarks for revision. See Appendix.]

Mr. OATES. Mr. Speaker, the debate has taken a very wide range, and has in many respects departed from the real issue to be considered.

The first resolution declares:

Resolved, First, That it is the sense of this House that the action of the United States minister in employing United States naval forces and illegally aiding in overthrowing the constitutional Government of the Hawaiian Islands in January, 1893, and in setting up in its place a Provisional Government not republican in form and in opposition to the will of a majority of the people, was contrary to the traditions of our Republic and the spirit of our Constitution, and should be and is condemned.

Then the second resolution says:

Second. That we heartily approve the principle announced by the President of the United States that interference with the domestic affairs of an independent nation is contrary to the spirit of American institutions. And it is further the sense of this House that the annexation of the Hawaiian Islands to our country, or the assumption of a protectorate over them by our Government, is uncalled for and inexpedient; that the people of that country should have absolute freedom and independence in pursuing their own line of policy, and that foreign intervention in the political affairs of the islands will not be regarded with indifference by the Government of the United States.

That is unquestionably an assertion of the true American doctrine. Now, sir, the principal question at issue is whether the United States, when that revolution occurred, interposed or took any part in it. If it did not, then we have no concern with it. If it did, then we have. In the light of all the facts and the report of Mr. BLOUNT, I think there can be but one conclusion. If I were to consider any man's testimony sufficient to warrant me in doing the most serious act that a man is ever called upon to perform, I know not a man whose word I would take in preference to that of Mr. BLOUNT. Tell me not that a man who has served here for twenty years and commanded universal respect and admiration for his honesty, good faith, and patriotism, would mar that record by making a false report when he was sent upon this high mission.

I believe what Mr. Blount says. He may have erred somewhat in some portions of his examination, but the conclusions are resistless, and should not be questioned.

Now, it is a fact that the United States minister caused the marines, 160 in number, I believe, and two Gatling guns, to be landed when the revolutionists were in the act of overthrowing the Queen's Government.

It is a further fact that they did no act of violence. Suppose they had, what would have been our duty? Suppose there had been an armed conflict precipitated and our guns and men had participated. What would have been the duty of the United States? The act would have been wrongful. Why, to repair that wrong and restore the Queen, though she be as black as Erebus and as immoral as any one ever was. No one can doubt the soundness of that proposition. If the United States used actual physical force to aid in deposing the Queen and in overthrowing her Government, we would be honor bound to use force in her restoration if necessary. But the Republicans who are opposed to this Administration, and wish to make party capital out of the affair, say there was no force employed.

I admit that no actual physical force was employed, but there was intimidation, which is quite the equivalent of force in many instances. It reminds me very much of an occurrence several years ago down in the South, when the colored voters were much more ignorant than they are now. An election was being held for justice of the peace, and all of the black voters were voting one way, and a friend of Bill Jones was the man against whom they were voting. Bill was a big fellow who weighed about 225 pounds, and could whip anybody with his fists. He had a long, heavy, red beard, and was cross-eyed. He was known to be a fighter. Bill saw that his man was going to be beaten unless something was done. He knew it was illegal to employ any force to deter these voters, so he stood near the polls, and whenever a negro would approach to vote, Bill would just step in front of him and look him in the face. The negro would move around, and Bill would move around, too, and keep looking at him. He did not give the negro many looks before he shot away from there as fast as he could. Another negro would come up, and Bill would treat him the same way. There was no actual violence in the whole proceedings, but it was intimidation and had the desired effect. He drove them away without saying a word or performing an act except standing around looking at them. [Laughter.]

Minister Stevens did no act of violence. There were his troops and guns—he did no act except to step around and look ugly at the Queen. [Laughter.] That was sufficient to do the business. The marines were landed with their guns and took position within 76 yards of the Government building, and there they were and they did intimidate the Queen and her forces. She knew that if they were molested that the war ship Boston was lying in the harbor and could destroy the city.

Now, I say it is none of our concern as a nation as to what kind of a government they had. It is none of our business; they had a right to a monarchy if they wanted it, or to a republic if they preferred it. That is none of our business.

How ridiculous is the charge that has been made and circu-

lated all through this country and even exhibited in metropolitan newspapers by wood cuts, our President at the feet of a black queen as her worshiper, or in other attitudes, assuming to restore her to the throne, and actually representing him as being in favor of monarchy. Why, my friends, it is absolutely disgraceful. To charge the President with such a purpose is a base slander, it is a slander whose edge is sharper than the sword, whose tongue outvenoms all the worms of the Nile, whose poisonous breath rides upon the posting winds and doth belie all corners of the world. There is no man who possesses a particle of patriotism, of any political party in this country, and who is not insane, would for one moment favor the establishment and maintenance of a monarchy anywhere. That insinuation is made against the President merely to prejudice him in public estimation. The purpose is mainly to make unpopular the Administration.

The President cares nothing about a monarchy. He naturally favors a republic. He was reared in a republic and is as much devoted to it as any man in America. The question presented to him was, did our Government do a wrong? Believing that it had he did the best he could to right that wrong. It matters not to him whom it benefits or whom it injures. He has simply done his duty at risk of incurring censure.

Why, many of the gentlemen who raise such an outcry against the President and charge him with aiding the black Queen seem to think it a crime because of her color. They have poisoned the public mind upon the subject against the Administration. They seem to forget their own conduct in the Southern States in reconstruction times when they set up negro-carpetbag governments over the white people of the Southern States. They heaped much blame and attempted degradation upon the white people of the South for alleged violations of law and denial of the rights of the colored race. Many more such allegations have been made and circulated that never had any true foundation. Is it not rather inconsistent in them now to be setting up such false charges against the President for doing an act of justice? They have swapped sides on the negro question.

Why, the Queen when she surrendered her government did so because the United States authorities were there, and so expressed herself at the time, and said she would abide the decision of the President of the United States. Mr. Harrison was President at that time, but it is a continuing office. It matters not what action he took it was not finished but was still *in fieri* when Mr. Cleveland came into office; it was his duty as soon as inaugurated to look into it and do even-handed justice. He has found on the facts that the United States forces were illegally used to intimidate the Queen and aid by their presence the cause of the revolutionists. They may have been right; they may have rebelled because she exacted absolute power, but with that our Government had no concern.

It was none of our business, and Minister Stevens should have kept his long nose out of it. He had no right to aid in the accomplishment of the revolution. He desired to immortalize his ministerial service by causing the annexation of the islands to the Union. President Cleveland has justly repudiated and the resolutions repudiate the act of the minister, and ought to be adopted without a dissenting voice. There was no actual force used, and when the act of the minister in disembarking the troops and guns, and aiding the revolution by their presence, is repudiated and condemned, I do not believe it is the duty of our Government to go any farther. The President submitted the whole question to the Congress. There, is in my judgment, no necessity of doing anything more than to pass these resolutions, which is a declaration of the illegality of the act performed by the representative of our Government upon that occasion. Minister Stevens has long since been recalled. Let the Hawaiians govern themselves as they please.

It seems to me that those who would deny this act of justice to the Queen and her government and those whom she represented are unjust. Stevens's conduct and those who sustain him have but little better excuse for it than did Plurabustah for his conduct toward Cuffee on their first acquaintance. Doesticks says that when Plurabustah invaded the dominion of Cuffee, in his native land, he said, "Good morning, Cuffee, I am glad to see you. Then he inquired how was pretty Mrs. Cuffee and all the little Cuffees, and then he made a face at Cuffee, and then he squared off at Cuffee, and then he lit into Cuffee; Cuffee's head was mauled and pummeled; Cuffee's wool was torn and tangled; Cuffee's sides were sore and aching; Cuffee's eyes looked like onions; his nose looked like a sausage, juicy sausage, damaged sausage; Cuffee's lips looked like oysters, huge, disfigured oysters, oysters with the shell off; then he was enslaved, all because, said Plurabustah, he had no right and no business to be a negro." [Laughter.]

Now, that is the sort of reasoning that is applied by many thoughtless people to this case. The Administration has done

nothing on earth except to bring forward the facts and to repudiate an act which was illegal toward a weak and helpless power which we can but poorly atone for short of the use of force. The President promptly withdrew the treaty for annexation from the Senate, which spoiled the job. That was a most righteous act. It was withdrawn, and Commissioner Blount sent to Honolulu to learn the true state of the case.

I am glad that treaty was withdrawn. That approval is well expressed in the second resolution as against the interests of this country. Look at the character of the population of those islands 2,000 miles from our shores, and we see no one but the men who are there engaged in speculation and want to make money out of it who favor annexation to this Government. Look at the mixed population, composed of colored, Chinese, Japanese, and a few white adventurers and speculators, and any gentleman who has had any experience with a large part of this country will certainly join me in saying that we want no more States, of mixed races, added to this Union. I will always oppose it. We want no part of the Hawaiian Islands except just enough for a coaling station for our ships, and that is easily obtained.

Mr. HEPBURN. Will it disturb the gentleman for me to ask him a question?

Mr. OATES. No.

Mr. HEPBURN. You have stated that coercion was used. Now, if it was proper for the Government of the United States to use coercion in its demand on the Government of Hawaii to surrender their Government ninety days ago, was it not a proper act now to right this great wrong that you say has been perpetrated?

Mr. OATES. I did not say what the gentleman represents me as saying. I say the presence of troops was intimidation, that it had the same effect as if they actually employed force, though no force was in fact used.

Mr. HEPBURN. Well, it was a force, a coercion. If actual force had been employed, then I say it would be the duty of the Government of the United States to right that wrong, even if they had employed a force to do it.

Mr. OATES. I quite agree. But no actual force was used and we are not responsible as a government to the extent of using force or making war in order to make amends for that illegal act. A repudiation of the illegal act committed by placing the troops in an attitude which exercised some moral force or intimidation does not call for the actual employment of force or act of war.

Mr. HEPBURN. Then, I understand the gentleman's ground to be, that the exemption of this Government from the duty of immediate restoration is based upon the difference which exists between coercion and force.

Mr. OATES. I think largely so; for there is a great difference between intimidation, simply caused by one's presence, and the employment of actual force.

Mr. HEPBURN. I thought from the illustration the gentleman made a moment ago, that he held that there was no difference between intimidation and force.

Mr. OATES. The gentleman is a good lawyer; I have served with him on the Judiciary Committee, and I will ask him if he does not know the difference which exists between the employment of actual force, even to justify the taking of life to resist it, and the fear which may be caused by the presence of another who uses no force. There is no justification in law for the slaying of another on the ground of his appearance alone unless he perpetrates an overt act or makes an attempt which endangers life or limb.

Mr. HEPBURN. I understood the gentleman to use the illustration of his neighbor at the polls to show that there was no difference between intimidation, coercion, and force. That is why I made the inquiry.

Mr. OATES. I think my illustration was rather an apt one. There was nothing on earth except the look of the man which operated as an intimidation in that case.

Mr. HEPBURN. And as force.

Mr. OATES. No, not as force; because the voter could have approached the polls and deposited his ballot if he had tried, but he was apprehensive that it might get him into trouble, and hence he desisted. The Queen and her forces were apprehensive that they might get into trouble and therefore they desisted.

Mr. HEPBURN. They desisted. That is what I thought.

Mr. OATES. Mr. Speaker, it is a very high mission which this Government has undertaken to perform toward its own people and the nations of the world and should be conscientiously and honestly performed in all cases. Its external policy ever has been that of noninterference in the affairs of other nations. If the people of Hawaii desire to have a Queen and a monarchical government it is their right.

If they desire a republican form of government it is their

right, and it is none of our business as a nation and we have no right to interfere, to dictate to them the kind of government which they shall establish and maintain. We have no such right, and the question presented here is simply whether the Government of the United States did a wrongful act by participating in the Hawaiian revolution. I have already given my view of that and will not repeat it. The President undertook, as I think it was his duty to have done, to make suitable atonement for that wrong, and he has performed the full measure of that duty so far as it lay in his power. Now the question is with the Congress, and, so far as I am concerned, I am convinced beyond all question that it is our duty not as Democrats nor as Republicans, but as fair, honest, and honorable American citizens, to adopt the resolutions reported by the committee.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. BOUTELLE was recognized.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may be allowed to proceed a little beyond the hour limit. I am not sure that I shall desire to occupy more than an hour, as my voice is somewhat impaired, yet, as this question covers a great deal of ground I would like to feel before beginning that I have a little latitude as to time.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman indicate any particular additional amount of time that he desires?

Mr. BOUTELLE. I would like to speak for an hour and twenty minutes or perhaps an hour and twenty-five minutes.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maine be permitted to continue for an hour and a half.

Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky. Of course, it is understood that the extension will come out of the time on the other side?

The SPEAKER. Certainly.

Mr. VAN VOORHIS of New York. Mr. Speaker, it may seem ungracious for me to object to this request—

Mr. BOUTELLE. I waive the request, and desire to proceed.

Mr. VAN VOORHIS of New York. I have not objected yet. I was only going to make a statement.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, I renew the request that the gentleman from Maine be permitted to proceed for an hour and a half.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa that the gentleman from Maine be permitted to proceed for an hour and a half?

Mr. VAN VOORHIS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I simply desire to say that the gentleman from Maine is speaking in my time. I am a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs and have a right to speak for an hour, but the gentleman from Maine has got in ahead of me and I am willing to give him an hour, but if he occupies more than that I may not get any time at all. [Laughter.]

Mr. BOUTELLE. I trust the few moments consumed by the gentleman from New York will not be taken from my time.

The SPEAKER. They will not.

[Mr. BOUTELLE withholds his remarks for revision. See Appendix.]

Mr. BLACK of Illinois was recognized, and yielded two minutes to Mr. MCDANNOLD.

Mr. MCDANNOLD. Mr. Speaker, there is, it seems to me, a very simple proposition presented in the Hawaiian question. We have not to concern ourselves with a discussion of whether or not there had been proposed prior to January 16, 1893, enactments or pronouncements by the then existing authority contrary to good law or morals. It is not for us to consider whether or not the Queen, then in undisputed authority, had proposed or intended to overthrow the existing constitution. These are matters entirely beyond our proper jurisdiction and lying entirely within the province of the inhabitants of that kingdom. We have no more to do with the selling of lottery tickets in Honolulu than we have with the morals of the denizens of the African wilderness. It is simply none of our business whether or not the Hawaiians legalize the selling of lottery tickets or wink at gambling on boards of trade. They can do both or either with no proper fear of outside interference.

But, sir, there is a matter which deeply concerns the American people. It has been charged that the President of the United States has exceeded his proper authority in the effort to undo what he deemed to have been a gross injustice. It is claimed that he has sought to overthrow a republican form of government and to set up a monarchy. If these charges can be sustained by fair inquiry, I will be the first on this floor to move for prompt action in the premises. But what are the facts? I will state them very briefly, and in so doing will draw only from the published statements of the gentlemen who have set themselves before the world as guardians of the moralities of Hawaii.

It appears from the official statement of Mr. John L. Stevens,

then representative of this Government at Honolulu as minister plenipotentiary and envoy extraordinary, dated January 18, 1893, that the immediate cause for the revolt of the gentlemen composing the Provisional Government against the Queen was the proposal of the latter to allow the establishment of a lottery scheme in her dominion. Because of the disturbance arising from the conflict between these guardians of public morals and the Queen, it is alleged by Mr. Stevens:

A large mass meeting of citizens was called to meet on Monday, the 16th, at 2 p. m., which assembled in the largest hall in the city. Short as was the notice, over 1,300 of the principal citizens of Honolulu and from other islands who happened to be in the city, were in attendance.

It is important to note the statement here quoted. Mr. Stevens asserts the presence of over 1,300 citizens in the meeting held in the largest hall in the city. Reference to the sworn testimony as to the size of that hall will have an important bearing upon the credibility of this witness.

Mr. Stevens says that a committee appointed at that meeting called upon him for aid, and that he "promptly addressed to the commander of the Boston, Capt. G. S. Wiltse, a note requesting the landing of United States marines and sailors." Thereafter there was constituted, according to Mr. Stevens, a Provisional Government. Then the following is said to have occurred:

The committee on public safety forthwith took possession of the Government buildings, archives, and treasury and installed the Provisional Government at the heads of the respective departments. This being an accomplished fact, I promptly recognized the Provisional Government as the *de facto* government of the Hawaiian Islands. The English minister, the Portuguese *charge d'affaires*, and the French and Japanese commissioners promptly did the same; these, with myself, being the only members of the diplomatic corps residing here.

It will be remembered that the meeting of 1,300 citizens referred to by Mr. Stephens was held on Monday, January 16, 1893. On the same day the soldiers were landed and located in such a manner as to command every approach to the Government buildings. In the report from which these quotations have been made there is not even a hint as to a disturbance having been created. On the contrary it is in evidence that Mr. Stephens asserted that he believed that "a force of twenty-five well-armed men could have driven all the Queen's men before them."

Now, sir, I stand here to assert that if the quoted statements of John L. Stevens are not totally disproved, there has been injustice done by this Administration in this matter. I do not mean that these statements shall be disproved by any forced construction of testimony from others. I will ask that the most trying tests shall be put to the proof I shall offer to show that Mr. Stevens willfully and deliberately misrepresented the facts of the case to his Government and that he stands before the world convicted of having used his position as a representative of this people to deceive the Administration from whom he received his appointment. The time for smooth words has passed. We are here confronted with a serious question. It is patent that either a gross outrage was perpetrated by the Administration of Mr. Stevens, or that one equally as gross has been attempted by Mr. Cleveland and his advisers. For one I am willing to meet this question out in the open and to leave the issue to the people of this country after the facts shall have been fairly marshaled.

In such a contest I believe the result not doubtful. I believe, too, that the event will prove of vast benefit to the better element in this country by the light it will throw upon the calumniators who have caught at a chance to malign the present Democratic Administration.

I turn now once more to the record. Hitherto I have quoted only from the written statements of Mr. Stevens, and I shall now give some statements from the record which the late minister possibly thought had been destroyed, as they had not been placed on file when he surrendered his office to his successor.

Under date of February 11, 1893, certain gentlemen calling themselves Commissioners of the Hawaiian Provisional Government, presented to the Secretary of State a document called by them a "Reply to the statements contained in the protest of the ex-Queen of Hawaii." In that document appears the following paragraph:

Sixth. At the time the Provisional Government took possession of the Government buildings no American troops or officers were present or took part in such proceedings in any manner whatever. No public recognition was accorded the Provisional Government by the American minister until they were in possession of the Government buildings, the archives, and the treasury, supported by several hundred armed men, and after the abdication of the Queen and the surrender to the Provisional Government of her forces.

Let us compare another portion of the record with this statement of the Commissioners of the Provisional Government. Under date of January 17, 1893, the following letter was addressed to the American Minister:

Sir: I acknowledge receipt of your valued communication of this day, recognizing the Hawaiian Provisional Government, and express deep appreciation of the same.

We have conferred with the ministers of the late Government, and have made demand upon the marshal to surrender the station-house. We are not actually yet in possession of the station-house; but as night is approaching, and our forces may be insufficient to maintain order, we request immediate support of the United States forces, and would request that the commander of the United States forces take command of our military forces, so that they may act together for the protection of the city.

Respectfully, yours,

SANDFORD B. DOLE,
Chairman Executive Council.

His Excellency JOHN L. STEVENS,
United States Minister Resident.

Mr. Thurston and his associates stated in the communication above quoted that—

No public recognition was accorded the Provisional Government by the American minister until they were in possession of the Government buildings, the archives, and the treasury.

Mr. Dole acknowledges receipt of the "valued communication recognizing the Hawaiian Provisional Government," and then, in a letter written toward the close of the day, acknowledges that—

We are not actually in possession of the station-house, but as night is approaching and our forces may be insufficient to maintain order we request the immediate support of the United States forces.

There can be no question as to the intent of the communication addressed by the Hawaiian commissioners to the Secretary of State. They unquestionably sought to convey the impression, so earnestly insisted upon by the American minister in his prior communication, that the Provisional Government had secured control of affairs at Honolulu prior to the act of recognition. Mr. Stevens, under date of January 18, 1893, assured the Secretary of State of the "enthusiasm and the profound feeling of relief at the peaceful and salutary change of government." Mr. Stevens indorsed, upon the appeal of the Provisional Government, for aid the night before, "the above request not complied with."

That the representations of Mr. Stevens completely deceived Mr. Foster, Secretary of State of the United States, appears from the text of his communication to the President. Secretary Foster says:

No public recognition was accorded to the Provisional Government by the United States minister until after the Queen's abdication and when they were in effective possession of the government buildings, the archives, the treasury, the barracks, the police station, and all the potential machinery of the government.

How Secretary Foster was led to this statement may be seen by examining the communication of the Hawaiian commissioners to Mr. Foster under date of Washington, February 3, 1893. They said:

Immediately after such proclamation such Provisional Government took possession of the city of Honolulu, including the government buildings, the archives, and the treasury, and within a few hours thereafter received surrender of all the military and police forces, thereby coming into full possession of the kingdom.

Immediately after such possession had been obtained notification thereof was given to the representatives of all foreign countries represented at Honolulu, accompanied by the request that such representatives extend to said Provisional Government their recognition.

In reply to such request the representative of the United States of America accorded such recognition upon the same day that it was requested, to wit, the 17th of said January.

Mr. Foster accepted the statements of the United States minister as truthful. He accepted the statements of the commission headed by Lorin A. Thurston as truthful. These gentlemen assured the Secretary of State that no recognition had been asked of the United States minister until after the "surrender of all the military and police forces, thereby coming into full possession of the kingdom." Mr. Foster accepted these statements as having been made in good faith. He knew nothing of the letter from Mr. Dole in which that functionary acknowledged receipt of Mr. Stevens's letter recognizing the *de facto* government and stating that—

We have conferred with the ministers of the late government, and have made demand upon the marshal to surrender the station-house.

If Mr. Stevens had been as "prompt" in furnishing Secretary Foster with this information as he had been in recognizing the *de facto* government would Mr. Foster have communicated to the President the statement that—

No public recognition was accorded to the Provisional Government until after the Queen's abdication and when they were in effective possession of the government buildings, the archives, the treasury, the barracks, the police station, and all the potential machinery of the government.

There are two men now prominent in this controversy who can not be allowed to plead ignorance of the existence of this criminal letter of Mr. Dole. They are the writer of the letter and the man who wrote upon it "The above request not complied with. Stevens." Mr. Stevens knew it was false. Mr. Dole knew it was false. It is now asserted by Mr. Thurston that he knew nothing of this letter until it was printed in the Blount report. He may escape conviction of that full guilty knowledge, certainly possessed by Messrs. Dole and Thurston. But he must now reconcile his emphatic and oft-repeated assurances as to the facts stated. If he did not make these statements knowing them to

be false, he made them not knowing them to be true, since it is now demonstrated that they were not true, and therefore his statement falls to the ground and he stands convicted of falsehood.

Mr. Dole informed the American minister, after he had received from that gentleman recognition of the *de facto* government, "We are not actually in possession of the station house." Mr. Stevens assured his superior at the head of the United States State Department that he did not accord recognition until after the forces of the Queen and the station house had been surrendered into the possession of the Provisional Government. Could there be plainer proof of gross falsehood brought against these gentlemen? Let it be noted that this testimony is not taken from any person unfriendly to the claim of the Provisional Government. It is but a repetition of their own statements.

It is their own confession of fraud and is discovered by comparison of a single letter, admitted by Mr. Thurston not to have been known of by him until he saw it in the Blount report. Its authenticity can not be questioned. Fortunately for the truth of history, it bears upon its face the criminating indorsement of the American minister, and convicts Mr. Stevens of having concealed from his Government an essential fact and of having made statements that were disproved by a letter criminally withheld.

Now, there are pertinent questions to be answered to which no reply has as yet been vouchsafed by the representatives of the Provisional Government. The first relates to the question of veracity between the president of that alleged government and his representatives. Did Mr. Stevens tell the truth when he affirmed that "No public recognition was accorded the Provisional Government by the American minister until they were in possession of the government buildings, the archives, and the treasury?" Or did Mr. Dole take counsel of his fears when he said, "We are not actually in possession of the station house; but as night is approaching and our forces may be insufficient to maintain order?"

The statement of Mr. Thurston is specific. It was not that the Provisional Government was in possession of a certain building, but "of the Government buildings, archives, and the treasury." Nothing can be clearer than that this statement was intended to convey the information that, prior to the act of Mr. Stevens early in the day of January 17, the Provisional Government had secured possession of all the government buildings. The fact as shown by subsequent testimony, as well as by the letter of President Dole, was that many hours after the recognition of the Provisional Government by Mr. Stevens, the head of that Government was appealing for support because the Queen's forces had not yet yielded to their demand.

Now, look at the significance of the refusal of Minister Stevens to comply with the request of Mr. Dole. Night was approaching, and the American minister was appealed to for support. His marines were already on shore, and so located as to command the Queen's palace. The sole claim upon which their landing is defended was that they were necessary to protect the citizens in the residence portion of the town. In some of the many published interviews with which the minister of the Provisional Government characterized his efforts during the first few weeks of this controversy, he explained that the residence portions of the town needing protection were those extending up the five valleys away from the center of the town.

Does the minister know of any troops having been so posted as to have been effective in case of outbreaks in these sections? Does he not know that Minister Stevens fully appreciated the situation on the evening of January 17, 1893, when he refused to comply with the request of Mr. Dole for aid? It will be recalled that for several months the gentlemen composing the commission sent hither for the purpose of carrying out the conspiracy into which an American minister had entered, lost no occasion to publish their side of the terrible scandal. Disregarding diplomatic usage and even the requirements of common decency, Mr. Thurston, the minister accredited to the United States from the Provisional Government, rushed into print whenever he saw or thought he saw a chance to increase the misinformation originally invented by Mr. Stevens. He declared that the forces of the United States were effectively placed for the care of the outlying districts, and denied that they were located near the government buildings for the purpose of overawing the Queen and forcing her to surrender forces which she held subsequent to the recognition of the Dole party. He asserted that the troops of the United States had nothing to do with the surrender of the Queen, and that no force had been used by them for that purpose.

Now let me call the attention of this diplomat to the significant fact that he has been more silent since his return from his flying visit to Honolulu. He has had opportunity to explain the discrepancy between the letter of Mr. Dole appealing for help after the recognition of his government, and that of Mr. Stevens, asserting that the Queen's forces had surrendered prior to

the act of "prompt" recognition. Since the publication of that letter of Mr. Dole, Mr. Thurston has had abundant opportunity of securing from the President of the Provisional Government explanation of the too apparent contradiction. He has had ample time since his return to this country to make public an explanation which would explain. But he has neglected this, and in thus keeping silent upon so important a matter he has followed the policy of every defender of the infamous scheme hatched by the speculating conspirators in Honolulu.

But this now careful diplomat affirms that the troops, while located near the government buildings, were just as effective in preventing outlawry in the residence portions of the town as if they had been distributed up and down the five valleys. He explains that their very presence in the city had the effect of subduing the lawless elements, and that they were looked upon as a part of the United States forces, and therefore not to be attacked. Now, let this same argument be applied to the effect of those troops upon the Queen and her forces. Were the advisers of the Queen less intelligent than the hoodlums from whom Mr. Dole feared violence as night approached? Did not the advisers of the Queen realize as well as the mob that marines landed from the Boston were a part of the United States forces? If so, then with what truth can it be said that no force was used by conspirators prior to the surrender? If the silent force far away from the residence district overawed possible disturbers there, what was it that lessened their influence in the government square?

And there is another telltale document which must be explained before credence can be given to anything offered by Mr. Stevens or Mr. Thurston. Against the emphatic statement that the Provisional Government was not recognized until after the "abdication of the Queen and the surrender to the Provisional Government of her forces," Mr. Dole wrote to the American minister late Monday afternoon, January 16, begging his assistance, and informing him that he had made demand for the surrender of the guardhouses. The only comment Mr. Stevens made, so far as the records of his office were allowed to show, was the simple indorsement upon Mr. Dole's letter, "This request not complied with." According to Mr. Stevens and the solemn statement of the commissioners sent by him to this country, the Provisional Government had been established prior to its recognition. According to Mr. Stevens and Mr. Thurston, this had been accomplished without the aid of the United States. According to Mr. Stevens's own words—

The committee of safety forthwith took possession of the government buildings, archives, and treasury, and installed the Provisional Government at the heads of the respective departments. This being an accomplished fact, I promptly recognized the Provisional Government as the *de facto* government of the Hawaiian Islands.

Now, Mr. Dole informed Mr. Stevens in the afternoon of the 17th of January that he had made demand for the surrender of the station houses. He admitted that the demand had not been complied with. Several hours after the recognition of the Provisional Government by Mr. Stevens, and after repeated efforts on the part of emissaries of the Provisional Government with the representatives of the Queen to secure a solution of the difficulty without bloodshed, the surrender of the Queen's forces was made in accordance with the following document:

C. B. WILSON, Esq.,
Marshal of the Kingdom:

You are hereby authorized to surrender to the so-called Provisional Government this day established, headed by S. B. Dole, esq., the police station and Oahu prison and Government property in your possession or under your control.

Dated at Honolulu this 17th day of January, A. D. 1893.

LILIUOKALANI, E.
SAMUEL PARKER,
Minister of Foreign Affairs,
JOHN F. COLBURN,
Minister of the Interior,
WM. H. CORNWELL,
Minister of Finance,
A. P. PETERSON,
Attorney-General.

The above was received by President Dole after his letter to Mr. Stevens, which I have quoted, and in which he declared that he had not yet received the surrender of the station house. At the same time was delivered the following protest from the Queen, containing the declaration of her reasons for yielding:

I, Liliuokalani, by the grace of God and under the constitution of the Hawaiian Kingdom, Queen, do hereby solemnly protest against any and all acts done against myself and the constitutional Government of the Hawaiian Kingdom by certain persons claiming to have established a Provisional Government of and for this Kingdom.

That I yield to the superior force of the United States of America, whose minister plenipotentiary, His Excellency John L. Stevens, has caused United States troops to be landed at Honolulu and declared that he would support the said Provisional Government.

Now, to avoid any collision of armed forces, and perhaps the loss of life, I do under this protest and impelled by said force yield my authority until such time as the Government of the United States shall, upon the facts

being presented to it, undo the action of its representative and reinstate me in the authority which I claim as the constitutional sovereign of the Hawaiian Islands.

Done at Honolulu this 17th day of January, A. D. 1893.
 LILIUOKALANI, R.
 SAMUEL PARKER,
Minister of Foreign Affairs.
 WM. H. CORNWELL,
Minister of Finance.
 JNO. F. COLBURN,
Minister of the Interior.
 A. P. PETERSON,
Attorney-General.

To S. B. DOLE, Esq., and others composing the Provisional Government of the Hawaiian Islands.

It was distinctly stated that she yielded to avoid any collision of armed forces. She yielded while the forces of the United States were so placed as to command absolutely all of the Government buildings. Her protest is indorsed: "Received by the hands of the late cabinet this 17th day of January, 1893," and signed "Sandford B. Dole, chairman of executive council of Provisional Government." This is the record made by the Provisional Government itself. There is no break in the link of evidence going to prove that this surrender was received after Mr. Dole's letter to the American minister acknowledging the receipt of the recognition of the Provisional Government. In these last two papers will be found explanation for the refusal of Mr. Stevens to act upon the demand of the alleged President of the Provisional Government the day before.

If Mr. Dole had been actually in possession of the government buildings, and if the Queen's forces had actually surrendered to him, as stated by Mr. Stevens in his communication to his Government, what more natural than that he should respond to the proper request of Mr. Dole for aid? But Mr. Stevens knew on Monday night that the Queen's forces had not surrendered. He knew there was no danger of an outbreak, and refused to accede to the request of Mr. Dole until that functionary had secured the surrender of the Queen's forces. No demonstration can be plainer. Not even the confession of the conspirators could make it more clear that Mr. Stevens misled this Government by his account of the overthrow of the Queen. Nothing can be plainer than that he connived at this overthrow, and then manufactured false testimony as to the events.

And there is one other point that must not be overlooked in the discussion of this question. It is claimed with vehemence by the defenders of the Provisional Government that attempt has been made by President Cleveland to overthrow a republic and reestablish a monarchy in the Hawaiian Islands. When was a republic established there? Can there be any pretense that the Provisional Government possesses any of the attributes of a republic? Has there been any opportunity offered the people of that country to declare their wishes in the premises? Mr. Thurston, hastening to Honolulu to consult with his fellow-conspirators, proclaims his belief that "The Royalists must be stamped out."

But has he or his friends taken the first step toward the establishment of a republic? In all the papers submitted by the friends of the Provisional Government there is not a line indicating even the intention of establishing a republic. There is, it is true, outlined a plan by which these gentlemen, possessing no shadow of authority from the people of the country, seek to deliver the islands over to the United States under a treaty. A treaty made with whom? Not with the people of the Hawaiian Islands, for they had never been consulted. The sole authority is vested now, as it was a year ago, in the men who named themselves as the rulers of the islands with no shadow of right.

But it is claimed by the friends of the Provisional Government, and the defenders of a United States minister shown to have been guilty of falsehood in his reports to this Government that, even admitting the fraud of Mr. Stevens, and admitting that he had been guilty of having aided in the overthrow of a government to which he was accredited, still there is no power in this Government to rectify the wrong; that the Provisional Government, once established and recognized, must remain and be sustained by the moral support of the United States.

Sir, I repel this assertion with all the force at my command. I repudiate the insinuation that a course that would be pronounced contrary to good morals in the individual shall be held proper for the nation. Every consideration of honor demands the maintenance of the contrary proposition. There are in all parts of the world men and women acting as Christian missionaries who look to this Government for care and protection. They are in China, Japan, Korea, and Africa. They are accorded respect and protection by the authorities of the countries wherein they labor. They have a right to demand that this Government shall refrain from a course justifying the fear that missionary enterprises are undertaken by Americans for purposes of conquest. They remember that it is a part of well-established history that American missionaries went to the Sandwich Islands and were

cordially welcomed by its ruler and accorded by him every protection and right needed.

The simple-hearted monarch told them that if the gospel they preached was good for him it was good for his people, and he bade them god-speed in their efforts to preach to the simple islanders the gospel of peace and good will. What will be the fate of our missionaries in other lands if it shall appear that the United States Government proposes to indorse the infamous action of which Minister Stevens has been convicted? What will be the answer of the ruling princes of these lands if it shall appear that the end of missionary effort is to be the overthrow of their institutions and the dethronement of their governing rulers?

Sir, the position assumed by the minority on this question can not be defended on any principle of justice. It degrades the American name and seeks to establish for this nation the credit of using Christianity as a cover for land-grabbing. And in their blind zeal and partisan bitterness, the gentlemen who have been so bitter in arraigning the present Administration seem to have forgotten the fact that they are losing the opportunity of defending their own President against the very charge they bring against the present Executive. I am not of those who believe that Mr. Secretary Foster would have countenanced the action of Minister Stevens if that gentleman had submitted to him the letter of Mr. Dole acknowledging the fact that the recognition of the *de facto* Government had been made prior to the surrender of the Queen. I am not of those who are so blinded by partisanship as to believe that President Harrison would have sustained Mr. Stevens if he had known that gentleman had lied to him in his report of the proceedings at Honolulu. And it is proved herein that Mr. Stevens did deliberately lie in his statements of the events of January 16 and 17, 1893.

Now, there is one more point to which I desire to call attention. I approach it with diffidence, and yet constrained by my sense of duty as a representative of my people on this floor. I believe it the duty of every citizen to defend his country against unjust accusations. I moreover believe it my duty to expose here the flimsy pretense that the present usurpers of authority in Honolulu stand in any sense for the Christian sentiment of this country. I know there have been gentlemen rushing before the public and claiming to represent the Christian church while defending the acts of a lot of land-grabbers. I know, too, that one gentleman has been quick to leave his luxurious home on Beretaria in Honolulu and his duties as a Christian minister to come here and bolster up the cause of the Dole gang. I know that he has, with others wearing the same garb, been active in disseminating charges against the character of the late Queen.

Now, sir, as I have said, I do not care what is the character of the Queen, so far as this investigation is concerned. But I believe it proper that the people of this country and of the world should know what are the mental characteristics of the men who are posing as guardians of public morals, and who seek to blacken the fair fame of this nation by making us *particeps criminis* in their deeds. One Rev. C. M. Hyde has volunteered his sworn statement in support of the Dole government and to sustain the charges made against the late Queen. Who is this Rev. Dr. Hyde? What are his antecedents, and what standing has he before honorable judges of character? I will make no reply to these questions in my own language. A full reply has been made by one gifted with a command of language commensurate with his hatred of villainy and false witness. I will leave this reverend gentleman to the judgment of this people with a reference to a letter addressed to him by Robert Louis Stevenson, with which I close my remarks:

FATHER DAMIEN—AN OPEN LETTER TO REV. DR. HYDE, OF HONOLULU.

SYDNEY, February 25, 1890.

SIR: It may probably occur to you that we have met, and visited, and conversed; on my side, with interest. You may remember that you have done me several courtesies, for which I was prepared to be grateful. But there are duties which come before gratitude, and offenses which justly divide friends, far more acquaintances. Your letter to the Rev. H. B. Gage is a document which, in my sight, if you had filled me with bread when I was starving, if you had sat up to nurse my father when he lay a-dying, would yet absolve me from the bonds of gratitude. You know enough, doubtless, of the process of canonization to be aware that, a hundred years after the death of Damien, there will appear a man charged with the painful office of the devil's advocate. After that noble brother of mine, and of all frail clay, shall have lain a century at rest, one shall accuse, one defend him. The circumstance is unusual that the devil's advocate should be a volunteer, should be a member of a sect immediately rival, and should make haste to take upon himself his ugly office ere the bones are cold; unusual, and of a taste which I shall leave my readers free to qualify; unusual, and to me inspiring. If I have at all learned the trade of using words to convey truth and to arouse emotion, you have at last furnished me with a subject. For it is in the interest of all mankind and the cause of public decency in every quarter of the world, not only that Damien should be righted, but that you and your letter should be displayed at length, in their true colors, to the public eye.

To do this properly, I must begin by quoting you at large: I shall then proceed to criticise your utterance from several points of view, divine and human, in the course of which I shall attempt to draw again and with more specification the character of the dead saint whom it has pleased you to vilify; so much being done, I shall say farewell to you forever.

"HONOLULU, August 2, 1889.

"DEAR BROTHER: In answer to your inquiries about Father Damien, I can only reply that we who knew the man are surprised at the extravagant newspaper laudations, as if he was a most saintly philanthropist.

"The simple truth is, he was a coarse, dirty man, head strong and bigoted. He was not sent to Molokai, but went there without orders; did not stay at the leper settlement (before he became one himself), but circulated freely over the whole island (less than half the island is devoted to the lepers), and he came often to Honolulu. He had no hand in the reforms and improvements inaugurated, which were the work of our board of health, as occasion required and means were provided. He was not a pure man in his relations with women, and the leprosy of which he died should be attributed to his vices and carelessness. Others have done much for the lepers, our own ministers, the Government physicians, etc., but never with the Catholic idea of meriting eternal life.

"Yours, etc.,

"C. M. HYDE."

"Rev. H. B. GAGE."

To deal fitly with a letter so extraordinary, I must draw at the outset on my private knowledge of the signatory and his sect. It may offend others; scarcely you, who have been so busy to collect, so bold to publish, gossip on your rivals. And this is, perhaps, the moment when I may best explain to you the character of what you are to read: I conceive you as a man quite beyond and below the reticences of civility; with what measure you mete, with that shall it be measured you again; with you, at least, I rejoice to feel the button off the foil and to plunge home. And if in aught that I shall say I should offend others, your colleagues, whom I respect and remember with affection, I can but offer them my regret; I am not free, I am inspired by the consideration of interests far more large; and such pain as can be inflicted by anything from me must be indeed trifling when compared with the pain with which they read your letter. It is not the hangman, but the criminal, that brings dishonor on the house.

You belong, sir, to a sect—I believe my sect, and that in which my ancestors labored—which has enjoyed, and partly failed to utilize, an exceptional advantage in the islands of Hawaii. The first missionaries came; they found the land already self-purged of its old and bloody faith; they were embraced, almost on their arrival, with enthusiasm; what troubles they supported came far more from whites than from Hawaiians; and to these last they stood (in a rough figure) in the shoes of God.

This is not the place to enter into the degree or causes of their failure, such as it is. One element alone is pertinent, and must here be plainly dealt with. In the course of their evangelical calling, they—or too many of them—grew rich. It may be news to you that the houses of missionaries are a cause of mocking on the streets of Honolulu. It will at least be news to you, that when I returned your civil visit, the driver of my cab commented on the size, the taste, and the comfort of your home. It would have been news certainly to myself, had any one told me that afternoon that I should live to drag such matter into print. But you see, sir, how you degrade better men to your own level; and it is needful for those who are to judge betwixt you and me, betwixt Damien and the devil's advocate, should understand your letter to have been penned in a house which could raise, and that very justly, the envy and the comments of the passers-by. I think (to employ a phrase of yours which I admire) it "should be attributed" to you that you have never visited the scene of Damien's life and death. If you had, and had recalled it, and looked about your pleasant rooms, even your pen perhaps would have been stayed.

Your sect (and remember, as far as any sect avows me, it is mine) has not done ill in a worldly sense in the Hawaiian Kingdom. When calamity befell their innocent parishioners, when leprosy descended and took root in the eight islands, a *quid pro quo* was to be looked for. To that prosperous mission, and to you, as one of its adornments, God had sent at last an opportunity. I know I am touching here upon a nerve acutely sensitive. I know that others of your colleagues look back on the inertia of your church, and the intrusive and decisive heroism of Damien, with something almost to be called remorse. I am sure it is so with yourself; I am persuaded your letter was inspired with a certain envy, not essentially ignoble, and the one human trait to be espied in that performance. You were thinking of the lost chance, the past day; of that which should have been conceived and was not; of the service due and not rendered. Time was, said the voice in your ear, in your pleasant room, as you sat raging and writing; and if the words written were base beyond parallel, the rage, I am happy to repeat—it is the only compliment I shall pay you—the rage was almost virtuous. But, sir, when we have failed, and another has succeeded; when we have stood by, and another has stepped in; when we sit and grow bulky in our charming mansions, and a plain, uncouth peasant steps into the battle, under the eyes of God, and succors the afflicted, and consoles the dying, and is himself afflicted in his turn, and dies upon the field of honor—the battle can not be retrieved as your unhappy irritation has suggested. It is a lost battle, and lost forever. One thing remained to you in your defeat—some rags of common honor; and these you have made haste to cast away.

Common honor; not the honor of having done anything right, but the honor of not having done aught conspicuously foul; the honor of the inert; that was what remained to you. We are not all expected to be Damiens; a man may conceive his duty more narrowly, he may love his comforts better; and none will cast a stone at him for that. But will a gentleman of your reverend profession allow me an example from the fields of gallantry? When two gentlemen compete for the favor of a lady, and the one succeeds and the other is rejected, and (as will sometimes happen) matter damaging to the successful rival's credit reaches the ear of the defeated, it is held by plain men of no pretensions that his mouth is, in the circumstance, almost necessarily closed. Your church and Damien's were in Hawaii upon a rivalry to do well; to help, to edify, to set divine examples. You having (in one huge instance) failed, and Damien succeeded, I marvel it should not have occurred to you that you were doomed to silence; that when you had been outstripped in that high rivalry, and sat inglorious in the midst of your well-being, in your pleasant room—and Damien, crowned with glories and horrors, tolled and rotted in that pigstye of his under the cliffs of Kalawao—you, the elect who would not, were the last man on earth to collect and propagate gossip on the volunteer who would and did.

I think I see you—for I try to see you in the flesh as I write these sentences—I think I see you leap at the word pigstye, a hyperbolical expression at the best. "He had no hand in the reforms," he was "a coarse, dirty man;" these were your own words; and you may think it possible that I am come to support you with fresh evidence. In a sense, it is even so. Damien has been too much depicted with a conventional halo and conventional features; so drawn by men who perhaps had not the eye to remark or the pen to express the individual; or who perhaps were only blinded and silenced by generous admiration, such as I partly envy for myself; such as you, if your soul were enlightened, would envy on your bened knees.

It is the least defect of such a method of portraiture that it makes the path easy for the devil's advocate, and leaves for the misuse of the slanderer a considerable field of truth. For the truth that is suppressed by friends is

the readiest weapon of the enemy. The world, in your despite, may perhaps owe you something, if your letter be the means of substituting once for all a credible likeness for a wax abstraction. For, if that world at all remember you, on the day when Damien of Molokai shall be named Saint, it will be in virtue of one work: your letter to the Rev. H. B. Gage.

You may ask on what authority I speak. It was my inclement destiny to become acquainted, not with Damien, but with Dr. Hyde. When I visited the lazaretto Damien was already in his resting grave. But such information as I have, I gathered on the spot in conversation with those who knew him well and long: some indeed who revered his memory; but others who had sparred and wrangled with him, who beheld him with no halo, who perhaps regarded him with small respect, and through whose unprepared and scarcely partial communications the plain, human features of the man shone on me convincingly. These gave me what knowledge I possess; and I learnt it in that scene where it could be most completely and sensitively understood—Kalawao, which you have never visited, about which you have never so much as endeavored to inform yourself, for, brief as your letter is, you have found the means to stumble into that confession. "Less than one-half of the island," you say, "is devoted to the lepers." Molokai—"Molokai ahina," the "gray," lofty, and most desolate island—along all its northern side plunges a front of precipice into a sea of unusual profundity. This range of cliff is, from east to west, the true end and frontier of the island. Only in one spot there projects into the ocean a certain triangular and rugged down—grassy, stony, windy, and rising in the midst into a hill with a dead crater: the whole bearing to the cliff that overhangs it somewhat the same relation as a bracket to a wall. With this hint you will now be able to pick out the leper station on a map; you will be able to judge how much of Molokai is thus cut off between the surf and precipice, whether less than a half, or less than a quarter, or a fifth, or a tenth—or say, a twentieth; and the next time you burst into print you will be in a position to share with us the issue of your calculations.

I imagine you to be one of those persons who talk with cheerfulness of that place which oxen and wainropes could not drag you to behold. You, who do not even know its situation on the map, probably denounce sensational descriptions, stretching your limbs the while in your pleasant parlor on Beretania street. When I was pulled ashore there one early morning there sat with me in the boat two sisters, bidding farewell (in humble imitation of Damien) to the lights and joys of human life. One of these wept silently; I could not withhold myself from joining her. Had you been there it is my belief that nature would have triumphed even in you; and as the boat drew but a little nearer, and you beheld the stairs crowded with abominable deformations of our common manhood, and saw yourself landing in the midst of such a population as only now and then surrounds us in the horror of a nightmare—what a haggard eye you would have rolled over your reluctant shoulder towards the house on Beretania street! Had you gone on; had you found every fourth face a blot upon the landscape; had you visited the hospital and seen the butt-ends of human beings lying there almost unrecognizable, but still breathing, still thinking, still remembering, you would have understood that life in the lazaretto is an ordeal from which the nerves of a man's spirit shrink, even as his eye quails under the brightness of the sun; you would have felt it was (even to-day) a pitiful place to visit and a hell to dwell in. It is not the fear of possible infection. That seems a little thing when compared with the pain, the pity, and the disgust of the visitor's surroundings, and the atmosphere of affliction, disease, and physical disgrace in which he breathes. I do not think I am a man more than usually timid; but I never recall the days and nights I spent upon that island promontory (eight days and seven nights) without heartfelt thankfulness that I am somewhere else. I find in my diary that I speak of my stay as a "grinding experience;" I have once jotted in the margin, "Harrowing is the word;" and when the Mokoli'i bore me at last towards the outer world, I kept repeating to myself, with a new conception of their pregnancy, those simple words of the song:

"'Tis the most distressful country that ever yet was seen."

And observe: that which I saw and suffered from was a settlement purged, bettered, beautified; the new village built, the hospital, and the Bishop-Home excellently arranged; the sisters, the doctor, and the missionaries, all indefatigable in their noble tasks.

It was a different place when Damien came there and made his great renunciation, and slept that first night under a tree amidst his rotting brethren, alone with pestilence; and looking forward (with what courage, with what pitiful sinkings of dread, God only knows) to a lifetime of dressing sores and stumps.

You will say, perhaps, I am too sensitive, that sights as painful abound in cancer hospitals and are confronted daily by doctors and nurses. I have long learned to admire and envy (the doctors and the nurses. But there is no cancer hospital so large and populous as Kalawao and Kalaupapa; and in such a matter every fresh case, like every inch of length in the pipe of an organ, deepens the note of the impression; for what daunts the onlooker is that monstrous sum of human suffering by which he stands surrounded. Lastly, no doctor or nurse is called upon to enter once for all the doors of that gehenna; they do not say farewell; they need not abandon hope on its sad threshold; they but go for a time to their high calling, and can look forward as they go to relief, to recreation, and to rest. But Damien shut to with his own hand the doors of his own sepulcher.

I shall now extract three passages from my diary at Kalawao:

A. "Damien is dead and already somewhat ungratefully remembered in the field of his labors and sufferings. 'He was a good man, but very officious,' says one. Another tells me he had fallen (as other priests so easily do) into something of the ways and habits of thought of a Kanaka; but he had the wit to recognize the fact, and the good sense to laugh at [over] it. A plain man it seems he was; I can not find he was a popular."

B. "After Ragsdale's death (Ragsdale was a famous Luna, or overseer, of the unruly settlement) there followed a brief term of office by Father Damien, which served only to publish the weakness of that noble man. He was rough in his ways, and he had no control. Authority was relaxed; Damien's life was threatened, and he was soon eager to resign."

C. "Of Damien I begin to have an idea. He seems to have been a man of the peasant class, certainly of the peasant type; shrewd, ignorant, and bigoted, yet with an open mind, and capable of receiving and digesting a reproof if it were bluntly administered; superbly generous in the least thing as well as in the greatest, and as ready to give his last shirt (although not without human grumbling) as he had been to sacrifice his life; essentially indiscreet and officious, which made him a troublesome colleague; domineering in all his ways, which made him incurably unpopular with the Kanakas, but yet destitute of real authority, so that his boys laughed at him and he must carry out his wishes by means of bribes. He learned to have a mania for doctoring; and set up the Kanakas against the remedies of his regular rivals; perhaps (if anything matter at all in the treatment of such a disease) the worst thing that he did, and certainly the easiest.

The best and worst of the man appear very plainly in his dealings with Mr. Chapman's money; he had originally laid it out [intended to lay it out] entirely for the benefit of Catholics, and even so not wisely; but after a long, plain talk, he admitted his error fully and revised the list. The sad state of

*From the Sydney Presbyterian, October 26, 1889.

the boys' home is in part the result of his lack of control; in part, of his own slovenly ways and false ideas of hygiene. Brother officials used to call it 'Damien's Chinatown.' 'Well,' they would say, 'your Chinatown keeps growing.' And he would laugh with perfect good nature, and adhere to his errors with perfect obstinacy. So much I have gathered of truth about this plain, noble human brother and father of ours; his imperfections are the traits of his face, by which we know him for our fellow; his martyrdom and his example nothing can lessen or annul; and only a person here on the spot can properly appreciate their greatness."

I have set down these private passages, as you perceive, without correction; thanks to you, the public has them in their bluntness. They are almost a list of the man's faults, for it is rather these that I was seeking; with his virtues, with the heroic profile of his life, I and the world were already sufficiently acquainted. I was besides a little suspicious of Catholic testimony; in no ill sense, but merely because Damien's admirers and disciples were the least likely to be critical. I know you will be more suspicious still; and the facts set down above were one and all collected from the lips of Protestants who had opposed the father in his life. Yet I am strangely deceived, or they build up the image of a man, with all his weaknesses, essentially heroic, and alive with rugged honesty, generosity, and mirth.

Take it for what it is, rough private jottings of the worst sides of Damien's character, collected from the lips of those who had labored with and (in your own phrase) "knew the man;" though I question whether Damien would have said that he knew you.

Take it, and observe with wonder how well you were served by your gossips, how ill by your intelligence and sympathy; in how many points of fact we are at one, and how widely our appreciations vary. There is something wrong here; either with you or me. It is possible, for instance, that you, who seem to have so many ears in Kalawao, had heard of the affair of Mr. Chapman's money, and were singly struck by Damien's intended wrongdoing. I was struck with that also, and set it fairly down; but I was struck much more by the fact that he had the honesty of mind to be convinced. I may here tell you that it was a long business; that one of his colleagues sat with him late into the night, multiplying arguments and accusations; that the father listened as usual with "perfect good-nature and perfect obstinacy;" but at the last, when he was persuaded—"Yes," said he, "I am very much obliged to you; you have done me a service; it would have been a theft." There are many (not Catholics merely) who require their heroes and saints to be infallible; to these the story will be painful; not to the true lovers, patrons, and servants of mankind.

And I take it, this is a type of our division; that you are one of those who have an eye for faults and failures; that you take a pleasure to find and publish them; and that, having found them, you make haste to forget the over-riding virtues and the real success which had alone introduced them to your knowledge. It is a dangerous frame of mind. That you may understand how dangerous, and into what a situation it has already brought you, we will (if you please) go hand in hand through the different phrases of your letter and candidly examine each from the point of view of its truth, its appositeness, and its charity.

Damien was coarse.

It is very possible. You make us sorry for the lepers, who had only a coarse old peasant for their friend and father. But you, who were so refined, why were you not there to cheer them with the lights of culture? Or may I remind you that we have some reason to doubt if John the Baptist were genteel; and in the case of Peter, on whose career you doubtless dwell approvingly in the pulpit, no doubt at all he was a "coarse, headstrong" fisherman! Yet even in our Protestant Bibles Peter is called Saint.

Damien was dirty.

He was. Think of the poor lepers annoyed with this dirty comrade! But the clean Dr. Hyde was at his food in a fine house.

Damien was headstrong.

I believe you are right again; and I thank God for his strong head and heart.

Damien was bigoted.

I am not fond of bigots myself, because they are not fond of me. But what is meant by bigotry, that we should regard it as a blemish in a priest? Damien believed in his own religion with the simplicity of a peasant or a child; as I would I could suppose that you do. For this, I wonder at him some way off; and had that been his only character, should have avoided him in life. But the point of interest in Damien, which has caused him to be so much talked about and made him at last the subject of your pen and mine, was that, in him, his bigotry, his intense and narrow faith, wrought powerfully for good, and strengthened him to be one of the world's heroes and exemplars.

Damien was not sent to Molokai, but went there without orders.

Is this a misreading? or do you really mean the words for blame? I have heard Christ, in the pulpits of our Church, held up for imitation on the ground that his sacrifice was voluntary. Does Dr. Hyde think otherwise? Damien did not stay at the settlement, etc.

It is true he was allowed many indulgences. Am I to understand that you blame the father for profiting by these, or the officers for granting them? In either case, it is a mighty Spartan standard to issue from the house on Beretania street; and I am convinced you will find yourself with few supporters.

Damien had no hand in the reforms, etc.

I think even you will admit that I have already been frank in my description of the man I am defending; but before I take you up upon this head, I will be franker still, and tell you that perhaps nowhere in the world can a man taste a more pleasurable sense of contrast than when he passes from Damien's "Chinatown" at Kalawao to the beautiful Bishop-Home at Kalau-papa.

At this point, in my desire to make all fair for you, I will break my rule and adduce Catholic testimony. Here is a passage from my diary about my visit to the Chinatown, from which you will see how it is (even now) regarded by its own officials: "We went round all the dormitories, refectories, etc.—dark and dingy enough, with a superficial cleanliness, which he [Mr. Dutton, the lay brother] 'did not seek to defend.' 'It is almost decent,' said he: 'the sisters will make that all right when we get them here.'" And yet I gathered it was already better since Damien was dead, and far better than when he was there alone and had his own (not always excellent) way. I have now come far enough to meet you on a common ground of fact; and I tell you that, to a mind not prejudiced by jealousy, all the reforms of the lazaretto, and even those which he most vigorously opposed, are properly the work of Damien. They are the evidence of his success; they are what his heroism provoked from the reluctant and the careless. Many were before him in the field; Mr. Meyer, for instance, of whose faithful work we hear too little; there have been many since; and some had more worldly wisdom, though none had more devotion, than our saint. Before his day, even you will confess, they had effected little. It was his part, by one striking act of martyrdom, to direct all men's eyes on that distressful country. At a blow, and with the price of his life, he made the place illustrious and public. And that, if you will consider largely, was the one reform needful; pregnant of all that should succeed. It brought money; it brought (best individual addition of them all) the sisters; it brought supervision

for public opinion and public interest landed with the man at Kalawao. If ever any man brought reforms, and died to bring them, it was he. There is not a clean cup or towel in the Bishop Home, but dirty Damien washed it.

Damien was not a pure man in his relations with women, etc.

How do you know that? Is this the nature of the conversation in that house on Beretania street which the cabman envied, driving past?—racy details of the misconduct of the poor peasant priest, toiling under the cliffs of Molokai?

Many have visited the station before me; they seem not to have heard the rumor. When I was there I heard many shocking tales, for my informants were men speaking with the plainness of the laity; and I heard plenty of complaints of Damien. Why was this never mentioned? and how came it to you in the retirement of your clerical parlor?

But I must not even seem to deceive you. This scandal, when I read it in your letter, was not new to me. I had heard it once before; and I must tell you how. There came to Samoa a man from Honolulu; he, in a public house on the beach, volunteered the statement that Damien had "contracted the disease from having connection with the female lepers;" and I find a joy in telling you how the report was welcomed in a public house. A man sprang to his feet; I am not at liberty to give his name, but from what I heard I doubt if you would care to have him to dinner in Beretania street. "You miserable little —" (here is a word I dare not print, it would so shock your ears). "You miserable little —," he cried, "if the story were a thousand times true, can't you see you are a million times a lower — for daring to repeat it?" I wish it could be told of you that when the report reached you in your house, perhaps after family worship, you had found in your soul enough holy anger to receive it with the same expressions; ay, even with that one which I dare not print; it would not need to have been blotted away, like Uncle Toby's oath, by the tears of the recording angel; it would have been counted to you for your brightest righteousness. But you have deliberately chosen the part of the man from Honolulu, and you have played it with improvements of your own. The man from Honolulu—miserable, leering creature—communicated the tale to a rude knot of beach-combing drinkers in a public house, where (I will so far agree with your temperance opinions) man is not always at his noblest; and the man from Honolulu had himself been drinking—drinking, we may charitably fancy, to excess. It was to your "dear brother, the Rev. H. B. Gage," that you chose to communicate the sickening story; and the blue ribbon which adorns your portly bosom forbids me to allow you the extenuating plea that you were drunk when it was done. Your "dear brother"—a brother indeed—made haste to deliver up your letter (as a means of grace, perhaps) to the religious papers; where, after many months, I found and read and wondered at it; and whence I have now reproduced it for the wonder of others. And you and your dear brother have, by this cycle of operations, built up a contrast very edifying to examine in detail. The man whom you would not care to have to dinner, on the one side; on the other, the Rev. Dr. Hyde and the Rev. H. B. Gage: the Apia barroom, the Honolulu manse.

But I fear you scarce appreciate how you appear to your fellow-men; and to bring it home to you, I will suppose your story to be true. I will suppose—and God forgive me for supposing it—that Damien faltered and stumbled in his narrow path of duty; I will suppose that, in the horror of his isolation, perhaps in the fever of incipient disease, he, who was doing so much more than he had sworn, failed in the letter of his priestly oath—he, who was so much a better man than either you or me, who did what we have never dreamed of daring—he, too, tasted of our common frailty. "O, Iago, the pity of it!" The least tender should be moved to tears; the most credulous to prayer. And all that you could do was to pen your letter to the Rev. H. B. Gage!

Is it growing at all clear to you what a picture you have drawn of your own heart? I will try yet once again to make it clearer. You had a father; suppose this tale were about him, and some informant brought it to you, proof in hand. I am not making too high an estimate of your emotional nature when I suppose you would regret the circumstance; that you would feel the tale of frailty the more keenly since it shamed the author of your days, and that the last thing you would do would be to publish it in the religious press? Well, the man who tried to do what Damien did is my father, and the father of the man in the Apia bar, and the father of all who love goodness; and he was your father too, if God had given you grace to see it.

Mr. BLACK of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the quotation with which the eloquent gentleman from Maine [Mr. BOUTELLE] closed his remarks, so far as it is an appeal to American sentiment, American honor, and American patriotism, awakens the liveliest commendation and the deepest echoes. But I am not aware, Mr. Speaker, of any Polynesian battlefields or Honolulu contests over which the American flag has ever waved, and therefore, while conceding that it is exceedingly gratifying to an American to read or to hear fine poetry glorifying his national emblem, I can not conceive why it should kindle similar emotions among the inhabitants of Otaheite or the Kanakas of the southern seas. On the other hand, I can understand that our flag might, under certain circumstances, appear to them as any other stranger flag, and, though brilliant with all the glory of all the battlefields of this continent, might seem to them an emblem of wrongdoing and oppression.

THE RESOLUTIONS ARE UNNECESSARY.

Mr. Speaker, we had a serious matter before us if we had taken it in the right time. I was much struck, though, with the remarks of the gentleman from Maine [Mr. REED] in the address with which he closed his side of the tariff debate the other day, when he declared that the passage of events had made the consideration of these resolutions ancient history. A month ago, sir, there might have been a great deal of fervor and emotion aroused by the consideration of these resolutions, but the matters to which they refer have now become largely obsolete.

A government is established in the Sandwich Islands with which no part of the American people is in conflict. A government is established in the Sandwich Islands against which no party and no portion of the power of the Republic is exercised or arrayed. The situation is like the story found in Scriptures where, in spirit, the Jewish prophet was taken to the edge of the valley of Dry Bones and bidden to view the sepulcher, where in former times contending armies had laid them down to their

eternal sleep. And he was bidden to prophesy over it the first and second and third time; and as he prophesied bone grew to bone, and at last the fleshy forms arose before his spiritual eye. But then the story pauses. He could not get conflict out of them after they were rehabilitated! And no more can the gentlemen who are agitating this question hope to secure permanent advancement of American interests anywhere by their discussion. All that is hoped for, gentlemen, in regard to this ancient history—made ancient by the rapid passage of events in the Polynesian group—all that you hope for, Messrs. Republicans, is a political advantage; and we intend that you shall not get it out of these resolutions. [Applause.]

ALL AMERICANS AGREE ON SOME PART OF EACH OF THE RESOLUTIONS.

There are four resolutions pending before this House. They agree remarkably well in many points. Every man subscribes to certain portions of those resolutions. I propose to analyze them and see which, if any of them, should be passed.

And first, the resolution offered by the gentleman from Maine [Mr. BOUTELLE] on the 19th of December last. Is the Republican side of this House prepared to vote for that resolution? Let us see. It declares—

Whereas the executive communications just read to this House—

And here let me pause to say that in preparing and presenting this resolution, the honorable gentleman from Maine himself disproves the claim that he makes for preeminence in public duty when he says that he presented this question to the Republic because in the recital of his resolution he declares that the Executive communications which had been spread before this House brought the matter to the attention of the House and the country. And I ask the House to note another fact—that during all the time that this matter was impending during the former Administration, not one word was communicated to the American House of Representatives of all the proceedings that were taking place in regard to annexation. So that if the few days that intervened after the Administration at present in power was preparing itself to deal with this question amounted to a lack of confidence, what may be said of the previous Administration, whose archives bristle all through with proof of every step that had been taken in the negotiations, and not one word of which had ever been communicated to this House or to the American people?

On the contrary, sir, when this treaty and the accompanying documents made here and in Honolulu were sent to the Senate of the United States, they were sent under the seal of secrecy. And therefore we may well claim that the first public disclosure made in this behalf was made by the present President of the United States. He is the first official who took the American people into his confidence. But the resolution proceeds further:

Whereas the executive communications just read to this House clearly disclose that the rights of the House of Representatives as a coordinate branch of the Congress of the United States have been invaded by the Executive Department—

Is that true? Where is the constitutional right embodied in this House to share, at the time of their occurrence, in diplomatic negotiations? Is it not true that from the time that George Washington sent his ministers abroad until to-day, the one branch of this Government that had a right to deal with executive affairs of this kind has been the Senate, not the whole Congress? It is not a breach of privilege that executive communications are kept for a long time under the seal of executive secrecy. So that this resolution recites as a matter of law a thing which is not the law; and I do not believe that gentlemen on the other side will willingly vote for a false statement of the law; but I proceed—

in furnishing secret instructions to a minister plenipotentiary of the United States to conspire with the representatives of a deposed and discredited monarchy for the subversion and overthrow of the established republican government to which he was accredited.

To what "republican" government was Mr. Willis accredited?

Mr. BOUTELLE. He was accredited to Hon. Sanford B. Dole.

Mr. BLACK of Illinois. Is Sanford B. Dole a "republican government?"

Mr. BOUTELLE. Is he not the President of the Hawaiian Provisional Government?

Mr. BLACK of Illinois. Is that a republican government?

Mr. BOUTELLE. It is not a monarchical government.

Mr. BLACK of Illinois. The recital of this resolution which you ask this House to pass is that he was conspiring to overthrow a republican government.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I assume that they had republican leanings, as they were trying to be annexed to this country.

Mr. BLACK of Illinois. I allow no assumptions. When you ask the House of Representatives, sitting in high council, to declare a fact, you must prove that fact. If you now are able to show that Mr. Willis was accredited to a republican government,

name your government; if not, withdraw your resolution. [Applause.]

Mr. BOUTELLE. He was accredited to the Hon. Sanford B. Dole. I refer you to the document.

Mr. BLACK of Illinois. I will not bandy words. The gentleman knows the point that is made against his resolution. He can not expect the majority of this House to pass a resolution which is false in its recital of facts; and I believe he may well be said to lean upon a broken reed when he calls upon his colleagues to do so.

I ask my friend from Illinois [Mr. HITT], the member who is leading this attack on behalf of the minority of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, to tell this House before he urges the passage of the resolution of the gentleman from Maine [Mr. BOUTELLE] to what republican government was Mr. Blount accredited? The Government to which he was accredited was a government provisional in its character, at the head of which was Sanford B. Dole, and backing whom were thirteen gentlemen, drawn at haphazard, if you please, from the body of the people of the Sandwich Islands. They were the men who assembled and proclaimed a provisional government. They were the men who nominated officers and appointed themselves thereto; they were the men who then took possession of the police force and the little militia, and surrounded their house of government with that force and that militia.

But tell me, if you please, my honored colleague, you that have moved the adoption of this resolution, at what point in its history did the Provisional Government of Hawaii become a republican government? Did it become a republican government when the proclamation was made? Did it become so when that council assembled? When and where has it submitted a constitution? When and where has it adopted a constitution? When and where has it proclaimed a constitution? When and where have the people of Hawaii voted in favor of such a constitution? And if it has never been submitted to them, if it has never been voted upon by them, if it has never been adopted by them, if it is held there, as my eloquent friend from Illinois [Mr. HITT] declared, with sandbag barriers and rifles and with an armed force, determined for the glory of "the American system" to sustain that government, tell me does that constitute a republican government? [Applause on the Democratic side, and cries, "It does not!"]

Moreover, this junta of self-chosen officials proceeded in their offices to execute monarchic laws under a monarchic constitution and with usurped and dictatorial powers, self-assumed, and enforced with armed power. Sirs, the recital in the resolution of that as a fact which is not true is such that no gentleman in the House can wisely vote in favor of the passage of that resolution.

Mr. BOUTELLE. What would the gentleman like to submit as an amendment?

Mr. BLACK of Illinois. I will not make any suggestion concerning that.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I would like to accommodate the gentleman, as he apparently desires to vote for that resolution. I would like to make it satisfactory to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BLACK].

Mr. BLACK of Illinois. I assure you that when it comes to the vote we will attend to that whole business for you in style. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.] We will not adopt your resolution.

Mr. PENDLETON of West Virginia. It will not need any amendment then.

Mr. BLACK of Illinois. The further statement of the gentleman from Maine in his resolution is:

Second. Resolved, That it is the sense of this House that any intervention—

And here I omit a clause—

in the internal affairs of a friendly recognized government, to disturb or overthrow it—

And here I drop a sentence—

is contrary to the policy and traditions of the Republic and the letter and spirit of the Constitution, and can not be so promptly or emphatically repudiated.

Mr. BOUTELLE. That is just as good.

Mr. BLACK of Illinois. Another thing: the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HITT] presented a shorter resolution, from which I read:

That it is the sense of this House that—

Here I omit a line—

intervention in the affairs of a friendly recognized government—

And here I drop a line—

is contrary to the policy and traditions of the Republic and the spirit of the Constitution.

I say that every recital that I have read from these resolutions is found in almost the same words in the resolution presented by

the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and you would hardly expect us to limit the scope of our resolution in that declaration of principles by drawing the lines down to a narrowness to suit the purposes of a party. The resolutions that are presented by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. McCREARY] contain all that I have quoted, and are broader, and fit the whole case and the whole sentiment of this country.

Now, the resolution of the gentleman from Maine [Mr. BOUTELLE] and the resolution of my friend from Illinois [Mr. HITT] contain three recitals each of which is a limitation on the general propositions to which I wish to call attention.

The first limitation imposed upon the general doctrine by the gentleman from Maine is this: That the Executive of the United States, its civil or military representatives, *without authority of Congress*, will not allow interference in the affairs of a friendly recognized government.

I say, Mr. Speaker, that the Democratic doctrine upon that point is broader than this; our policy is that there shall be no intervention in the affairs of a friendly foreign nation, with or without the direction of the Congress. The Democratic doctrine is that even if Congress should undertake to intermeddle with the affairs of a foreign people, it would be violative of our policies and our traditions. Therefore the limitation imposed in the resolution of the gentleman from Maine [Mr. BOUTELLE] is not a correct limitation.

I say this Government has no right to interfere in the domestic affairs of any foreign people. And so with the next limitation which is imposed by the resolution of the gentleman from Maine. It is a limitation of the scope and purpose and declaration of the mighty Monroe doctrine, and the doctrine of nonintervention, and therefore when we, the Democratic Representatives in this House, come to vote upon that question, we will vote for the broad and general declaration of policy set forth in the McCreary resolutions and which indorses the PRINCIPLE announced by the President, rather than for one that is narrowed and prescribed by the limitations contained in the other resolutions.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Would the gentleman like to have a sentence from the Democratic platform read right there?

Mr. BLACK of Illinois. And so, also, in regard to the resolution of my friend from Illinois [Mr. HITT], it contains this limitation:

Resolved, That the Government of the United States shall not interfere with the affairs of a friendly recognized nation to disturb and overthrow it and substitute a monarchy therefor.

Mr. Speaker, we go away beyond that, and we say when we pass the resolution from the Committee on Foreign Affairs, that we are not to interfere with the domestic affairs of a friendly nation for any purpose. The adoption of the resolution of the Committee on Foreign Affairs contains all that there is good in the resolutions offered both by the gentleman from Maine and the gentleman from Illinois, and rejects the limitations and makes the doctrine as broad as the continent, by which every American Representative can well afford to stand. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. REED. May I offer a suggestion to the gentleman?

Mr. BLACK of Illinois. If it is not taken from my time. I always listen with the keenest appreciation to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. REED. My suggestion is that in broadening this thing you fail to hit the mark. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. BLACK of Illinois. That is not for the gentleman to decide.

Mr. REED. I am not deciding it.

Mr. BLACK of Illinois. I am not seeking your kindly judgment in the matter.

Mr. REED. I do not undertake to decide it; I only offer to make a suggestion [laughter on the Republican side] in connection with what you have said, which seems to have met with approval.

Mr. BLACK of Illinois. Notwithstanding the fact that the gentleman's suggestions are always perfectly lovely, both in manner and in spirit, I can not accept them. [Laughter on the Democratic side.]

Mr. REED. I am quite aware of the fact that you can not.

A SKIRMISH FOR POSITION.

Mr. BLACK of Illinois. Well, we will pass that. Now, the points that are left are three. Let us be right, clear, and honest with each other. You want to censure Mr. Cleveland for the effect you may be able to get out of it in the next campaign. We do not intend that you shall do it. [Democratic applause.]

Mr. BOUTELLE. Will the gentleman indorse him?

Mr. BLACK of Illinois. I will not answer that question. We are discussing the resolutions pending before the House.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I thank you for your hesitation.

Mr. BLACK of Illinois. As I stated, you are after the President for political purposes, and we are after Mr. Stevens. I guess we will get him. [Laughter.] I think we will; and I think we ought to.

ANNEXATION THE REAL ISSUE.

But there are serious matters between us, gentlemen, however much has been said in a spirit of levity. The serious thing before us is not presented in two of the resolutions. But we have it in one which is presented by the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. BLAIR] declaring for annexation. I notice that whenever that declaration has been mentioned by your orators—and you have able and splendid orators, and you have discipline, such as I have never seen equaled since men stepped together in the ranks. I notice on every conflict that every Republican is in his seat, ready to cheer and applaud, and I regard you with admiration as a trained, splendid phalanx. I notice whenever the question of annexation came up, you were ready with your cheers to applaud. We on the other side have presented a resolution which declares that annexation should not now take place; this is the real basic issue, this the dividing line of debate.

OUR PAST POLICY.

There has been much talk of what has been the policy of the Government upon that point. I go back to the first authoritative declaration. It was made to the House of Representatives—our honored predecessors—by the President of the United States in 1842, and announced the policy of nonintervention.

Just emerging from a state of barbarism, the Government of the islands is as yet feeble; but its dispositions appear to be just and pacific, and it seems anxious to improve the condition of its people by the introduction of knowledge, of religious and moral institutions, means of education, and the arts of civilized life.

It can not but be in conformity with the interest and wishes of the Government and the people of the United States that this community thus existing in the midst of a vast expanse of ocean should be respected, and all its rights strictly and conscientiously regarded. And this must also be the true interest of all other commercial states. Far remote from the dominions of European powers, its growth and prosperity as an independent state may yet be in a high degree useful to all whose trade is extended to those regions, while its near approach to this continent, and the intercourse which American vessels have with it—such vessels constituting five-sixths of all which annually visit it—could not but create dissatisfaction on the part of the United States at any attempt by another power, should such attempt be threatened or feared, to take possession of the islands, colonize them, and subvert the native Government. Considering, therefore, that the United States possesses so very large a share of the intercourse with those islands, it is deemed not unfit to make the declaration that their Government seeks nevertheless no peculiar advantages, no exclusive control over the Hawaiian Government, but is content with its independent existence, and anxiously wishes for its security and prosperity. Its forbearance in this respect, under the circumstances of the very large intercourse of their citizens with the islands, would justify the Government, should events hereafter arise to require it, in making a decided remonstrance against the adoption of an opposite policy by any other power.

I advance and move upward from the Presidential chair itself into those splendid heights where the real demigods of the Republic abide and endure as in the unbroken luster of the clustered stars. [Applause.] Listen to Daniel Webster, who declared in December, 1842:

The United States have regarded the existing authorities in the Sandwich Islands as a government suited to the condition of the people and resting on their own choice.

Have the people of the Sandwich Islands chosen the "republican administration" of Sanford B. Dole of their own choice?

The United States have regarded the existing authorities in the Sandwich Islands as a Government suited to the condition of the people, and resting on their own choice; and the President is of opinion that the interests of all the commercial nations require that that Government should not be interfered with by foreign powers. Of the vessels which visit the islands, it is known that a great majority belong to the United States. The United States, therefore, are more interested in the fate of the islands, and of their Government, than any other nation can be; and this consideration induces the President to be quite willing to declare, as the sense of the Government of the United States, that the Government of the Sandwich Islands ought to be respected; that no power ought either to take possession of the islands as a conquest, or for the purpose of colonization, and that no power ought to seek for any undue control over the existing Government, or any exclusive privileges or preferences in matters of commerce.

And what was shorter, and stronger, if possible, was his great declaration on the 15th of March, 1853, when, as Minister of State for the American Republic, he wrote:

We seek no control over their Government, nor any undue influence whatever. Our only wish is that the integrity and independence of the Hawaiian territory may be scrupulously maintained and that its Government should be entirely impartial towards foreigners of every nation. In making resolute and stern resistance, therefore, to any claim of favor or exclusive privilege by other powers, you will at all times frankly disavow any desire that favors or exclusive privileges should be granted to the United States, their ships, commerce, or citizens.

So spoke and wrote the statesman of the elder days. I will not name them all. Said Mr. Buchanan:

We ardently desire that the Hawaiian islands may maintain their independence.

Last of all, Mr. Speaker, I call a witness who on the 3d of February, 1893, in dealing with this precise question and speaking as the Republican Secretary of State of the United States, de-

clared in his letter to Mr. Stevens, in relation to his action at Honolulu:

But so far as it may appear to overstep that limit by setting the authority and power of the United States above that of the Government of the Hawaiian Islands, in the capacity of protector, or to impair in any way the independent sovereignty of the Hawaiian Government by substituting the flag and power of the United States as the symbol and manifestation of paramount authority, it is disavowed.

[Applause on the Democratic side.]

That was not Mr. Blount speaking, that was not the gallant Admiral Skerrett, who, from the smoke-wreathed deck of his vessel went to the aid of Blount, that was no Democratic official. That was John W. Foster, Secretary of State under President Harrison.

Where will you find a stronger condemnation than that of the action that was taken in hoisting the American flag upon that foreign land?

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Illinois be extended.

The SPEAKER. How much extension does the gentleman desire?

Mr. BLACK of Illinois. Only a little time. I do not want to fight over the valley of dry bones too long. [Laughter.]

Mr. BOUTELLE. Will not the gentleman read Mr. Stevens's proclamation?

Mr. BLACK of Illinois. No, I am well loaded down with literature now. I am reading what expresses the policy of the United States and not the declaration of a petty official.

But, Mr. Speaker, the vital point remains. The question is not so much what the fathers through many years thought was wisest and best to be done; it is not what hoary tradition, venerable with our affections and regards, may have pointed out for us. The question is, What is wise and right to do to-day? And with the responsibility resting upon us, let us see whether the resolution of the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. BLAIR], or the resolution of the gentleman from Maine [Mr. BOUTELLE] ought to pass, declaring in favor of annexation.

That reminds me again of the magnificent leader in the tariff debate on the other side [Mr. REED]. In the course of his closing remarks, turning full toward me, because I had made a declaration that seemed to him to leave me vulnerable, he charged me with being unfriendly to immigration from abroad. Gentlemen, I accept my full responsibility for all I have said here on that great subject, portentous of evil or good as we are wise or lacking in dealing with it.

POPULATION AND AMERICAN CITIZENSHIP.

"We may obscure facts, the eyes of cowardice may turn from them, the foot of caution may seek to avoid them, but upon the horizon of American politics, turn what way we will, whether we discuss the tariff, the internal revenue, or labor problems, or educational themes; mingling with all great and grave questions that arise before us, is the question of the population that is to be made a portion of the governing power of the United States. And, Mr. Speaker, in the very week wherein the gentleman from Maine criticised what I had said (giving to it an interpretation which I will not now contradict, because time fails and not because it is just), what I had said was being illustrated by the lawless acts of a population brought into our country for purposes and in ways that I will not stop to discuss, that was setting fire to the mines of Pennsylvania; that, with its strange speech, was pursuing men and women to death and destruction; that was wrecking and destroying American property and exciting in Pennsylvania and in other portions of the United States the most terrible alarm, and at that very time the echoes of the guns of the miners in Pennsylvania and elsewhere were disturbing the peace of the Pennsylvania hills as they had been disturbed but once before since 1863.

So all through the United States, wherever the most pitiable crowds congregate of those who seek and must have help we find masses of people that have been brought in here untimely, and who are now needy, now helpless, now destitute, except as charity extends to them its dole. Looking to the southern half of our country you find six millions of people struggling to the front for political and social preferment and recognition. In God's name let all prosper, but let us not add to the perplexity of the situation by the annexation of an unripe and unfit population in the Pacific Ocean.

What is that population? When the Sandwich Islands were first touched by the prow of an American ship, only three score and ten years ago, they were 125,000 of the most peaceful, quiet, simple, inoffensive people that ever lived in wild seclusion.

They had their savage rites and practices; but in their dealings with the American world, with all the world about them, they were an inoffensive people. I am not going to defend their morality, or their low standards in any respect, but I know and

you know that they were an inoffensive people. And they owned all the islands of that group! It was in view of their conditions that Mr. Webster said their government seemed to be fitted to that people.

What followed? At the end of seventy years, when the census of 1890 was taken, of all that people and their children but 34,000 survived! There were there 1,278 American men. What of the property? Those 1,278 American men owned 74 per cent, where in 1820 they had come on bended knees and with the sign of the cross above them begged shelter and hearing that they might preach the gospel of justice and of love! But to-day three-quarters of all that territory is in the hands of those 1,278 who furnished support to Mr. Dole and his compatriots with their "republican" government.

What else has happened? Of all the vast possessions which belonged to them, with all their richness, their fertility, and their glory of sea and of sky, there is only eight-tenths of 1 per cent of the land left in the possession of the surviving natives. Gentlemen, point me, if you will, to any page of history that contains the parallel to this picture. The invasion of Mexico by Cortez did not match it in its deadly results, for those invaders left the land to the Mexican while they seized the government and the gold. The conquest of Peru, with its bloody inquisitorial processes, the sword of Pizarro dripping its bloody rain over every province in that land, was nothing in comparison with this peaceful conquest and extirpation by which three-fourths of a great native race have been destroyed, and all their lands taken except four-fifths of 1 per cent.

For what purpose do you think that four-fifths of 1 per cent has been left to those natives? I can not think, Mr. Speaker, of any use other than this—that those now in possession of the vast estate may bury in that little fragment of the land the miserable remnant of a race, and then drive the plow of conquest and of "civilization" over graves made rich by the carcasses of a destroyed people. What else has happened in the islands that they should seek admission to the Republic of liberty and freedom and law? There have been brought in by this group that you speak of as constituting a "republican" government, 15,000 Chinese. Gentlemen, we have passed laws excluding the Chinese; we have made it a penal offense for them to enter our country. Yet the American influence in the Sandwich Islands has brought to their shores 15,000 of the coolie contract laborers of the Chinese Empire. And along with these are 12,000 of the Japanese, and other thousands of Malays and Portuguese and Lascars; why no pirate ship has had a crew without it was recruited from these sources. There is the yellow horde that is beginning to pour in and is constantly increasing, driving all other labor out before it, and creating a society compared with which that system which prevailed in the South before the war was the mild and patriarchal institution which it has been claimed to be. There is the civilization that you propose to add to the American problem of self-government.

Sir, when the last of the witches that surrounded the magic cauldron, thither summoned by the spirits of hate and crime and night to the uncanny feast, she poured the last mingling drop into the cauldron that boiled with infernal fires, making the draught of death and woe. Let us not summon this weird sister from the Polynesian sea. We, with all our problems (which, thank God, we shall solve), ought not to be required by annexation, under any pretext or in any shape or form, now to add the last ingredients to the cauldron of the troubles which we must safely brew in order to keep our national life, which is freedom. [Applause.]

Yet if the resolution of the gentleman from Maine or that of my honored friend from New Hampshire [Mr. BLAIR] should pass, it means the incorporation with us of an oligarchy, a plutocracy, that has no place or part in anything American. It might belong to Russia; it might belong to some autocracy in the farther East; but while the American flag flies, it is to fly only over free institutions and a republican form of government.

Mr. BLAIR. All the reasons the gentleman has given are, from my point of view, reasons for immediate action. Does the gentleman contemplate the permanent abandonment of those islands to such influences as he has just described?

Mr. BLACK of Illinois. Sir, I leave those islands to the ameliorating conditions of the Provisional Government and the greedy spirit that has taken possession of three-quarters of the soil. [Laughter.] I leave those islands where the American policy has left them for three-quarters of a century. I leave them to work out their destiny alone—not with us nor of us. Men and governments must work out their own salvation. So it ever has been, and so it must be to the end.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the American political influence in those islands is already paramount, and from the nature of things must continue. We have now, and we have had since

the beginning of this century—since the first lonely whaler about the cape went prowling through those seas for his mighty prey until this hour, we have had a protectorate stronger than a treaty, stronger than law, stronger than constitutional annexation, the protectorate of American power and undiminished purpose and determination that the islands shall be free and independent. The American people have declared in every shape and upon every occasion that they will not tolerate interference with those islands by any foreign power, and so these resolutions, presented by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. McCREARY], declare.

We know that around those islands there is drawn the awful circle of our people's power. Stronger than the guard of our steel-clad ships, stronger than the most valiant exhibitions of our men, stronger than any demonstration of our power, is the understood spirit and purpose of our people that on those islands there shall be no foreign intervention, but that the people of those islands shall follow their own volition, work out their own destiny, preserve until the fullness of time their own existence, and in the end, if fitted for association with the great Republic, and with the free consent of the peoples of both countries both desire fuller and closer relationships, the statesmanship of that time will find a way for the accomplishment of their desires. That time may be near or far; the sovereignty of the islands may some time be ours; but when it comes it must be under the conditions I have outlined, not by the intrigue of a court or the violence of men first received as guests, only to turn conquerors and destroyers. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. VAN VOORHIS of New York. Mr. Speaker, there are so many abler men in this House, so many men of much greater experience in foreign affairs, that it is with great diffidence that I essay to utter a single word in this debate. I am no orator, and therefore you will not expect any flights of eloquence, figures of rhetoric, or outpourings of wit and humor.

It seems, Mr. Speaker, that the President of the United States needs indorsement. At least that is the opinion of the majority of the Committee on Foreign Affairs in this House. These resolutions are supposed to afford the needed indorsement. I do not know whether they have been sanctioned by the Executive or not; whether they have or not, they have been sanctioned by the friends of the Executive, and are the indorsement which it is sought here to give him.

The first one of these resolutions is an attack upon President Harrison's Administration. Of course it is a covert attack. It hits Mr. Harrison through Minister Stevens. It is:

That it is the sense of this House that the action of the United States minister in employing United States naval forces and illegally aiding in overthrowing the constitutional Government of the Hawaiian Islands in January, 1893, and in setting up in its place a Provisional Government not republican in form, and in opposition to the will of a majority of the people, was contrary to the traditions of our Republic and the spirit of our Constitution, and should be and is condemned.

That resolution assumes a fact which has never been proved. It contains a false assumption, which is that the naval forces of the United States were used in the way mentioned in the resolution. Minister Stevens did not aid in overthrowing the Government in any way; neither with the forces of the United States, nor in any other manner.

The second resolution contains a generality which we all agree to, and then it asserts that this Government will under no circumstances annex the Sandwich Islands or assume a protectorate over the islands; then comes the paradoxical statement—

And that foreign intervention in the political affairs of the islands will not be regarded with indifference by the Government of the United States.

Now, what are we to do? Suppose there is foreign intervention. We are not to annex the islands. We can not give them a protectorate. We can not protect them, and what can we do? Why, this language is significant. It is the language of diplomacy. "We will not regard with indifference the interference of any foreign government." That does not mean that we will simply look on and say that we do not like it. It means that we will use the Army and Navy of the United States to prevent such interference. What then? You are not going to take the islands. You are not going to protect them. You are going to fight any other country that assumes to do it.

Now, if these islands are an entirely independent government, what prevents their doing what they themselves please to do? If we will not give them any protection, what is there to prevent their asking some one else to protect them? If they apply to the British Government for protection, have we anything to say, after we have refused? They give us the first chance, and we refuse it. If they go to England and England accepts, is that a cause of war between England and the United States? Not at all. The whole civilized world would be against us in such a war. Therefore these resolutions propose to give up these islands now and forever, and any claim that this country may ever have to them.

Mr. Speaker, the United States finds itself engaged just now in a scheme to overthrow a republic, to establish a monarchy, to place a degraded and brutal savage on the throne. The gentleman who has just taken his seat [Mr. BLACK of Illinois] says the Provisional Government is not a republic. I take issue with him. It is republican in form. Have they not a president and officers exactly like a republic, almost patterned after our own? What is it if it is not a republic? Is it a monarchy?

Mr. SPRINGER. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him are not these officers executing the laws passed under the monarchy, and are they not holding the very offices created in the constitution that was in force under the monarchy?

Mr. VAN VOORHIS of New York. Certainly. The republic takes the country right where it finds it, and carries it on, and I will say to the gentleman, that when Claus Spreckels, who had loaned the Queen \$96,000, applied to President Dole to get his money back, because he thought he could overthrow this Provisional Government by making the demand, the merchants of Honolulu raised the \$96,000 in twenty minutes and paid Claus Spreckels off, and Claus Spreckels is the life and soul and body of the sugar monopoly, and all of the statements that this Provisional Government is in the interest of the sugar monopolies are utterly false.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. Will the gentleman pardon a question? Does the gentleman contradict the statement of Mr. Stevens in that respect? Mr. Stevens says the contrary of what the gentleman says.

Mr. VAN VOORHIS of New York. I do not know what he says about it. There is a record as to Claus Spreckels, and I will come to that presently.

Mr. SPRINGER. When was this Government ever submitted to the people for their ratification or approval?

Mr. VAN VOORHIS of New York. My friend is a little too previous. You can not submit a government to the people in five minutes.

Mr. SPRINGER. They have had it a year now.

Mr. VAN VOORHIS of New York. How long was it before the French Republic was submitted to the people?

Mr. SPRINGER. I am not talking about the French Republic.

Mr. VAN VOORHIS of New York. Was it not a republic, all the same?

Mr. SPRINGER. No; it never was until it was submitted to the people and ratified as such.

Mr. VAN VOORHIS of New York. What have you to say as to when they shall submit their republic to the people? It is their business and not yours.

Mr. SPRINGER. When did the people give the authority?

Mr. VAN VOORHIS of New York. It is not necessary that a republic shall be started by a vote of the entire people. The gentleman knows that perfectly well.

Mr. SPRINGER. Then republican government does not necessarily come from the people?

Mr. REED. Not in some of the Southern States.

Mr. VAN VOORHIS of New York. A republican government comes from the people, and the men who represent the people are the men in this Government, and I will say right here they are the ablest and wealthiest men, and men of the highest character on those islands. That is the certificate even of Mr. Willis.

Mr. SPRINGER. You admit, then, that the Government has not been submitted to a vote of the people?

Mr. VAN VOORHIS of New York. I do not admit or deny it. I do not say anything about it.

Mr. SPRINGER. Is it not true, then, that they have never had a vote of the people concerning this Government?

Mr. VAN VOORHIS of New York. It is hardly a year old yet.

Mr. SPRINGER. No matter how old it is, it has not been voted upon.

Mr. VAN VOORHIS of New York. They will have one as soon as their constitution is adopted. They have already prepared a constitution. They are getting it into shape as fast as possible, as a republic, and you will not be ashamed of that republic either, when they get under way.

Now, this movement was carried on solely by President Cleveland. Although it involved war, he kept it an entire secret. He did not allow either House of Congress to know anything about it, although when he started the movement and appointed his commissioner, the Senate was in session.

He gave Mr. Blount power that no other commissioner appointed by a President ever has had, and all the precedents cited by gentlemen do not show a single case where a commissioner was given such power as was given to Mr. Blount. I am not going to say anything against the personal character of Mr. Blount. I shall not deny anything with regard to him that his

friends have said of him on this floor. All I say is that Mr. Blount made a mistake in accepting that position. He made a mistake in going over to Honolulu and gathering up all the gossip of the camp followers of that dissolute Queen and presenting it here as though a true solution of things could be gotten out of it.

Now, at last, after demands from the Senate and repeated demands from the House of Representatives, the President has given us the information. We see what a wretched fiasco he has been conducting over there. And what is it? What are these islands? Perhaps they are not of any account. They were discovered in 1788 by Capt. Cook. They were inhabited by savages of a cannibalistic tendency, and when Capt. Cook visited the islands the next year they played the confidence game on him and got possession of his person. They killed him with a war club and probably roasted him and ate him up.

The character of these savages at the time the missionaries began their work is graphically described by Mr. Haole in a book published in 1854. He says:

Thefts, robberies, murders, infanticide, licentiousness of the most debased and debasing character, burying their infirm and aged parents alive, desertion of the sick, revolting cruelties to the unfortunate maniac, cannibalism, and drunkenness form a list of some of the traits in social life among the Hawaiians in past days.

Mr. STOCKDALE. That was in the past days.

Mr. VAN VOORHIS of New York. I am coming to their present days.

And the same writer says:

Their political condition was the very genius of despotism, systematically and deliberately conducted.

And again he says:

Kings and chiefs were extremely jealous of their succession, and the more noble their blood the more they were venerated by the common people. The Egyptian Pharaohs and the Roman Caesars never employed more studied precautions to compel the entire submission of their subjects than the kings and chiefs of Hawaii did to secure the unreserved obedience of their own people. The will of the high chief was a law from which there was no appeal.

Now, what has happened since? By the efforts of heroic American missionaries, the condition of the natives has been greatly improved. They have abandoned cannibalism, idolatry, and the savage dress. They have progressed from savagery to barbarism, and even show some indications of civilization. The missionaries have presented to them a phonetic alphabet, and taught them a written language.

Mr. MORSE. The American missionaries first went there in 1819. That is the exact date.

Mr. VAN VOORHIS of New York. The late Lewis H. Morgan suggests the phonetic alphabet as the line between barbarism and civilization, and John Fiske indorses that suggestion. But such a demarcation is more formal than substantial. It is evident the natives of these islands, like the American Indians, can not stand civilization. They have constantly decreased in numbers. That decrease has been in the inverse ratio of the increase of the foreign population, a population which has brought to these islands the vices as well as the virtues of civilization.

In 1778 Capt. Cook estimated the native population at 400,000. In 1823 the missionaries calculated it to be 142,000. The census of 1832 shows the population to be 130,313. The census of 1878 shows that the natives numbered 44,088, a decrease in numbers of over 356,000 in one hundred years, and at the ratio of 3,500 a year. The census of 1890 reduces the number of natives to 34,436, not counting half castes, who numbered 6,186. At this census the foreign population numbered 49,368, a preponderance over the natives of 15,000, and over natives and half castes of over 9,000. Of the foreign population 1,928 are Americans, and 8,602 are Portuguese; the balance is made up of 7,495 Hawaiian-born foreigners, 1,344 British, 1,034 Germans, 70 French, 227 Norwegians, 15,300 Chinese, 12,360 Japanese, 588 Polynesians, and 419 other nationalities.

Mr. STOCKDALE. From that it would seem that the missionaries have served to extinguish the race in Christianizing them.

Mr. VAN VOORHIS of New York. It is readily to be seen that the total disappearance of the natives from these islands is only a question of time, and a not very long time at that. The hand of civilization has driven and is driving them away. These natives have not lost their savage character; the influences of Christianity and civilization have not destroyed that. Blood will tell even among savages.

Mrs. Dominis, the ex-Queen, is a native, and inherits all the vices of her ancestors. She is essentially a savage. All the benign influences of education and Christianity have been lost upon her. In her private life she is the vilest of the vile. In public life she is a tyrant and a despot. She is weak in everything, excepting only savagery; there she is a strong character. No woman in all history can compare with her in brutality.

Herodias was satisfied with the head of one John the Baptist on a charger. Mrs. Dominis wants more than a hundred. She demands of this Government the right to behead all the leading men of Honolulu.

I refer to this to show what kind of a person the President of the United States has been endeavoring to put upon the throne of the Sandwich Islands. Those gentlemen who desire to approve of this effort will vote for these resolutions. I say this, that before the American Congress or the American people indorse such a proceeding, a case must be made that is conclusive. It must be an imperative case; it must be a case free from any reasonable doubt. The facts on which such a case is predicated must be conceded facts. No such case has been made.

Mr. Speaker, the issue which is sought to be raised is an issue with President Harrison. President Harrison recognized this Government. President Harrison indorsed the Government and the action of Minister Stevens. Gentlemen say that he indorsed him when he did not have the information; that he was deceived into doing it. Not at all. President Harrison knew all the facts in the case when he indorsed Minister Stevens's action and sent the treaty to the Senate.

Now, let us see. If Mr. Stevens was a conspirator, Mr. Harrison was a conspirator with him. If Mr. Stevens was a conspirator, the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, which unanimously, I believe, reported the treaty of annexation between us and the Provisional Government favorably, were coconspirators with him.

Mr. STOCKDALE. Has the President of the United States authority to hoist the flag over foreign territory?

Mr. VAN VOORHIS of New York. If he chooses, in a proper case. But, Mr. Speaker, the point I was making is this: That Benjamin Harrison investigated this case fully and heard all the evidence. The Queen sent her paid lawyer here to argue the case before the President passed upon it. Who was that lawyer? Paul Neumann, the ablest lawyer in the Sandwich Islands among the Queen's followers. He was taken over there nine years ago by Claus Spreckels, and became a prominent lawyer, and he put in his pocket a fee of \$5,000, and came here to argue the Queen's case before President Harrison.

Mr. BRETZ. Let me ask the gentleman how many days after the representatives of the Hawaiian Government came here was it that the President submitted the treaty to the Senate?

Mr. VAN VOORHIS of New York. They got here on the 3d of February, and he submitted it on the 15th of February.

Mr. BRETZ. Do I understand you to say that the President examined all the facts and all the testimony in that short space of time?

Mr. VAN VOORHIS of New York. I do say so. And here is his report to the Senate showing that all the documents were before him. Here is his message to the Senate, and having examined the question, having heard the argument of Paul Neumann, having read the Queen's statement that she was induced to surrender by fear of United States troops, having investigated the entire case, and had the commissioners of the Provisional Government before him, and heard their side, he decided that there was not a word of truth in the charge, and here is what he said in his message to the Senate—

Mr. STOCKDALE. If the flag was not raised until the 11th of February, nearly a month had elapsed—

Mr. VAN VOORHIS of New York. Oh! you need not worry about the flag.

Mr. STOCKDALE. And if the Provisional Government could sustain itself, what need was there for a protectorate?

Mr. VAN VOORHIS of New York. I have not said anything about the hauling down of the flag. When I do, you may ask a question.

Mr. STOCKDALE. I do not care anything about this claptrap about the flag, but I would like to have you, as a lawyer, discuss that proposition.

Mr. VAN VOORHIS of New York. I will when I come to it. Here is what President Harrison said to the Senate:

It has been the policy of the Administration not only to respect, but to encourage the continuance of an independent government in the Hawaiian Islands so long as it afforded suitable guarantees for the protection of life and property and maintained a stability and strength that gave adequate security against the domination of any other power. The moral support of this Government has continually manifested itself in the most friendly diplomatic relations and in many acts of courtesy to the Hawaiian rulers.

The overthrow of the monarchy was not in any way promoted by this Government, but had its origin in what seems to have been a reactionary and revolutionary policy on the part of Queen Liliuokalani, which put in serious peril not only the large and preponderating interests of the United States in the islands, but all foreign interests, and indeed the decent administration of civil affairs and the peace of the islands.

Mr. STOCKDALE. Now, why did Stevens raise the flag?

Mr. VAN VOORHIS of New York. Do not you worry about the flag too much.

Mr. STOCKDALE. It is worrying you more than it is me, I think.

Mr. VAN VOORHIS of New York. Not at all. But I am not going to have you break into the line of my argument at this point. What does the President say further?

He says:

It is quite evident that the monarchy had become effete, and the Queen's government so weak and inadequate as to be the prey of designing and unscrupulous persons. The restoration of Queen Liliuokalani to her throne is undesirable, if not impossible, and unless actively supported by the United States would be accompanied by serious disaster and the disorganization of all business interests. The influence and interest of the United States in the islands must be increased and not diminished.

Only two courses are now open; one the establishment of a protectorate by the United States, and the other annexation full and complete. I think the latter course, which has been adopted in the treaty, will be highly promotive of the best interests of the Hawaiian people, and is the only one that will adequately secure the interests of the United States. These interests are not wholly selfish. It is essential that none of the other great powers shall secure these islands. Such a possession would not consist with our safety and with the peace of the world. This view of the situation is so apparent and conclusive that no protest has been heard from any government against proceedings looking to annexation. Every foreign representative at Honolulu promptly acknowledged the Provisional Government, and I think there is a general concurrence in the opinion that the deposed Queen ought not to be restored. Prompt action upon this treaty is very desirable.

Now, Mr. Harrison had got at the very bottom of the case, whereas Cleveland was skimming over the surface. Harrison had learned that this revolution was the outcome, the culmination of a deep-seated sentiment that had been growing there since 1887. It is a matter of history that the constitution of 1887 was wrested from the monarch of the islands just as Magna Charta was wrested by the barons from King John. It is matter of history that this ex-Queen was in England when that was done, and that she was an enemy of that constitution; that she conspired to have her brother removed from the throne that she might go there before his death in order to overthrow this constitution. And the moment she did take the throne, she went into a crusade to destroy this constitution and to clothe herself with arbitrary power. She was the revolutionist.

And when Saturday, the 14th of January, came, where was Mr. Stevens? On that day the city of Honolulu was full of tumult. The Queen had her troops drawn up in front of the state-house; she had her ministers with her, arguing with them and threatening them to get their consent to overthrow this constitution which could not be legally overthrown except by two successive Legislatures. Does anybody say there was not tumult that day? Where was Mr. Stevens? He landed that day from the Boston, having been out on a ten days' cruise. This thing had been culminating for days, and Mr. Stevens was not there at all—a fact that my friends on the other side have entirely lost sight of. He landed on Saturday forenoon from the Boston, and found this state of things existing. And when on Saturday evening the committee of citizens asked him for troops to parade the streets to preserve order, he marked the application "declined."

My friend from Maryland [Mr. RAYNER] was in error when he said that the paper that had the word "Declined" indorsed on it was the proclamation of the Queen that she would postpone the evil day when she would upset this constitution of 1887. Mr. Stevens declined the request of the committee of citizens. The committee wanted the public peace preserved. The water front of Honolulu is seven miles in extent. There are five gorges running back into the mountains; and there was not police force enough to properly protect the city. They asked for protection, but they did not get it.

Now, I come to the question, what is the charge against Mr. Stevens? We have heard a great deal of newspaper talk about this; we have heard a great deal of oratory about it; but let us find the indictment; let us find it in black and white; and where can we find it better than over the sign manual of Grover Cleveland? The whole "head and front of the offending" of Mr. Stevens is stated by Mr. Cleveland in these words:

The lawful Government of Hawaii was overthrown without the drawing of a sword or the firing of a shot.

On this point Mr. Cleveland is mistaken. There was one shot fired. Capt. Gould shot a policeman.

The lawful Government of Hawaii was overthrown without the drawing of a sword or the firing of a shot by a process every step of which, it may safely be asserted, is directly traceable to and dependent for its success upon the agency of the United States acting through its diplomatic and naval representatives.

Now that indictment, so far as it goes, is against the naval officers as well as against the minister. What further is charged?

But for the notorious predilections of the United States minister for annexation, the committee of safety, which should be called the committee of annexation, would never have existed.

But for the landing of the United States forces upon false pretexts respecting the danger to life and property the committee would never have exposed themselves to the pains and penalties of treason by undertaking the subversion of the Queen's Government.

But for the presence of the United States forces in the immediate vicinity and in position to afford all needed protection and support the committee would not have proclaimed the Provisional Government from the steps of the Government building.

How does Grover Cleveland know these facts? We all know better than that. But the charge against Mr. Stevens is that he had "predilections" in favor of liberty—"predilections" in favor of Americanism. A minister of the United States must not have "predilections." If he has he can not pass the scrutiny of Grover Cleveland. He is a scoundrel and a vagabond if he has any "predilections," especially if they are in favor of his own country and its institutions, and especially if those "predilections" become "notorious."

Now, Grover Cleveland does not state a single overt act that Mr. Stevens committed. Every lawyer knows that there can be no conspiracy unless accompanied with an overt act. There must be some act done which is unlawful, unlawful in itself, in carrying out the conspiracy.

The distinguished gentleman from Maine [Mr. BOUTELLE] has shown what the request of Minister Stevens was about the landing of the troops. You say that he lied when he said to Capt. Wiltse, "I want you to land the forces to protect the American legation, and to protect American life and property." You say that Capt. Wiltse lied when he issued an order to Swinburne directing him to use the forces for that purpose only. You say that Swinburne lied when he reported that he had used them for that purpose only. In other words, you undertake without proof to break down the entire record in the case, and to convict these naval officers of offenses for which every one of them, if guilty, ought to be court-martialed and cashiered. And one of them, I am informed—Lieut. Young—one of the most gallant young officers of the Navy, belongs in the State so ably represented by my distinguished chief, the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of this House.

Now if those officers conspired with Mr. Stevens, why did not the President call those officers to account? Why did he not give them a chance to come up and say that it was not true? Can you not rely upon the order of an army officer or a naval commander? I think you can. If there are any documents that do not lie, that tell the truth, they are the orders and reports of the officers of the Army and Navy. I was arguing that President Harrison knew all about this. He knew every word of it. He had the report of Capt. Wiltse, which is here, in which he certifies that the troops were only used to protect American life and property.

This is the report of that noble Roman, Capt. Wiltse, the commander of the Boston. Right here I wish to refer to the argument of gentlemen who have said, why did not the warships of some of the other countries send their marines ashore if there was such danger there? I will tell you why. There was no war ship in the harbor except the Boston. There was no war ship from Japan, England, Spain, or any other country. That is the reason why. And right there I will show that Capt. Wiltse, in making his report, says of it:

CAPT. WILTSE TO MR. TRACY.

U. S. S. BOSTON,
Honolulu, Hawaiian Islands, January 18, 1893.

SIR: I have the honor to make the following report concerning the condition of political affairs in the Hawaiian Islands:

As stated in my communication of January 4, 1893, the Boston sailed from this port for Hilo, Hawaii, with the United States minister on board.

During the absence of the ship from this port, on January 12, the cabinet was voted out of office by a vote of 25 to 16. Another cabinet was appointed on January 14.

That was the first revolutionary act. This Queen turned every member of her cabinet out and elected a new cabinet, and when Mr. Blount came to take the testimony of the men who knew something there, he never called a single member of that old cabinet before him, but called in the members of the new cabinet and gave them an exhaustive examination.

Capt. Wiltse's report continues:

On the morning of January 14 the Boston arrived in this port from Lahina, Maui, and came to anchor. At noon on the same day the Legislature was prorogued by the Queen, and it was rumored that the Queen intended proclaiming a new constitution.

Why was it prorogued? Because it had refused to join with her in destroying this constitution which gave the people their rights.

My distinguished friend from Mississippi [Mr. MONEY] said that Arion Hall was a mile and a half away from any American property. There is not a point in Honolulu about which centers so much American property as Arion Hall. Within the radius of a quarter of a mile there is more American property than at any other point in the city. Right across the alley, 12 feet away, stands the opera house, which cost \$135,000, which is owned by Americans.

Thirty of these naval soldiers were stationed at the legation, fifteen or twenty at the consulate, and the rest at Arion Hall. Did a soldier fire a shot? No. Did he draw a sword? No. What our friends complain of is the fact that the soldiers put this Queen, with her eight hundred soldiers, under moral duress. Not at all. Had the soldiers ever landed before? Oh, yes; they

landed in 1874, when the British marines landed with the Americans and protected Kalakaua from an assault upon him. They landed in 1889, and protected the monarch again. The letter which the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. RAYNER] referred to, dated February 8, 1892, written by Mr. Stevens to Mr. Blaine, was a very funny affair.

Mr. RAYNER says that this question of annexation had been in Mr. Stevens's mind all the time. He recites the letter of Mr. Stevens to Mr. Blaine, of the 8th of February, 1892, in which he asked Mr. Blaine if, under certain contingencies, he would be justified in landing the troops. Now, read the letter, and read the history of it, and it shows that that was in the interest of the Queen. That was to put down the Wilcox and Ashford conspiracy, a conspiracy of filibusterers, and the United States Government was on the side of the Hawaiian Government, and not against it; and that request of Mr. Stevens to Mr. Blaine was a question as to how far he should use the naval forces of the United States to help the Queen to put down this mob of filibusterers. Mr. Dole and Mr. Thurston, as well as Mr. Stevens, were on the Queen's side of that rebellion. I will proceed with what Capt. Wiltse said:

This, however, was not done. On Monday, January 16, there was a large and enthusiastic mass meeting, composed of the representative men of Honolulu, held in the largest hall in the city, at 2 p. m. On the same day I received from the United States minister a request to land the sailors and marines of the Boston to protect the United States legation, consulate, and the lives and property of American citizens.

At 4:30 p. m., January 16, I landed the ship's battalion under command of Lieut. Commander William T. Swinburne.

One detachment of marines was placed at the legation and one at the consulate, while the main body of men, with two pieces of artillery, were quartered in a hall of central location near the Government building.

On Tuesday, January 17, a Provisional Government was established and the Queen dethroned.

The Provisional Government took possession of the Government buildings, the archives, and the treasury, the Queen acquiescing under protest. The Provisional Government was recognized as the *de facto* Government of the Hawaiian Islands by the United States minister.

The revolution has been accomplished without the loss of a single life, and to-day, January 18, the Provisional Government has possession and control of the city, which is under martial law.

I am informed that commissioners will leave to-morrow for Washington fully accredited for purposes of negotiation to permit these islands to come under the control of the United States.

Very respectfully,

G. C. WILTSE,

Captain, U. S. Navy, Commanding U. S. S. Boston.

Now, it ought to be enough that Mr. Harrison decided this question. It was the consummated act of the Harrison Administration. When it had examined all the evidence it approved of the Provisional Government, and the recognition of it, as had every other civilized nation on the face of the earth. The other nations were fast on the heels of Mr. Stevens. Mr. Stevens recognized it on Monday evening and the others did so on Tuesday morning; and not a single protest from any foreign government was ever made. Every one of them acquiesced in it. And here I want to refer to the evidence of a single witness, Samuel Parker, who was the Queen's prime minister, and her minister of foreign affairs. I find it in Mr. Blount's report.

Mr. BLOUNT. When that was done, what action was taken by the Queen—when the troops were landed?

Mr. PARKER. The troops were landed on Monday and the protest was made on Tuesday, and on Tuesday I had a meeting of the diplomatic corps. I invited them to come. There was Mr. Woodhouse, the British minister; Mr. Carnavara, the Portuguese minister; Mr. Vizavona, the French minister, and Mr. Fugit, the Japanese minister, present. We asked their advice on the subject. The advice from them was to offer no resistance. Mr. Stevens did not come. He sent word that he was not well enough.

Mr. BLOUNT. Was that after the proclamation?

Mr. PARKER. No; before.

Mr. BLOUNT. In this consultation it was assumed that the Provisional Government would be proclaimed, and you were advised to offer no resistance.

Mr. PARKER. I think that was it. We had heard there was going to be trouble.

Mr. BLOUNT. You said the diplomatic corps advised no resistance?

Mr. PARKER. Yes; not to have any bloodshed, because they all knew we had a big force. We had seen Mr. Stevens before. Mr. Stevens had told us that they would not assist us.

Mr. BLOUNT. Did he say who he would assist?

Mr. PARKER. I think that will appear in our memorandum. He considered the committee of safety represented the capitalists—represented the people—the responsible people.

Mr. BLOUNT. Does that appear in your paper?

Mr. PARKER. I think so.

Mr. BLOUNT. Will not you please state the circumstances attending the conference between the cabinet and the Queen about signing the new constitution?

Mr. PARKER. Before the Legislature met that Saturday morning we were asked to come there and meet her, in the first part of the day.

Mr. BLOUNT. You had met her in the morning?

Mr. PARKER. No; this was the day when the Legislature was prorogued. In the morning she asked us to come there to talk about this situation. I arrived there first, but my colleagues were late. I waited for them. Nine o'clock, or 10, I do not remember exactly, was the hour for the Legislature to meet at Legislature Hall. When my colleagues arrived we had to go right out without having a meeting. In the meantime she had stated that she wanted us to come there in order to sign the new constitution. I said: "Your Majesty, we have not seen the new constitution." "It will be time enough," she said, "when you come here. I will show it to you and your colleagues." She asked me to be there soon after the prorogation of the Legislature. Just then my colleagues came up to the palace. I said: "Your

Majesty, we have no time. We have to be at the Legislature now." I told my colleagues we had to go right over to the hall. We left her.

On the way, I told them that the Queen was requesting us to be there at such and such a time for the promulgation of the new constitution; I said I had not seen it and that I had told her we could not do anything until we first read it. That was what I told my colleagues. After the Legislature was prorogued someone said to me that the diplomatic corps would like to meet the cabinet before they went over. Of course, I did not know what was up. It seemed that a rumor had got downtown that the Queen was going to promulgate a new constitution. Rumors got out, and the diplomatic corps wanted to ask me if it was so. I said it was a fact. I had not seen the constitution, but the Queen had requested me to be there with my colleagues. I told them I had not seen the constitution and had no idea what kind of document it was. We all assured them that we would not consent to sign the constitution, and then we went over to the palace.

We went into the blue room. She said "I sent for you gentlemen; I was requested by my people to promulgate a new constitution. I want you gentlemen to sign it or to consent to it." They all looked to me. I said: "Your Majesty, we have not read the constitution, but before we read it, you must know it is a revolutionary act. It can not be done."

Now, we have evidence of a revolution in Hawaii. There was an existing government, which was a limited monarchy, almost as limited as a republic; and under the constitution the Queen was little more than the executive of a republic. She had gotten up this revolution, and we are to-day asked to indorse the President of the United States in his effort to sustain her. Now, it is said that there was quiet in the islands when the troops were landed. There was quiet in Chicago when the anarchists were executed. Chicago never had a more quiet day. All was as peaceable and as still as the mist slumbering on the hill. But the troops were massed in proper places with shoted guns; the police were massed in proper places so as to preserve order.

Order was maintained, and on that day that city was a perfect pattern of quietness; but everybody knows that but for the presence of the troops and the way in which the police were massed, the streets of Chicago would have run with blood. And so in the city of Honolulu on that day of revolution. There was quiet at the moment the forces were landed, but there had been tumult on the preceding day. The troops had been landed before. They knew on the Saturday and Sunday that the United States troops were coming, as they had done on a former occasion, and everybody knew what would take place. The reason there was peace at that moment was due entirely to the fact that the troops were coming.

There had been two tumultuous assemblies held, with two or three thousand men in each, one on behalf of the Queen and one on behalf of the Provisional Government on that day. Fiery speeches had been made, and two of the cabinet ministers of the Queen had taken part in one of the meetings against her.

Mr. Chairman, the report of Minister Blount is unworthy a judicial officer. He went over there to make out a case to upset a government. That government was a party to the proceeding, but he did not let that government know what he was at; he did not let them cross-examine a witness; he did not let them take any testimony.

His report is more to be commended for what it leaves out than for what it contains. Did he take the evidence of Sanford B. Dole? No. Did he take the evidence of the four members of the Queen's cabinet who had gone out of office three or four days before? No. There is not one of the affidavits that he took that is worthy to be called evidence. Every one of them is extrajudicial, is an affidavit upon which no charge of perjury could be predicated. The bulk of his so-called "testimony" was gossip taken in his private room by a stenographer from persons interested to sustain the Queen. Can that be dignified as a judicial proceeding? Can anybody say that the judgment of a President of the United States ought to be upset upon such authority as that?

I have here a case where the Senate of the United States placed its emphatic disapproval upon such procedure as Mr. Cleveland has taken in this case.

The motive that inspired the President was a desire to discredit the Administration of Mr. Harrison. Impelled by that motive he withdrew the Harrison treaty from the Senate, and thus deprived that body of an opportunity to express its views concerning it. Impelled by that motive, he sent Mr. Blount to the Sandwich Islands, clothed with unconstitutional power, and instructed to make a case upon which the Provisional Government could be overthrown. He proposed to show the countries of the world that he disagreed with the views of the Harrison Administration, and that he was determined to act in antagonism to it, and that another political party is now in power in this country.

It is very seldom in the history of the Government that in treating with foreign powers an Administration has so demeaned itself as to attack its predecessor in matters relating to foreign affairs. A notable case of that kind occurred, however, in 1832, and the Senate of the United States emphatically set its seal of disapproval upon such procedure. Upon this question alone Mr. Van Buren's nomination as minister to the court of England

was rejected by the Senate. Mr. Van Buren was Secretary of State under President Jackson. Our Government had a controversy with England in respect to the trade of the West Indies. By the convention of 1815, a reciprocity of intercourse was established between us and Great Britain. The ships of both countries were allowed to pass to and from each other, respectively, and subject to the same duties. But this arrangement did not extend to the British West Indies. There our intercourse was cut off. Various discriminating and retaliatory acts were passed by England and by the United States. Eventually in the summer of 1825 the English Parliament passed an act offering reciprocity, so far as the mere carrying trade was concerned, to all nations who might desire within one year to accept the same. Mr. Adams's Administration did not accept that offer, because it was never officially communicated to it, and because a few months before a negotiation on the very same subject had been suspended, with the understanding that it might be resumed, and because it was very desirable, if possible, to arrange the whole matter by treaty, in order to secure, if we could, the admission of our products into the British Islands for consumption, as well as our vessels. This object had been earnestly pursued ever since the peace of 1815. It was insisted on during the whole of the Monroe Administration. President Monroe would not treat at all, without treating for this object. He thought the existing state of things better than any arrangement which, while it admitted our vessels into the ports of the West Indies, still left our products subject to such duties there that they could not be carried. Mr. Adams's Administration occupied, therefore, the same position its predecessor had taken. In this state of things President Jackson appointed Mr. McLane as minister to England, and he received his instructions from Mr. Van Buren, the Secretary of State. Mr. Van Buren took care to say in substance to Mr. McLane that a different political party was in power now in this country, and that the British might expect better terms than they could have obtained from Mr. Adams. He said in his instructions to Mr. McLane:

The opportunity which you have derived from a participation in our public councils, as well as other sources of information, will enable you to speak with confidence (as far as you may deem it proper and useful to do so) of the respective parts taken by those to whom the administration of this Government is now committed, in relation to the course heretofore pursued upon the subject of the colonial trade.

He proceeds:

Their views—that is, the views of the present Administration—upon that point have been submitted to the people of the United States; and the councils by which your conduct is now directed are the result of the judgment expressed by the only earthly tribunal to which the late Administration was amenable for its acts.

The Secretary continues:

To set up the acts of the late Administration as a cause of forfeiture of privilege which would otherwise be extended to the people of the United States would, under existing circumstances, be unjust in itself, and could not fail to excite their deepest sensibilities.

And the Secretary concludes by saying:

You can not press this view of the subject too earnestly upon the consideration of the British ministry. It has grounds and relations that reach beyond the immediate question under discussion.

And adverting again to the subject, he says:

I will add nothing as to the impropriety of suffering feelings that find their object in the past actions of this Government to have an adverse influence upon the present conduct of Great Britain.

A little later Gen. Jackson nominated Martin Van Buren as minister to the Court of England, and the nomination was promptly rejected by the Senate, solely upon the ground of the improper and un-American instructions which he had given to Minister McLane.

The argument of Daniel Webster, in the executive session of the Senate, against the confirmation of Mr. Van Buren, was based entirely upon that ground. Mr. Webster said:

I think those instructions derogatory in a high sense to the character and honor of the country. I think they show a manifest disposition in the writer of them to establish a distinction between his country and his party, to place that party above the country, to make interest at a foreign court for that party rather than for the country, and to persuade the English ministry and the English monarchy that they have an interest in maintaining in the United States the ascendancy of the party to which the writer belongs.

It is the first time, I believe, in modern diplomacy; it is certainly the first time in our history in which a minister to a foreign court has sought to make favor for one party at home against another, or has stooped from being the representative of the whole country to being the representative of a party, and as this is the first instance in our history of any such action, I intend to do all in my power to make it the last. For one I set my mark of disapproval upon it; I contribute my voice and my vote to make it a negative example, to be shunned and avoided by all future ministers of the United States. If, in a deliberate and formal letter of instructions, admonitions and directions are given to a minister, and repeated once and again, to urge these mere party considerations upon the foreign government, to what extent is it probable that the writer himself will be disposed to urge them, in his thousand opportunities of informal intercourse with that government?

Mr. Webster recites the facts in the case, and then paraphrases the instructions given by Mr. Van Buren to Mr. McLane, as follows:

You will be able to tell the British minister, whenever you think proper, that you and I and the leading persons in this Administration have opposed

the course heretofore pursued by the Government and the country upon the subject of colonial trade. Be sure to let him know that on that subject we have held with England and not with our own Government.

Mr. Webster proceeds, as follows:

Now, I ask you, sir, if this be dignified diplomacy? Is this statesmanship? Is it patriotism, or is it mere party? Is it a proof of high regard to the honor and renown of the whole country, or is it evidence of a disposition to make a merit of belonging to one of its political divisions?

Mr. Webster then proceeded to show that the assertions in the instructions are not true in point of fact, and said:

Mr. President, we are reduced, are we, to the poor condition that we see a minister of this great Republic instructed to argue or to intercede with the British minister lest he should find us to have forfeited our privileges; and lest these privileges should be no longer extended to us? And we have forfeited those privileges by our misbehavior in choosing rulers who thought more of our own claims than of the British. Why, sir, this is patently submitting to the domineering tone of the British minister, who told us that all our trade to the West Indies was a boon, granted to us by the indulgence of England. The British minister calls it a boon, and our minister admits it as a privilege and hopes that His Majesty will be too gracious to decide that we have forfeited this privilege by our misbehavior in the choice of our rulers.

And Mr. Webster repeated:

I ask again, Mr. President, if this be statesmanship; if this be dignity; if this be regard for country? Can any man read this whole dispatch with candor, and not admit that it is plainly and manifestly the writer's intention to promote the interests of his party, at the expense of those of his country?

Mr. Webster closed by stating that he had discharged the most unpleasant duty of his public life.

The action of the present Executive in the Hawaiian matter, and the instructions given to Commissioner Blount and Minister Willis, bring the case squarely within the principle denounced by Mr. Webster and disapproved by the Senate of the United States in 1832.

Mr. Cleveland says in effect: "My predecessor, Mr. Harrison, has stated in his message to the Senate of February 15, 1893, in relation to the revolution in Hawaii, that the overthrow of the monarchy was not in any way promoted by this Government, but had its origin in what seems to have been a reactionary and revolutionary policy on the part of the Queen, Liliuokalani, which put in serious peril not only the large and preponderating interests of the United States in the islands, but all the foreign interests, and, indeed, the decent administration of civil affairs and peace of the islands. I will therefore declare exactly the contrary."

"Mr. Harrison had investigated the facts, and reached the conclusion which he stated in his message. I will send an agent to the Sandwich Islands to gather up the gossip of the late Queen's following, and upon that, make a case to upset the judgment of my predecessor. President Harrison has sent to the Senate a treaty executed by commissioners of the Provisional Government of Hawaii, upon the one side, and by the Secretary of State of the United States, Mr. John W. Foster, upon the other, for the annexation of the Sandwich Islands to the United States. I am therefore against it, and will withdraw that treaty. President Harrison has approved of the acts of Minister Stevens in recognizing the Provisional Government of the Hawaiian Islands, and although every other civilized nation on the face of the earth has also recognized that government, I will repudiate my predecessor's action, and turn down that government. I will show the world that the Democratic party is now in power, and that I, as the embodiment of that party, have no respect whatever for the action of my predecessor."

There could have been no high principle which induced Mr. Cleveland to attempt to restore the monarchy of Hawaii. It stands out in plain relief that his motive was to discredit the Administration of Mr. Harrison and throw odium upon the Republican party.

There is no constitutional warrant for the assumption that one President is more wise, more sagacious, or more patriotic than another.

The office of President of the United States is a continuing office. Administrations of that office are divided into periods of four years each by the Constitution itself. There is no provision in the Constitution authorizing one President to review and revise consummated acts of his predecessor. A President entering upon an administration of the Government is directed to the future, and not to the past. Otherwise his term would include four years in the future and an indefinite past. What is done and consummated by one Administration is done and consummated by the United States, and not, in contemplation of law, by the person who for the time being speaks for the United States. The power to review and revise the action of a predecessor assumes higher power in the office which reviews than exists in the office whose conduct is reviewed. There is no constitutional warrant or jurisdiction for this assumption as applied to different Presidents. The powers of one President are absolutely identical and equal with the powers of all Presidents.

It is a great mistake to suppose that the annexation of the Sandwich Islands originated with Mr. Harrison. The same views that were entertained by him have been held by many of

the ablest men of the country, including Mr. Marcy, Mr. Seward, President Johnson, President Grant, Mr. Fish, and Mr. Blaine. The policy of our Government has been in favor of maintaining an independent government in Hawaii as long as the islands were able to maintain themselves. The Government of Hawaii has never been a strong government, and the fear that it would go to pieces has existed for many years. In 1853 Secretary of State Marcy in a letter to our minister at the Sandwich Islands said:

I do not think that the present Hawaiian Government can long remain in the hands of the present rulers, or under the control of the native inhabitants of those islands, and both England and France are apprised of our determination not to allow them to be owned or to be formed under the protection of any of these powers or any other European nation.

It seems to be inevitable that they must come under the control of this Government, and it would be but reasonable and fair that this disposition should be made, provided the transfer was effected by fair means.

These views of Mr. Marcy have been entertained by every Administration during the past half century. They are in harmony with the views expressed by President Harrison in his message. In discrediting President Harrison, President Cleveland discredits every Administration that has preceded him, and every statesman who is on record on the subject.

I have already said that the revolutionists in the islands were the ex-Queen and her followers, and that the revolution of January, 1893, was the culmination of a revolutionary sentiment that had existed for years, and ever since the constitution of 1887 was adopted. That constitution provides for the only way by which it can be changed, and requires the approval of any amendment by two regular successive Legislatures. The Queen was in the act, every other means having failed, of setting aside that constitution by her arbitrary fiat. She had been considering upon what method she could upset that constitution for the six preceding years. On July 29, 1890, Rear Admiral George Brown, commanding the United States naval forces in the Pacific, wrote to Secretary Tracy from Honolulu as follows:

UNITED STATES FLAGSHIP CHARLESTON,
Honolulu, Sandwich Islands, July 29, 1890.

SIR: In reference to political matters in the Hawaiian Islands, I have to report that since last communication on this subject, No. 228, of June 26, 1890, many events have transpired in Honolulu which indicate serious trouble, if not a revolution, is imminent at no distant date. The Legislature now in session will probably not adjourn until the middle of September next, and until that time the discordant element in the National Reform party, as represented by several natives and half-castes in the Legislature, who were prominent leaders in the attempted revolution, are discussing their movements either in the Legislature or at public meetings in the streets. Their efforts are now being made in favor of a national convention, with a view to the revising of the present constitution, which was adopted in 1887.

The revision of the constitution which these revolutionists desire to bring about is nothing less than an entire new constitution, which will restore to the King his former powers, giving the native element almost absolute control of the Government, and ignore the interests of foreign residents and the vast amount of capital they now have invested in the several islands. The present constitution provides for the only way by which it can be amended, and requires the approval of any amendment by two regular successive Legislatures. The Legislature meets biennially. Any attempt to change the constitution in any other way will be revolution, and will be resisted by the reform party and by the best element of the National Reformers. It is almost certain that there will be a majority in the Legislature opposed to granting a petition for the proposed constitutional convention, and that the defeat of the revolutionists in the Legislature will be the signal for an uprising of the lower class of natives.

The result of such an uprising will undoubtedly prove disastrous to them as the interests of the moral and the better class of natives and half-castes can not be permitted to be jeopardized by a small number of irresponsible and impecunious, but educated natives and half-castes. The presence of the force under my command has a marked influence on the would-be revolutionists, as, while they are well aware that I am here to protect the property and the citizens of the United States, the general belief among them is, that I will in the event of a revolution, take a more decided stand in the interest of those opposed to them than I might be warranted in doing.

The white residents and natives and half-castes, who stand ready to oppose the revolutionists, have every confidence in their ability to do so successfully and take great comfort in the knowledge of an adequate naval force being present. I am in frequent personal communication with our minister residing there, as also with many of the leading American merchants and lawyers, and from them I am able to keep constantly advised of the progress of events.

GEORGE BROWN,
Rear-Admiral, United States Navy,
Commanding United States Naval Forces, Pacific Station.

On August 22 of the same year Commander Felix McCurley, in a report to the Secretary of the Navy from Honolulu, uses the following language:

The only trouble that may occur is that if an attempt to coerce the Representatives to vote for the new constitution be made our minister and the English commander, Maj. Wodhouse, proposed to land the men from the American and British men-of-war to prevent it, and I think this display of force will prevent further trouble. As regards this movement I asked the Hon. John L. Stevens if this was not interfering with the autonomy of the Government at this place, to which he replied, "No, not if the governmental authorities request it."

So it is readily seen that the revolution against the constitution which was completed in January, 1893, came very near coming to a crisis in 1890, between two and three years before. It is idle to charge that the overthrow of the Queen's Government was caused by the landing of a 162 marines, including a brass band, to protect American life and property on the 16th day of January, 1893.

The Provisional Government has at its head the best men of the Sandwich Islands. Their high character for ability and integrity was not only certified to by Minister Stevens, but by Mr. Cleveland's minister, the Hon. Albert L. Willis, who says in one of his communications to the Secretary of State that they are men of the highest respectability and integrity. A comparison of the state papers prepared by the Provisional Government in relation to our affairs in those islands with those prepared by our own officers, shows that the men of the Provisional Government, in matters of diplomacy, are not behind our own.

These men represent not only the American interests in the island, but all the foreign interests as distinguished from the natives. They are high-minded men, patriotic men. They have in view no aim but the good of that country. They see clearly that the Sandwich Islands must gravitate to the United States. They perceive that it is best for them, and believe it is best for us. They do not desire to be any longer ruled by a degraded monarch surrounded by officers only a little less degraded than she. The sympathy of all the decent people of the earth must be with the Provisional Government.

What is the future of the Hawaiian Islands?

These islands are the key to the supremacy of the commerce of the Pacific Ocean. They are the only point where this country can get a foothold in that ocean. We can not and will not permit Hawaii to pass under the control of any European power. We ought to, and ultimately must, take control of those islands. They may be formed into a county and added to the State of California. They may be brought in in some other way. But unless these islands can maintain their independence they must become a part of this country. Of course such action is based solely upon the consent of those islands, and their inability to maintain an independent government. There may be, and is likely to be in the future, a struggle for the commercial supremacy of the Pacific Ocean between the United States and Great Britain.

There may be in the future a struggle for power in that section of the globe between the United States and Great Britain, and possibly some other one of the great powers. In such an event we need the Sandwich Islands. The British have Australia, New Zealand, and it may also be said the whole of the South Pacific islands. France possesses the Society Islands and New Caledonia and one or more of the Hebrides and some of the Leeward Islands. Spain has been awarded the Caroline Islands, and Germany the Marshall Islands. The latter islands are about the same distance from the Sandwich Islands as is the coast of California. Russia has control of the Asiatic coast from Bering Strait to Kamchatka.

The principal European powers have secured the strongest strategic points in the Pacific Ocean, where trading or coaling stations can be, or have been located, except the Hawaiian Islands. The United States does not possess a solitary coaling station beyond her coast line. In case of war she would be compelled to ask the privilege of coaling her ships from some European power. The Sandwich Islands have for very many years been seeking admission to this country. They are now seeking such admission. We can have them now peaceably and upon our own terms. President Harrison recommended such admission, and sent to the Senate a proposed treaty of annexation. The Senate appeared to be friendly to such admission, and the Committee on Foreign Relations reported the treaty favorably.

In taking this course President Harrison pursued the constitutional method. He did not send a paramount commissioner to these islands to make a secret case. His work was open and above board. He concealed nothing from Congress. The position he took was not without precedent. Eminent American statesmen for half a century had taken the same ground. Mr. Cleveland's action in relation to the Hawaiian affair was taken upon the most superficial investigation and information. He never perceived that the Queen herself was a revolutionist, and was about to overthrow the constitution of 1887 by an act of her arbitrary will. He never perceived that by such action she abdicated her crown and became a rebel. He never perceived the deep-seated and deep-rooted causes that produced the establishment of the Provisional Government. He never knew that the constitution of 1887 was the result of a revolution; and that that constitution was wrested from the King by the people and by force. He never knew that the now ex-Queen was opposed to that constitution long before she went upon the throne, and that she determined to overthrow it by every means within her power, and conspired to overthrow it before she became Queen.

Mr. Speaker, we are approaching the threshold of the twentieth century; we have behind us a hundred years of wonderful progress and magnificent achievement. Who dare prophesy what American brains, American pluck, and American enterprise will accomplish by the close of the coming century. Certain things are in sight. One of them is continental union be-

tween the United States and the Dominion of Canada. That union is decreed by a law that admits of no successful resistance; the people of the two countries and the interests of the two countries are so identical that nothing can keep them apart.

It is a question only of time. Another is the Nicaragua Canal, uniting the commerce of the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans by a waterway across the continent. The success of this great enterprise no one now doubts. Another is the annexation to the United States of that Gibraltar of the Pacific Ocean, the Sandwich Islands. That will come in time. You may pass your resolutions against it now for partisan purposes, but some more patriotic Congress will take the needful action to give to the United States the supremacy in the mighty commerce of the Pacific Ocean.

Mr. VAN VOORHIS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I object.

Mr. VAN VOORHIS of New York. I hope the gentleman will withdraw that objection. I had nearly concluded.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I object.

EVENING SESSION.

Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, there are several gentlemen who desire to speak to-night, and I therefore ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of this day's session we take a recess until 8 o'clock, in order to have an evening session, not to extend beyond half past 10 o'clock, for debate only upon the pending question.

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, it does not seem to me that there is the slightest necessity for having evening sessions. We can just as well have day sessions. There is plenty of time.

Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky. I was requested by gentlemen on your side to ask for a night session, and there are also gentlemen on this side who desire to speak.

Mr. REED. I think we may as well have the speeches made in the House. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that the time for debate upon this question be extended for another day, in order to enable gentlemen who desire to debate it to address the House. There is really no occasion for us to come here evenings. This debate was, by the original order, to close this afternoon, and was to be followed by discussion of another resolution for which unlimited time was given.

Now, it has been already announced that extended debate upon that resolution on which the time was not limited will not be insisted upon. Surely the committee can not have intended that less than two days should be devoted to that resolution, which covers absolutely the same subject as those pending, only that the House wants to have the debate take place upon the matter that is actually before it. It seems to me that the more reasonable course would be to postpone the taking of the vote for one day more, and allow gentlemen who desire to speak to really address the House.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, this may be a very interesting question, especially to gentlemen desiring to speak upon it, but I have not noticed any great attention given to it on the part of members. There is a bill pending here which ought to be brought up, in which the American people are directly interested; and while I agreed yesterday to extend this debate for one day in order to accommodate members here, I shall insist on calling up as soon as possible the bill which I mentioned the other day to provide money to pay for the running of this Government, instead of issuing bonds. I therefore shall object to any further extension of the time for taking the vote on this question.

Mr. POST. I do not understand that anyone presses any objection now to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MCCREARY].

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. There is no objection to that request, and I hope it will be agreed to.

The SPEAKER. If there be no objection, then, at the close of the remarks of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN], who expects to address the House for fifteen or twenty minutes, the House will take a recess until 8 o'clock this evening, the evening session to be devoted to debate only on the pending bill—

Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky. And not to extend beyond half past 10 o'clock.

The SPEAKER. Not to extend beyond half past 10 o'clock. Without objection, that order will be made.

There was no objection.

PRINTING TARIFF BILL.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee, by unanimous consent, submitted the following resolution; which was read, considered, and adopted:

Resolved, That there be printed 3,000 copies of the bill (H. R. 4864) to reduce taxation, to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes, for the use of the House, as the same passed the House.

HAWAII.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, I had intended to speak at length upon this question; but when I learned that instead of being allowed an hour and a half or two hours, which is a short enough time in which to present in an intelligent and orderly manner all the points involved, I had been awarded only fifteen or twenty minutes, I abandoned the idea of submitting any remarks. I have reversed my decision after listening to the poetry upon the flag read by the gentleman from Maine, and shall therefore confine my attention and devote my few minutes chiefly to the incident of the flag, and the features which led up to its placement and displacement.

I shall have no time to discuss the beauty or the virtue of the Queen, which has been so persistently pressed upon our attention by the opponents of the Administration, and which seems to illy comport with the dignity of this House in a debate upon the rights and privileges of *de jure* and *de facto* government. The Queen is the state; she is the sovereign, and I have been puzzled to know just when the House of Representatives or the Congress of the United States came in charge of the beauty and the virtue of the foreign sovereigns when they happen to be women.

I cordially and enthusiastically indorse the Administration, and I would not, if I could, make so little change as to reject the dotting of an "i" or the crossing of a "t" in anything that has been said or done by the present Administration in respect to Hawaiian affairs. Yet, in recently accepting the high privilege of membership in the Congress of the United States, I find myself in the midst of distinguished statesmen who have spoken in terrific denunciation of the executive department and of the recent foreign policy of the Administration. The arraignment has not been an impersonal one, but the President himself has been styled an usurper, reckless of the rights and dignities of a coördinate branch of the Government and indifferent to the claims and demands of the Constitution which he has sworn to support.

Occasionally, almost a cry of despair would go up to "call a halt," to the discredit and disgrace into which, it was said, the country was being plunged by the distressing course of the Executive. Since I have begun to read these accusations and hear them spoken, with fresh installments of charges from time to time, I have daily felt, in the simplicity of my inexperience, that the pall of an earthquake was about to cover us. But to-day the sun shines as bright as it did before Hawaii was heard of. Happiness is as near to us as it ever was; and the country is safe, quiet, contented, and satisfied, so far as any overweening desire to annex the Hawaiian Islands is concerned.

It has been said, Mr. Speaker, that the almost universal voice of the press and of the people is opposed to the policy of the Administration. It is only recently that the facts have been placed before the people; and even now, oftentimes, in a broken, disconnected, vague, and obscure manner. Intelligent men are undoubtedly thinking upon this subject; call upon call has been made by my constituents for all information relating to the Sandwich Islands imbroglio; and I respectfully suggest to the honorable Committee on Foreign Affairs a more extended publication and circulation of the brief but able summary of the Secretary of State, the clear and cogent report of Mr. Blount, and the lucid and convincing message of the President, with all the correspondence relating thereto or connected therewith.

If it be true that the almost universal voice of the people is in condemnation of the President, one might well feel timid in standing upon the floor of this House in advocacy of the position which he maintains. I do not believe it. The people are sometimes temporarily misled, sometimes overcredulous, but always patient, always honest, always hopeful, and ever stirred and thrilled by the eternal principles of right and justice. [Applause on the Democratic side.] They will not submit to a wrong or injustice done to the veriest courtesan on the street, any more than to the virtuous woman who adorns the sacred relations of home.

Pervaded, sir, with the idea that the President has done the right thing at the right time and in the right place, I am ready once again, as in former days, to rally round the flag; to put it up when it is improperly hauled down, and to haul it down when it is improperly put up. [Applause on the Democratic side.] It is the symbol of our national greatness. It is the picturesque embodiment of the strength of the Government and the patriotism of the people. It stands for the Union of forty-four States, all vying with each other in the love of a common country. Wherever it is lawfully unfurled, it carries no message but of peace and good will to men. It proclaims noninterference with the internal affairs of other governments and enforces the independence of our own. It is at the head of all our public and quasi public processions.

The boys carry it in their military parades of miniature sol-

diery. The girls wear it as a fitting decoration for a Fourth of July celebration. And whether it streams from the Dome of the Capitol, or kisses the breeze at the top of the liberty pole, or is flung across the catafalque, or blesses the joys and festivities of a wedding occasion, it is altogether too sacred a piece of bunting, and means too much, to be hoisted over the government building of Hawaii as a signal to the world that the great Republic of the United States has overthrown the peaceful and constitutional Government of the Hawaiian Islands and substituted in its stead a wretched and miserable oligarchy. Observe for a moment the composition of this oligarchy.

Mr. Stevens says that it is a government composed of four men, highly respectable; but that hardly does the subject justice. The monarchical government was abrogated, and the provisional oligarchy established on the 17th day of January, 1893, by a paper writing signed by eleven persons, one of whom was made a member of the executive council, seven of whom were made members of the provisional council, and all but three of whom secured high civil positions exempt from military service, out of the way of the shot of a gun, and ready forsooth to step into the Senate of the United States, the House of Representatives, the judiciary, or any other posts of trust that would best subserve their personal promotion. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side].

A self-constituted clique! It may be said that all revolutionists are a self-constituted clique; but this one was only possible by reason of the domination of United States forces, and had not the backing of the people; a clique so cowardly, so lacking in the courage of the Anglo-Saxon race, that before the ink had become dry upon this proclamation, nay, undoubtedly as a part and parcel thereof and contemporaneous therewith, a letter was signed, addressed to the American minister, imploring him not only to recognize this abortion as a *de facto* government, not only to afford it moral support, but, if necessary, the support of the United States troops, to aid and assist in preserving the public peace. And where were the main body of troops?

Lieut. Swinburne tells us that they were marched down about 8 o'clock in the evening of the day previous, to Arion Hall, which fronts the side of the government building, and is only separated from it by a narrow street. Bravo! Well located, says Admiral Skerrett, if it was designed to foster the movement for the Provisional Government, and very improperly located if only intended to protect American citizens in person and property. Thus garrisoned by United States troops, thus supported by the marines, the Gatling guns and the infantry, armed with the Lee rifle and wearing the double-webbing belt with sixty cartridges in the loops and twenty in the magazines, it might well be supposed that this Provisional Government rested upon a pretty solid foundation, emboldened even against the fear and torment that come from a disturbed and awakened conscience. "The wicked flee when no man pursueth; the righteous are bold as a lion."

Yet what do we find? We find these gentlemen trembling in their boots, their very hair standing on end, like the quills of a fretful porcupine. A pistol shot alarms them. The bang of the door of the government building startles them. Even the very murmur of the breeze strikes terror to their affrighted imagination, and in a fortnight they are content to haul down the Hawaiian flag, and to petition the American minister to raise the flag of the United States in protection of the Hawaiian Islands, with the offer of freedom of occupation of the public buildings and the soil of the Hawaiian Government.

This offer was accepted by Mr. Stevens. Lieut. Swinburne, who was charged with the execution of details, reports that on the 1st day of February, in the presence of the executive and advisory councils, the government building was turned over to him, and the proclamation of Minister Stevens establishing a protectorate over the Hawaiian Islands was read by the adjutant; and that at 9 o'clock in the forenoon the ensign of the United States was hoisted over the government building, the Hawaiian flag remaining on a pole in the grounds. On the same day a telegram was sent by the American minister to his own Government. As speedily as practicable a reply came from the then Secretary of State suggesting that the affair looked very much like a genuine protectorate, and the act was promptly disavowed by the Government of the United States.

Do we hear of any proclamation of disavowal? Do we hear of any official intimation from Mr. Stevens that the condition of affairs had changed? Ah, no; Mr. Stevens had annexation on the brain. It had perverted his mental and moral faculties alike. It had softened every spot where thought shoots out to give itself expression, and the ensign of the United States still continued to float from the Hawaiian pinnacle, ever and anon looking humorously way down to the colors of the independent government of Hawaii in the back yard. There this ensign floated until after the arrival of Mr. Blount, a menace to the people of Ha-

waii, that they must not raise a voice or lift a hand for the restoration of their beloved Government.

There it floated, as Mr. Blount tells us, until, such had been its influence in intimidating citizens opposed to the provisional oligarchy, free and untrammelled speech and opinion could not be secured; and when Mr. Blount hauled down the ensign of the United States he did as creditable an act for his Government as the brave soldier who, under other conditions, plants his country's flag upon the parapets of the enemy. True, he did this by virtue of a discretion vested in him by the President of the United States, but it needed not the sanction of an official act.

It is clear that the right to raise the ensign was solely dependent upon the right to establish the protectorate. The fall of the one carried with it the fall of the other. The flag was floating, therefore, in fraud of the rights of the Hawaiian people. It was a continued false pretense that the Government of the United States was still protecting the Government of the Hawaiian Islands; and was an unrevoked threat of the displeasure and vengeance of the United States if the people should rise in their might and overthrow the oligarchy. It proclaimed a public lie. It had become a public nuisance, specially damaging every citizen of Hawaii and every citizen of the United States, and he who could truthfully say I am an American citizen, had the right to rescue it from the dishonorable purposes to which it had been subjected; and any Hawaiian subject might properly have torn it into tatters and trampled it in the dust. So much, Mr. Speaker, for the incident of the flag. [Loud applause.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

The SPEAKER. The hour having arrived, under the order adopted, the House will take a recess until 8 o'clock, the evening session to be devoted to debate on the pending proposition only; and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BROOKSHIRE] will perform the duties of the Chair.

And accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 30 minutes) the House was declared in recess.

— EVENING SESSION. —

The recess having expired, the House reassembled at 8 o'clock p. m., Mr. BROOKSHIRE in the chair as Speaker *pro tempore*.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Clerk will read the special order.

The Clerk read the special order, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this order the House proceed to the consideration of House resolution printed as Miscellaneous Document No. 75, reported from the Committee on Foreign Affairs January 29, 1894, expressive of the sense of the House of Representatives relative to Hawaiian affairs; that the consideration thereof be resumed immediately after the first morning hour on the two legislative days following next after that day on which this order is adopted; that at the hour of 4 o'clock p. m. on the last of said legislative days the previous question be considered as ordered on said resolution and pending amendments, and then without intervening motion the vote be taken thereon; that immediately after said resolution shall have been disposed of, and not before, the House shall proceed to the consideration of House resolution printed as Miscellaneous Document No. 43, reported adversely from the Committee on Foreign Affairs on December 21, 1893, relating to policy respecting intervention of the United States Government in affairs of foreign friendly governments; and the consideration thereof shall continue from day to day, after the second morning hour, until disposed of.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The House is in session for the purpose of debate only, pursuant to the special order just read. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. HALL] is recognized.

Mr. HALL of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, it was no novice in diplomacy whom President Harrison sent to the Hawaiian Islands. He wisely selected for that small but important mission a trained diplomat of long experience and well versed in the principles and precedents of international law.

Situated 2,000 miles from our coast, in the highway of commerce with the far East, by their geographical position, by the character of their population and the bustling Americanism which has found lodgment there, the islands were liable at any time to present most difficult problems of diplomacy.

It is there that the incompatible civilizations of the East and the West meet face to face; it is there that the trader and the speculator have trod upon the heels of the missionary and plundered the Christianized savage as soon as his conversion was accomplished.

Thus it has been in all ages whenever and wherever the antagonistic forces of barbarism and civilization have confronted each other. It detracts not from the good faith and the good work of the devoted missionary who has given his all of life to the dissemination of the gospel, to state as a historic truth that wherever he has gone he has after all been merely the pioneer of active and unscrupulous adventurers who have followed in his path only to plunder, debauch, and destroy the people he came to save.

This lesson, so horribly told in the history of Puritan New

England and of the West, is reiterated with less horror but with equal certainty in the Sandwich Islands. The world will never know, or, knowing, will never appreciate the story of privation and unselfish devotion of the earlier missionaries to these islands. The work they did, the good they accomplished can not be gainsaid. But the missionary is no longer the guiding star of Hawaiian destiny.

The whaler and merchantman, the steamship and the ironclad have sounded the channels and cast anchors in Hawaiian waters. The trader, the speculator, the planter, the bankrupt adventurer, and the imported laborer have peopled the islands with a new and heterogeneous race, trespassing upon the rights of the natives, despoiling them of their property, debauching their morals, and swiftly and relentlessly moving on to their final extermination.

This, sir, is what we Christians of the nineteenth century mean by "the onward march of civilization."

The American minister, Mr. Stevens, was from start to finish an ardent, persistent, active annexationist. His associations, his sympathies, his hopes were with the disaffected American element which was hostile to the Government to which he was accredited.

In his correspondence with our Secretary of State he gloats over the rapid decimation of the native population; he rejoices over the increase of the annexation sentiment; he predicts the overthrow of the reigning monarch, and gravely suggests that the time has come for a "new departure" by the United States as to Hawaii. Every line of his correspondence shows that Mr. Stevens regarded himself as a specially commissioned agent, whose sole duty it was to annex Hawaii to the United States at all hazards.

STEVENS HAS "RELIABLE INFORMATION."

I call attention to dispatch No. 48, written to Secretary Blaine March 8, 1892, viz:

If the Government here should be surprised and overturned by an orderly and peaceful revolutionary movement, largely of native Hawaiians and a provisional or republican government organized and proclaimed, would the United States minister and naval commander here be justified in responding affirmatively to the call of the members of the removed Government to restore them to power or replace them in possession of the Government buildings? Or should the United States minister and naval commander confine themselves exclusively to the preservation of American property, the protection of American citizens, and the prevention of anarchy?

Should a revolutionary attempt of the character indicated be made, there are strong reasons to presume that it would begin with the seizure of the police station, with its arms and ammunition, and this accomplished, the royal palace and the Government building, containing the cabinet offices and archives, would very soon be captured, the latter building being situated about one-third of a mile from the police station. In such contingencies would it be justifiable to use the United States forces here to restore the Government buildings to the possession of the displaced officials? Ordinarily in like circumstances the rule seems to be to limit the landing and movement of the United States force in foreign waters and dominion exclusively to the protection of the United States legation and of the lives and property of American citizens.

I have information which I deem reliable that there is an organized revolutionary party on the islands, composed largely of native Hawaiians and a considerable number of whites and half whites, led chiefly by individuals of the latter two classes. This party is hostile to the Queen and to her chief confidants, especially opposed to the coming to the throne of the half-English heir apparent, now being educated in England, and means to gain its object either by forcing the Queen to select her cabinet from its own members, or else to overthrow the monarchy and establish a republic with the ultimate view of annexation to the United States of the whole islands.

I have little doubt the revolutionary attempt would have been made ere this but for the presence here of the United States ship-of-war. I still incline to the opinion that the revolutionary attempt will not be made so long as there is a United States force in the harbor of Honolulu, but it would be rash to assume or assert this positively.

This, I submit, is—

THE KEY TO STEVENS'S WHOLE CAREER

in the islands. He says that he has "reliable information" that a revolution—an annexation revolution—is being incubated. It is organized. He knows the parties to it, he knows its ultimate purpose, nay, more, he knows the details of its programme. It would begin with the seizure of the police station, with its arms and ammunition, and "this accomplished," it would capture the royal palace and the Government building. If this is done, what shall I do, he asks. "Shall I reinstate the overthrown Government?"

Why did Stevens ask this? He was a trained diplomat of thirteen years' experience. He knew well enough that in the event stated, the revolutionary government would be the *de facto* Government which every nation would at once recognize. Why ask the question? He knew the answer. Were there others in Hawaii who had less confidence in Stevens than he had in himself, and needed a positive assurance from the Harrison Administration before they embarked upon the stormy sea of revolution?

THE U. S. SHIPS-OF-WAR.

Note, too, in the light of subsequent events, what Stevens says about the ship of war. "When the ship sails, the revolution

comes." "If you order it away, Mr. Blaine; if I take it away on a ramble among the neighboring islands, the revolution will come and with it annexation. For Heaven's sake, Blaine, do not let the ship slip out of the harbor." [Laughter.]

It was the Queen, and not the revolution junta, who feared the presence of a war ship under the control of a hostile minister. So long as it remained she would do nothing which would furnish a justification or an excuse for rebellion.

To this remarkable request for instructions it is said no official reply was made. Nothing was done at Honolulu. The ship remained in the harbor, the Queen was quiet, the revolution dormant. A Presidential election was pending in the United States.

In No. 72, on October 31, 1892, Stevens again says:

The are strong reasons for the belief that were it not for the presence of the American naval force in the harbor the Tahitian marshal and his gang would induce the Queen to attempt a *coup d'état* by proclaiming a new constitution, taking from the Legislature the power to reject ministerial appointments.

And Capt. Wiltse on November 9, 1892, writes to the Secretary of the Navy:

I am informed from reliable sources that the Queen had been strongly advised to dissolve the Legislature and order a new election, which would have been unconstitutional, and which would probably have caused a revolution; but she was deterred by the presence of United States vessels of war.

In the meantime the people of the United States had been to the ballot boxes and decreed the overthrow of the Harrison Administration. If anything was to be done in Hawaii it was well that it be done quickly.

Stevens's No. 74, dated November 20, 1892, must have been written soon after the result of the Presidential election was known in Honolulu. In it he says:

An intelligent and impartial examination of the facts can hardly fail to lead to the conclusion that the relations and the policy of the United States toward Hawaii will soon demand some change, if not the adoption of decisive measures, with the aim to secure American interests and future supremacy by encouraging Hawaiian development and aiding to promote responsible government in these islands.

Then follows an interesting statement of the commercial and naval importance of the islands, coupled with the assertion:

Well handled and sold at fitting opportunities, the proceeds of the Crown lands would pay the national debt, provide adequate pensions for the two or three royalties, in case monarchy should be abolished.

In this letter Stevens acknowledges that the annexationists—the "best element" as he calls them, "unaided and alone can not make the necessary changes in the existing condition of things." "The men qualified are here to carry on good government, provided they have the support of the United States." "I can not refrain from expressing the opinion with emphasis that the golden hour is near at hand." This, sir, is the language of conquest, not altogether unknown in diplomacy, but rarely used since the days of Cortez and Pizarro. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

In the light of subsequent events, the significance of this letter is unmistakable. It was notice to the Harrison Administration that the revolution was at hand, and equipped that Administration with all the data and arguments necessary to support the result.

THE GOLDEN HOUR AT HAND.

In Honolulu the conspiracy was ripe. It awaited some act on the part of the Queen which would excite the revolution. The Queen was restrained by the presence of the war ship Boston.

A month of inactivity elapsed—time enough for President Harrison to call a halt if he wished—and then on January 4, 1893, the Boston sailed out of the harbor, carrying Stevens and his family on a pleasure tour among the islands. Behind him he left the "organized revolution;" he knew that the time was at hand for the prorogation of the Legislature; he knew that the sailing of the Boston would light the fuse which would explode the revolution. And yet, like Capt. Kidd, he "sailed away." [Laughter.]

One can not but admire the marvelous precision in time displayed by the Boston on that historic cruise. At the right moment she steamed away, and just in time she was back again.

"Events in Hawaii in the past few days have moved rapidly," wired the exultant minister to Secretary Foster on January 18, 1893. So indeed they had. The departure of the Boston was the Queen's opportunity. A new cabinet was formed, the lottery bill passed, the Legislature prorogued, and a new constitution promised—and then on January 14th Stevens and the Boston came sailing back.

PECULIAR.

Of all revolutions in recorded history that at Honolulu was the most effeminate and unimpassioned. It was not accompanied by bloodshed tumult, or indignation. It did not interfere with the business of men, nor the gossip of women, nor the play of children. [Laughter.] A mass meeting and a proclamation constituted the sum and substance of the movement. For three days after Stevens's return it smoldered harmlessly in Thurston's office. [Laughter.] Then it developed into an unarmed

mass meeting, with speeches, and resolutions, and the appointment of thirteen men as a committee of public safety.

THE TREATY.

On February 15, 1893, President Harrison submitted to the Senate for ratification the treaty of annexation which he had negotiated with the commissioners of the Provisional Government.

I call attention to the President's message and Secretary Foster's letter which accompanied the treaty. It says:

On Saturday, the 14th of January, the capital was wholly controlled by the royal troops, including a large additional force of over 500 armed men not authorized by Hawaiian law. On the same day the first call to arms in opposition to the Queen was issued, and the citizens' committee of safety was developed. During the 14th, 15th, and most of the 16th the two parties confronted each other in angry hostility, with every indication of an armed conflict at any moment.

It was not until late in the afternoon of Monday, the 16th, after request for protection had been made by many citizens of the United States residing in Honolulu, that a force of marines was landed from the Boston, by direction of the minister, and in conformity with the standing instructions which for many years have authorized the naval forces of the United States to cooperate with the minister for the protection of the lives and property of American citizens in case of imminent disorder. The marines, when landed, took no part whatever toward influencing the course of events.

Their presence was wholly precautionary, and only such disposition was made of them as was calculated to subserve the particular end in view. They were distributed that night between the legation and the consulate, where they occupied inner courts and a private hall rented for their accommodation. Beyond a sentry at the door of each post, and the occasional appearance of an officer passing from one post to another, no demonstration whatever was made by the landed forces, nor was the uniform of the United States visible upon the streets. They thus remained, isolated and inconspicuous, until after the success of the Provisional Government and the organization of an adequate protective force thereunder.

At the time the Provisional Government took possession of the Government buildings, no troops or officers of the United States were present or took any part whatever in the proceedings. No public recognition was accorded to the Provisional Government by the United States minister until after the Queen's abdication and when they were in effective possession of the Government buildings, the archives, the treasury, the barracks, the police station, and all the potential machinery of the Government.

Then, and not until then, when the Provisional Government had obtained the full *de facto* control, was the new order of things recognized by the United States minister, whose formal letter of recognition was promptly followed by like action on the part of the representatives of all foreign governments resident on the Hawaiian Islands. There is not the slightest indication at any time prior to such formal recognition in full accord with the long-established rule and invariable precedents of this Government, did the United States minister take any part in promoting the change, either by intimidating the Queen or by giving assurance of support to the organizers of the Provisional Government.

The President says that the marines were landed from the Boston "after request for protection had been made by citizens of the United States." This is not true. The request was made by the organized committee of public safety—as such committee. It is as follows, viz:

HAWAIIAN ISLANDS, Honolulu, January 16, 1893

SIR: We, the undersigned, citizens and residents of Honolulu, respectfully represent that, in view of recent public events in this Kingdom, culminating in the revolutionary acts of Queen Liliuokalani on Saturday last, the public safety is menaced and lives and property are in peril, and we appeal to you and the United States forces at your command for assistance.

The Queen, with the aid of armed force and accompanied by threats of violence and bloodshed from those with whom she was acting, attempted to proclaim a new constitution; and while prevented for the time from accomplishing her object, declared publicly that she would only defer her action.

This conduct and action was upon an occasion and under circumstances which have created general alarm and terror.

We are unable to protect ourselves without aid, and therefore pray for the protection of the United States forces.

HENRY E. COOPER,
F. W. MCCHESNEY,
W. C. WILDER,
C. BOLTE,
A. BROWN,
WILLIAM O. SMITH,
HENRY WATERHOUSE,
THEO. F. LANSING,
ED. SUHR,
L. A. THURSTON,
JOHN EMMELUTH,
WM. R. CASTLE,
J. A. MCCANDLESS,
Citizens' Committee of Safety.

To His Excellency JOHN L. STEVENS,
American Minister Resident:

It nowhere refers to the persons or property of American citizens. It is the request of the "organized revolution," and it closes with a remarkable confession of the weakness and instability of the movement. "We are unable to protect ourselves without aid, and therefore pray the protection of the United States forces." "Help me, Cassius, or I sink!" was the helpless cry of the revolution to Minister Stevens. [Laughter.]

Suppose Stevens had refused this request, what would have become of the revolution? "Unable to protect themselves," how could they overthrow their enemies?

In his letter of January 18, 1893, to Secretary Foster, Stevens says: "The Committee of Public Safety called on me for aid. It was fortunate that the Boston was in the harbor," and in the

same letter he says he inclosed a copy of this "call of the Committee of Public Safety for aid."

If he did so, then President Harrison

SUPPRESSED THE DOCUMENT.

It nowhere appears among the papers sent by him to the Senate.

It was an important document, because it bore upon its face indisputable evidence that the revolution was a sham; that it could not stand upon its feet; that the Provisional Government could not have existed without the support of the armed forces of the United States.

The charge I bring against ex-President Harrison is a serious charge. It accuses him of duplicity in his communications with the United States Senate—of suppressing, of withholding from the Senate an important document concerning an important treaty submitted to it.

If Stevens in fact sent the "call" to Secretary Foster, what has become of it? Why was it not sent to the Senate when every other scrap of paper connected with these transactions, except this, was transmitted?

There are sins of omission as well as sins of commission.

THE MARINES ON SHORE.

What part did our marines and blue-jackets play in this tragedy of the isles? Is it true, as President Harrison says, "that they took no part whatever toward influencing the course of events"? Let us see. They landed on the afternoon of the 16th; a small squad was sent to the legation, a larger party under the command of Lieut. Draper was posted at the consulate, on the same street, in the same block, and not many feet distant from the station house, then occupied by the Queen's forces under the command of Marshal Wilson.

The larger part of the force marched up Fort street to King, and thence along King street to Atherton's residence, far out in the eastern suburbs of the city. Their line of march took them directly by the Queen's palace and the barracks near the palace. With band playing, flags flying, and Gatlings rattling over the stony street, they marched by, saluting the startled Queen as they passed. On to Atherton's they went, and soon they came marching back again by the palace, and wheeling to the left, quartered themselves at Arion Hall. Arion Hall confronted the palace and also commanded the Government building. It is located a mile from the business and American part of the city.

Admiral Skerrett says:

SIR: I have examined, with a view of inspection, the premises first occupied by the force landed from the United States steamship Boston, and known as Arion Hall, situated on the west side of the Government building. The position of this location is in the rear of a large brick building known as Music Hall. The street it faces is comparatively a narrow one, the building itself facing the Government building. In my opinion it was inadvisable to locate the troops there if they were landed for the protection of the United States citizens, being distantly removed from the business portion of the town, and generally far away from the United States legation and consulate-general, as well as being distant from the houses and residences of United States citizens. It will be seen from the accompanying sketch that, had the Provisional Government troops been attacked from the east, such attack would have placed them in the line of fire.

Had Music Hall been seized by the Queen's troops, they would have been under their fire, had such been their desire. It is for these reasons that I consider the position occupied as ill selected. Naturally, if they were landed with a view to support the Provisional Government troops, then occupying the Government building, it was a wise choice, as they could enfilade any troops attacking them from the palace grounds in front. There is nothing further for me to state with reference to this matter, and as has been called by you to my attention—all of which is submitted for your consideration.

The disposition of the marines was such that wherever the forces of the Queen were posted they were confronted by the armed forces of the United States.

It taxes human credulity to the utmost to suppose that all this merely "happened so," as Stevens says. The display of force, the marching and countermarching by the palace, the location of the forces, all show a deliberate purpose on the part of the minister who ordered these things done. It is true that the marines remained "passive"—they did nothing except to confront, overawe, and intimidate the Queen and her forces.

RECOGNIZED BEFORE BORN.

President Harrison says that the Provisional Government was not recognized "until after the Queen's abdication and when they were in effective possession of the government buildings, the barracks, the police station, and all the potential machinery of the government. Then, and not until then, when the Provisional Government had obtained full *de facto* control" was it recognized by Minister Stevens.

This statement is literally untrue in every particular. It is charitable and it is reasonable to assume that Mr. Harrison was not aware of its falsity. It was his credulity and not his probity which was at fault. Misled by Stevens, and tricked and deceived by Thurston, he accepted and submitted to the Senate a statement of facts which investigation has demonstrated to be wholly untrue.

What are the facts? At about 2:30 p. m. on January 17 the committee of public safety, accompanied by the members of the government about to be formed, proceeded to the Government building. They were unarmed. From the only person there they demanded possession of the building, and from the front steps read their proclamation establishing the Provisional Government. Then they sought recognition from the United States. Capt. Wiltse, of the Boston, peremptorily refused to recognize them, because they had not yet obtained possession of the barracks and the station house. That which Wiltse refused to do Stevens did at once with alacrity. Before 5 o'clock, probably about 3, he recognized the Provisional Government as the *de facto* government of the islands.

At that time the Queen held the palace, the barracks, and the station-house with her armed troops. The whole city of Honolulu, with the exception of the Government building and the points occupied by the United States forces, was in her possession. The Provisional Government was in possession of the Government building, and of nothing else. So far from being a *de facto* government, it had not yet become a belligerent.

QUEEN'S MINISTERS TO MR. STEVENS.

DEPARTMENT OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
Honolulu, January 17, 1893.

SIR: Her Hawaiian Majesty's Government having been informed that certain persons to them unknown have issued proclamation declaring a Provisional Government to exist in opposition to Her Majesty's Government, and having pretended to depose the Queen, her cabinet and marshal, and that certain treasonable persons at present occupy the Government building in Honolulu with an armed force, and pretending that your excellency, in behalf of the United States of America, has recognized such Provisional Government, Her Majesty's cabinet asks respectfully:

Has your excellency recognized said Provisional Government? and if not, Her Majesty's Government, under the above existing circumstances, respectfully requests the assistance of your Government in preserving the peace of the country.

We have the honor of being your excellency's obedient servants,
SAMUEL PARKER,
Minister of Foreign Affairs.
WM. H. CORNWELL,
Minister of Finance.
JOHN F. COLBURN,
Minister of the Interior.
A. P. PETERSON,
Attorney-General.

His Excellency JOHN L. STEVENS,
Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary.

[Extract from records of the United States legation.]

CORRESPONDENCE WITH HAWAIIAN GOVERNMENT.

UNITED STATES LEGATION, Honolulu, January 17, 1893.

About 4 to 5 p. m. of this date—am not certain of the precise time—the note on file from the four ministers of the deposed Queen, inquiring if I had recognized the Provisional Government, came to my hands, while I was lying sick on the couch. Not far from 5 p. m.—I did not think to look at the watch—I addressed a short note to Hon. Samuel Parker, Hon. William H. Cornwell, Hon. John F. Colburn, and Hon. A. P. Peterson—no longer regarding them ministers—informing them that I had recognized the Provisional Government.

JOHN L. STEVENS,
United States Minister.

STATEMENT OF LIEUT. DRAPER.

May 5, 1893. Herbert L. Draper, Lieutenant Marine Corps, attached to Boston:

I was at the United States consulate-general at the time the Provisional Government troops went to the station house and it was turned over to them by Marshal Wilson. It was about half past 7 o'clock. The station house is near the consulate-general on the same street. As soon as it happened I telephoned it to the ship. I wanted my commanding officer to know, as I regarded it as an especially important thing.

I was the commanding officer at the consulate-general. There was no other United States officer there at the time excepting myself.

The above is a correct statement.

HERBERT L. DRAPER,
First Lieutenant, United States Marine Corps.

MR. SWINBURNE TO MR. BLOUNT.

HONOLULU, HAWAIIAN ISLANDS, May 3, 1893.

SIR: In response to your verbal request for a written communication from me regarding certain facts connected with the recognition of the Provisional Government of the Hawaiian Islands by the United States minister to that country on the afternoon of January 17, 1893, I have to state as follows:

On the afternoon in question I was present at an interview between Capt. Wiltse, commanding the Boston, who was at that time present in his official capacity with the battalion then landed in Honolulu, and Mr. Dole and other gentlemen representing the present Provisional Government, in the executive chamber of the Government building. During the interview we were informed that the party represented by the men there present was in complete possession of the Government building, the archives, and the treasury, and that a provisional government had been established by them.

In answer Capt. Wiltse asked if their government had possession of the police station and barracks. To this the reply was made that they had not possession then, but expected to hear of it in a few minutes, or very soon. To this Capt. Wiltse replied: "Very well, gentlemen, I can not recognize you as a *de facto* government until you have possession of the police station and are prepared to guaranty protection to life and property," or words to that effect. Here our interview was interrupted by other visitors, and we withdrew and returned to the camp at Arion Hall. As far as I can recollect, this must have been about 5 o'clock p. m.

About half past 6 Capt. Wiltse left the camp, and as he did so he informed me that the United States minister to the Hawaiian Islands had recognized the Provisional Government established by the party in charge of the Gov-

ernment building as the *de facto* Government of the Hawaiian Islands. About half past 7 p. m. I was informed by telephone by Lieut. Draper, who was then in charge of a squad of marines at the United States consulate, that the citizen troops had taken possession of the police station, and that everything was quiet.

Very respectfully,

WM. SWINBURNE,
Lieutenant-Commander, United States Navy.

Hon. J. H. BLOUNT,
Special Commissioner of the United States.

GOVERNMENT BUILDING, Honolulu, January 17, 1893.

SIR: I acknowledge receipt of your valued communication of this day, recognizing the Hawaiian Provisional Government, and express deep appreciation of the same.

We have conferred with the ministers of the late Government, and have made demand upon the marshal to surrender the station house.

We are not actually yet in possession of the station house; but as night is approaching and our forces may be insufficient to maintain order, we request the immediate support of the United States forces, and would request that the commander of the United States forces take command of our military forces, so that they may act together for the protection of the city.

Respectfully, yours,

SANFORD B. DOLE,
Chairman Executive Council.

His Excellency JOHN L. STEVENS,
United States Minister Resident.

It was after Stevens had recognized the Provisional Government, after he had informed her cabinet of the fact, that the Queen, fearing a conflict with the United States forces, yielded her authority "until such time as the Government of the United States shall, upon the facts being presented to it, undo the action of its representative and reinstate her."

I, Liliuokalani, by the grace of God and under the constitution of the Hawaiian Kingdom, Queen, do hereby solemnly protest against any and all acts done against myself and the constitutional Government of the Hawaiian Kingdom by certain persons claiming to have established a Provisional Government of and for this Kingdom.

That I yield to the superior force of the United States of America, whose minister plenipotentiary, his excellency John L. Stevens, has caused United States troops to be landed at Honolulu, and declared that he would support the said Provisional Government.

Now, to avoid any collision of armed forces and perhaps the loss of life, I do, under this protest, and impelled by said force, yield my authority until such time as the Government of the United States shall, upon the facts being presented to it, undo the action of its representative and reinstate me in the authority which I claim as the constitutional sovereign of the Hawaiian Islands.

Done at Honolulu this 17th day of January, A. D. 1893.

LILIUOKALANI, R.
SAMUEL PARKER,
Minister of Foreign Affairs.
WM. H. CORNWELL,
Minister of Finance.
JNO. F. COLBURN,
Minister of the Interior.
A. P. PETERSON,
Attorney-General.

S. B. DOLE, Esq., and others,
Composing the Provisional Government of the Hawaiian Islands.

(Indorsed:) Received by the hands of the late cabinet this 17th day of January, A. D. 1893. (Signed) Sanford B. Dole, chairman of the executive council of Provisional Government.

Then, and not until then, the station house was surrendered. On the next day, and not until the next day, the representatives of other foreign nations recognized the *de facto* Government.

Stevens had triumphed. The mission with which he charged himself was accomplished. By intrigue and conspiracy, by fraud and force, he, the sworn representative of the United States, had overthrown the friendly government to which he was accredited. The glory of the achievement, the shame of the success, is his. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

That Stevens was the head and heart of the conspiracy; that he was the scene-shifter and the curtain-raiser in this Hawaiian tragedy; that from start to finish he encouraged, engineered, and accomplished the revolution, is beyond all reasonable doubt. I know that he denies this; I am aware of his protestations of innocence. But every denial, every protest made in the face of the overwhelming proof against him, is evidence of his audacity and cumulative evidence of his untruthfulness.

Mr. Blount's investigations merely corroborate that which appears in Stevens's own letters. Blount gives us fuller details, but no new matter of material importance. The history I have given of these transactions is derived entirely from Stevens and his associates. I use the evidence which he himself has furnished in his own correspondence. With it, I nail him to the cross of public detestation as a conspirator against the peace of a friendly nation—a diplomat who has soaked the flag of his country in the loathsome filth of plot and intrigue; false to the nation whose commission he bore, and treacherous to that to which he was accredited; one who has brought disrepute to American honor, disgrace to American diplomacy, and shame and reproach to American manhood.

I know of no laws upon our statute books which prescribe punishment to the wretch who betrays and disgraces the country which honors him with its commission. But there exists in the great American heart a sense of justice, a love of fair play, a rugged self-respect, which will view John L. Stevens's Hawaiian

diplomacy with shame and indignation—a pure public opinion, growing stronger as the facts grow clearer, which will—

Put a whip in every honest hand,
To lash the scoundrel through the land.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HITT], who supports, while he does not defend this Hawaiian infamy, denounces the deposed Queen as the embodiment of all that is loathsome and brutal. She is immoral, he says, a monster, a Lucretia Borgia, hungry for her victims, greedy for a holocaust, and gloating over the hope of a new St. Bartholomew. The gentleman will pardon me if I quote only a small part of the fusillade of epithets he has fired against the crownless Queen. The same discretion which led him to avoid any defense of Stevens leads me to ignore Liliuokalani. [Laughter.]

But here is a treaty of annexation—a treaty of absorption made with the Provisional Government. It was made by President Harrison. It is the last of the follies of a weak Administration—the evanescent glow of an expiring luminary. Have you read it? By Article V we are to pay and assume the Hawaiian debt of three and one-quarter millions. By Article VI we grant to this savage Queen, this last of the Borgias, this modern De Medici, this hideous, grinning, ebony monster, this royal strumpet an annual pension of \$20,000 for the term of her natural life.

This was your work, not ours. You took this victim of her own crimes, this dethroned and homeless monarch, this incarnation of vice and debauchery, and placed her upon the nation's pension list side by side with the crippled veterans and the widows and daughters of the heroes who washed and purified with their blood the flag which for one hundred years has been in every port and on every sea the symbol of freedom at home and honest dealing and fair play abroad. [Applause.]

This was your work. Take back your pensioned Queen and wash her clean if you can.

Debauched and depraved as she may be, she is, nevertheless, entitled to justice. The weaker and more defenseless she is by so much the more is she entitled to fair play at our hands. We are too great, too manly a nation to allow our armed forces to be made the instruments of outrage and robbery.

No man who bears the credentials of an American minister should ever be permitted to plot and conspire against the government to which he is accredited. American honesty, American justice, American fair play must be maintained all around the globe; and if any filibustering enthusiast attempts to blazon the skull and cross-bones upon the spotless flag of our country honored be the hand that will shoot him on the spot.

A great wrong has been done in Hawaii by this man Stevens. He has shamelessly compromised the honor of the American people; he has nearly established a dangerous precedent in international law. Thank God, we have in the White House a man who has the wisdom to annul the precedent, the manhood to preserve our honor, and the courage to RIGHT THE WRONG. [Applause.]

Mr. POST. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. HALL], who has just taken his seat, closed his very able speech with a declaration that no American minister accredited to a foreign government ought to be permitted to attempt to overthrow that government. I was amazed at this assault upon Mr. Willis, who is the minister accredited by this Government to the Government of the Sandwich Islands, because I had inferred from the preceding part of the gentleman's speech that he favored the resolution reported by the Committee on Foreign Affairs. Now, the statement which the gentleman from Minnesota so elaborately made with reference to the fall of the Hawaiian monarchy and all the transactions that took place there in January, 1893, were published in every newspaper of the United States soon after the events occurred, and just as fully as the gentleman has made it here, and Congress was then in session, yet there was not the slightest objection made to any of the transactions at that time.

My friend here who sits near me [Mr. STOCKDALE], who listened to this arraignment of Mr. Stevens, and who made some comment on it to me privately, did not say a word about these transactions at that time, although he was then a member of Congress, and as I have said, Congress was then in session. All this denunciation of Mr. Stevens has burst out suddenly, and why? The gentleman from Minnesota in his closing sentence gives us the key to the whole situation. The President in the White House wills that it shall be so. Is there any other reason? I think not.

Now, Mr. Speaker, my time is limited, and if I permit myself to go on talking generally on this subject it will be all gone before I shall say precisely what I want to say with reference to the matter before the House.

Mr. Speaker, the object of this resolution would never be suspected from the text. Its real purpose is, first, to condemn Presi-

dent Harrison for submitting to Congress a treaty annexing the Hawaiian Islands; second, to whitewash President Cleveland's attempt to set up a fallen throne with a ruler reinstated under a pledge to him not to obey the constitution and laws of the monarchy.

REPUBLICAN DIPLOMACY.

Mr. Speaker, Thomas Jefferson once wrote: "No ground for the support of the Executive will ever be so sure as a complete knowledge of his proceedings by the people." This sentiment was also expressed in similar terms by President Harrison in one of his messages, and it was the rule which governed his conduct of public affairs. It was the rule which he observed in the Hawaiian question. Whether his judgment was right or wrong, there was no secrecy, his conduct was straightforward and open to the inspection of all mankind, and the matter at issue was promptly submitted to the decision of Congress. President Harrison's course was applauded and approved by the American people. The resolution which attempts to smirch his conduct and that of his subordinates will be condemned by the American people.

ROYAL INTRIGUE.

President Cleveland came into power and immediately removed the question from Congress in order that he might decide it himself. Violating the Jeffersonian maxim, suppressing information as to his royal purposes from the American people whom he distrusted, "contrary to the traditions of our Republic and the spirit of our Constitution," President Cleveland instructed the minister of the United States accredited to the Hawaiian Government first, to inform the Queen as to what she must and what she must not do "when reinstated;" second, to notify the Executive of the Hawaiian Government and his ministers that President Cleveland had determined that they should "promptly relinquish" their authority to the Queen. These were the secret instructions given to Mr. Willis October 18, 1893, and at the demand of both Houses of Congress two months later they were made public.

The course of President Cleveland has received unqualified denunciation from the Democratic as well as the Republican press, and the almost universal condemnation of the people. Does any Democrat imagine that public opinion will change, that the detected conspiracy to reestablish royalty will become less odious if this cunning resolution is forced through the House? Every member who votes for it will be arraigned before his constituents for injustice and insincerity. Pass the resolution, if you must, for patronage is powerful, and you may not be free agents; but the people will surely pass upon you, and the next House of Representatives will expunge from the record the truthless charge against the Navy of the United States. [Applause on the Republican side.]

THE NAVY.

This resolution asserts that the naval forces of the United States overthrew the constitutional Government of the Hawaiian Islands. Who believes the statement? The naval forces certainly know what they did. Has a single officer or man of the United States Navy testified to that effect? Was any such charge made by any of the foreign governments who recognized the new Government? Has any officer or man of the Navy been punished for the acts which this resolution declares to have been illegal?

The responsibility can not be shifted to the United States minister, for ministers have no authority to order naval officers to do illegal acts; and if any illegal act was done by the naval forces of the United States, naval officers are responsible. It is true that President Cleveland attempted to delegate his power as commander of the Navy to a civilian and gave authority to Mr. Blount, "My paramount commissioner," to take command of the Navy, but that authority was so clearly illegal that this resolution does not even refer to it. [Applause.]

The resolution declares "that interference with the domestic affairs of an independent nation is contrary to the spirit of American institutions;" but so adroitly is it worded that it would appear to be a principle announced by President Cleveland, when all the world knows, except the committee making this report, that President Cleveland was the very President and the only President who ever attempted to interfere with the domestic affairs of Hawaii; that he is the only President of the United States who ever accredited a minister to a friendly republic with instructions to overthrow that government and establish a monarchy.

Mr. Speaker, earlier in this debate I heard a good deal of discussion as to whether this new Hawaiian Government is a republic or not. Well, it is undoubtedly a Government recognized by all the powers. It is recognized by the people of Hawaii. It seems to have been a popular Government in its origin, beginning in a mass meeting. It certainly is not a monarchy, for there is no king, and, on the other hand, there is a president.

As to whether I am right or wrong in calling it a republic I am indifferent; I am perfectly willing to call it a democracy, or any other name that gentlemen who are particular about names may prefer.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER] asked what seemed to him to be a very pertinent question, as to whether the new government was not enforcing the laws of the monarchy. If I had had the floor at the time I should have been pleased to have replied: Yes; and what of it? The gentleman from Illinois ought to know that the State of Illinois enforces the common law of England—that is, enforces laws which grew up under the English monarchy, yet it will hardly be charged for that reason that Illinois is itself a monarchy. [Laughter.]

HONOR OF THE NAVY AND THE NATION.

The resolution is cunningly drawn and conceals the truth. It is a cruel assault upon the naval forces of the United States which every honest man will regret, and it is an undeserved and unjustifiable attack upon the fair fame and honor of this nation.

Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky. If it will not disturb the gentleman, I would like him to read that part of the resolution to which he has just referred.

Mr. POST. The resolution says that "it is the sense of this House that the action of the United States minister in employing the United States naval forces and illegally aiding in overthrowing the constitutional government of the Hawaiian Islands," etc. That is, it asserts, in effect, that the naval forces of the United States were used to overthrow the Hawaiian Government, and such certainly was the argument of the gentleman who preceded me [Mr. HALL of Minnesota].

Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky. Does the gentleman from Illinois believe that the committee of safety, so called, which had a meeting and passed a resolution declaring that a Provisional Government was established to exist until annexation to the United States could be obtained—does he believe that if Minister Stevens had not landed the troops that committee of safety would have been able to sustain the Provisional Government?

Mr. POST. I do believe it; but I am willing to imagine that the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs does not believe it. I was not trying to make his argument; I was simply trying to state my case and to state it in terms that would not be in the slightest degree offensive to him.

Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky. My friend from Illinois, perhaps without noticing it, characterized the resolution in very strong terms, and I wanted to get his reasons for saying what he did say.

Mr. POST. Well, if the gentleman will listen to me I think he will find that I will give the reason. I contend that the allegation that the naval forces were used to overthrow the Government of Hawaii is without foundation; that there is no evidence to support it; and I say that if they were so used the officers of the Navy and the men of the Navy, as well as the lookers-on, certainly ought to be able to tell us where and in what way they were so used.

Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky. I understand my friend to say that they were not so used. Now, in answer to that I state that the committee of safety appealed to Minister Stevens, saying to him, "We are unable to protect ourselves and we appeal to you for the aid of the United States forces;" that then, in a short time, Mr. Stevens ordered the United States forces to land, and although three members of the committee of safety went to him on the evening of Monday, the 16th, and said, "Do not land the troops this evening," Mr. Stevens replied: "I have ordered them to land and I will land them whether you are ready or not."

Mr. POST. It would seem, then, that he could not have been cooperating with the committee of safety, these "conspirators" about whom we hear so much. On the contrary, he seems to have been pursuing his own course and acting in his own time without regard to their wishes.

Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky. He seemed to be making himself the head conspirator.

Mr. POST. I entirely disagree with the gentleman as to that; and as to the argument of the gentleman who has preceded me [Mr. HALL], based upon the reports which Mr. Stevens made to the State Department about the condition of public opinion and public feeling in Hawaii, I will say to the gentleman that if he will look into diplomatic history a little he will find that just such information had been sent to the Department by several of our ministers to Hawaii who preceded Mr. Stevens.

Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky. Will the gentleman read that part of the resolution which attacks the naval forces.

Mr. POST. Does the gentleman see how little time I have? I would be very glad to discuss this question with the gentleman if I had time.

Now, I ask my Democratic friends, Is it not better that Presi-

dent Cleveland, the Democrat, and Secretary Gresham, the Republican, should suffer for their own blunders and crimes than that the two great parties in this House should attempt to rescue them by a resolution which will deceive nobody?

Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky. Do you want an answer to that?

Mr. POST. My time is limited.

Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky. You put the question to Democrats, and I am one.

Mr. POST. The case has already gone to the people and their righteous verdict has been against President Cleveland's policy. That policy failed; the occupation of beheading subjects in Hawaii to satisfy a despotic ruler has gone, let us hope, forever. Woe to the American autocrat who connives at the revival of that occupation!

THE CONJURER.

If there are Democrats in this House whose faith in President Cleveland is greater than in their own senses, let them consider the fable adapted to their case:

"Gentlemen," said a conjurer, one fine starry evening, "these heavens are a *deceptio visus*; what you call stars are nothing but fiery motes in the air. Wait a little, I will clear them off and show you how the matter is." Whereupon the artist produced a long syringe of great force (message of December 18, 1893), and stooping over the neighboring puddle, filled it with mud and dirty water (report of my paramount commissioner), which he then squirted with might and main against the zenith. The wiser of the company (the Republicans) unfurled their umbrellas; but the most part (of the Foreign Affairs Committee) looking up in triumph cried, "Down with delusion! It is an age of science." Here the dirt and muddy water fell, and bespattered and beplastered these simple persons, and even put out the eyes (prevented the reflection) of several, so that they never saw the stars (seats in Congress) any more. [Laughter.]

Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question right here. Does he think any Democrat would be willing to take his advice as to how to secure his reelection? We do not want the gentleman's advice. The gentleman had better attend to his own political affairs.

Mr. POST. I insist that the time occupied in this way by the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs shall not be taken out of my time.

Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky. I will say to my friend that my interruptions are of course all pleasant; and if the gentleman does not get through in the thirty minutes allowed him, I shall ask that his time be extended so as to make up for the time that I may occupy.

Mr. POST. I am very much obliged to the gentleman.

Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky. Before you leave that point will you let me ask you a question?

Mr. POST. I would much rather listen to my friend than speak myself.

Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky. The question I was about to ask was this—

Mr. STOCKDALE. I hope the gentleman will excuse me a moment. I ask the Chair at what time the discussion this evening is to close?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore* (Mr. BROOKSHIRE). The evening session closes at half past 10.

Mr. STOCKDALE. I do not know whether the gentleman from Kentucky has the right to grant unlimited time to my friend from Illinois.

Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky. My colleagues on this floor will bear me out in the statement that I rarely interrupt a speaker; but I have a rule, in public as well as private life, that when any man addresses a remark to me he will get an answer all the time; and the gentleman from Illinois has been addressing sometimes the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs and sometimes the Committee on Foreign Affairs. As I have the honor to be the only member of that committee present to-night, I feel that when the committee is assailed I ought to answer the gentleman now.

Mr. POST. Will you wait till I finish this line of remark, because my time is flying? [Laughter.]

Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky. I want to ask the gentleman a question bearing upon the matter he is now discussing and bearing upon the very kindly feeling he is evidencing here to-night to take care of the Democratic party. My question is this: It is an old proverb that charity should begin at home. I would prefer to see the gentleman showing his love for the Republican party and trying to take care of that party, instead of wasting his affection upon the Democratic party. [Laughter and applause.] Now, I want to ask him this question: Less than a year ago President Harrison sent to the Senate an annexation treaty, and earnestly asked that it should be ratified—a treaty requiring this Government to pay three million and a quarter of dollars, to pay

the Queen an annuity of \$20,000, and to pay the princess \$150,000. I want to know whether the gentleman is still in favor of that annexation treaty?

Mr. POST. I want to answer the gentleman's first question first—the question with reference to taking care of the Republican party. I have faith to believe that the people will take care of the Republican party when it next comes before them. [Applause.]

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. Did they do it in the last election?

Mr. POST. Mr. Speaker, my duty now is to try to bring the Democrats into camp.

Now, as to the gentleman's other question, I will answer that as I go on.

This House can not lessen the odium showered upon the Executive for attempting to reestablish a monarchy in Hawaii by invoking a new deluge of popular displeasure. The Executive policy was an admitted crime; indorsement of it would be worse—it would be a blunder.

The New York Sun (Democratic) says:

A more impudent report was never laid before a legislative body of reasonable men. It insults the intelligence of Congress and the people. It treats them as if they were fools, incapable of understanding the meaning of words. After Mr. Cleveland has worked and conspired ceaselessly for nearly a year to restore a discarded Queen to her throne, by the overthrow of a foreign Government recognized by the United States and all the rest of the great powers of the world, this committee have the shamelessness to tell the people that by so doing he announced the principle that such interference "is contrary to the spirit of American institutions!" In one breath they condemn foreign interference in the domestic affairs of Hawaii, and in the next they glorify him for having practiced it. On the assumption that Minister Stevens assisted in the overthrow of the barbarous monarchy, they condemn him; but with the facts of Mr. Cleveland's efforts to restore that corrupt rule before them in official documents, they stultify themselves by attributing to the President the enunciation of a principle of noninterference which condemns his own course as false to "the spirit of American institutions."

Moreover, the resolutions reject both annexation and the assumption of a protectorate over the Hawaiian Islands as "uncalled for and inexpedient," so far as this country is concerned; but they recognize the right of the Hawaiians to make a treaty of annexation with any other power—England, for instance—by saying that they have "absolute freedom and independence in pursuing their own line of policy," without foreign intervention. Being free to pursue their own policy without interference from us or any other foreign power, they have now as much right to offer themselves to England as they had before to ask for annexation to the United States; and if we undertake to interfere with their policy in that particular, we shall be guilty of the very foreign interference reprobated by the committee.

To such lengths must the servile retainers of Clevelandism in Congress go in order to make a pretense of defending this indefensible and infamous Hawaiian policy. They must humiliate and stultify themselves and render our country ridiculous and contemptible in the eyes of the world.

HAWAII ASKS ANNEXATION.

Mr. Speaker, the Hawaiian question has been before the American people for nearly half a century. Mr. Severance, our representative in Hawaii during Fillmore's Administration, and Mr. Gregg during Pierce's Administration, found that there was a desire on the part of the people and the Government of the islands to be annexed to the United States, and reported the facts to our Government. Since that time almost every representative from Gregg to Stevens has reported the same thing, and it has always been favorably considered by our executive government.

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. If you are so much in favor of it—

Mr. POST. One minute. I would be glad to be interrupted if I could be assured of an extension time.

Mr. Marcy, Secretary of State, replied to Mr. Gregg giving him "full power to treat with the present authorities of the Hawaiian Government for the transfer of the Sandwich Islands to the United States." The treaty was negotiated, but the King died before ratifications were exchanged.

Again, in 1893 the proposition came. The Queen had proposed to repudiate the constitution of 1887, which had been forced upon her royal predecessor, and to assert her rights as an absolute monarch. Revolution followed; a new government assumed power and negotiated with the United States for annexation. President Harrison submitted the question to Congress whether the United States would accept the key which secures all the commerce of the North Pacific, or whether it would hand that key over to China, or our commercial rival, England.

The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. DRAPER], a member of the Committee of Foreign Affairs, has fully and admirably presented the reasons why the United States should control the Hawaiian Islands, and I commend his argument to every American who hopes for a glorious future for this Republic.

The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. RAYNER] wasted a large amount of time and energy in proving that Mr. Stevens believed that Secretary Marcy was right in his expectation that at some time the Hawaiian Islands would become a part of the United States.

The President, in his message of December 18, 1893, addressed himself to the same task with commendable success. These su-

preme efforts seem unnecessary when Mr. Stevens had frankly stated his opinion so that no man could doubt it.

President Cleveland seems to be ignorant of what Mr. Stevens knew—that the monarchy had long been tottering to its fall. In his dispatch of February 8, 1892, after referring to the political excitement in the islands and to "Wilcox, the half-caste, who was at the head of the revolutionary outbreak in July, 1889," Mr. Stevens said:

The present political situation is feverish and I see no prospect of its being permanently otherwise until these islands become a part of the American Union or a possession of Great Britain.

Such being the case, it was but natural that Mr. Stevens should be friendly to that traditional policy of our Government which had been approved of by every President and Secretary of State for fifty years. He was not in favor of seeing the islands become a possession of Great Britain, and every patriotic American shares the same prejudice.

That is my answer to the gentleman from Kentucky, and every patriotic American concurs in that answer. [Applause.]

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. Now, will the gentleman let me ask him a question right there?

Mr. POST. I fear I have not the time.

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. I would like to ask you just one more question.

Mr. POST. Well, Mr. Speaker, you will not bring down that gavel while I answer, will you?

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. I hold in my hand the annexation treaty which President Harrison sent to the Senate and recommended the Senate to ratify. One article in that treaty provides that three and a quarter millions shall be taken out of our Treasury and paid to the authorities at Honolulu, and used by them in paying off their public debt, including the amount due to depositors in the Hawaiian Postal Savings Bank. It also provides for giving Liliuokalani \$20,000 a year, and for giving \$150,000 to the princess Kaulani. Are you in favor of that?

Mr. POST. I want to say with reference to that, that the treaty of annexation is not before us. It is no fault of mine that it is not.

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. You were discussing the question of annexation.

Mr. POST. I was discussing the question of annexation, and saying that everybody heretofore, including the Democratic party under Mr. Marcy, had been in favor of it.

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. I think the gentleman is mistaken there.

KEY TO THE PACIFIC.

Mr. POST. The views of that great statesman and diplomatist, William H. Seward, should be recalled. "He believed that the nation of the future is the nation that holds the key to these western waters. The purchase of Alaska has given our Republic a foothold on both sides of the sea. It is a geographical impossibility that any other nation can occupy a position in its own territory upon both sides of the Pacific. This is the theory of the purchase. It secures the control of the Pacific to the young Republic. It assures the future of the world's dominion to Yankee civilization. This was his theory, and his outlook was grand. In his political horoscope he saw the Republic enjoying a prosperity of which the annals of human affairs had furnished no example; he saw our country rising to the place of umpire among the world's powers; he saw how by wise statesmanship material prosperity and peaceful conquests grew together; how our increasing commerce made us mistress of the seas; how western civilization and oriental decrepitude were stayed upon the Pacific Sea and compelled to render homage to young America, which has become the keeper of the world's keys."

AN AMERICAN BULWARK.

Let us not deceive ourselves. The "dog in the manger" policy that we will not take the islands ourselves nor allow any other nation to take them can not last long. The situation of the islands on the earth's surface is such that they are of the first importance in the world's commerce, and give a commanding position to any nation which possesses them. Neither from the extent of territory nor resources is anyone justified in supposing that they can maintain real independence. One of the great nations of the earth will control them. China is becoming powerful, and with Hawaii in her possession, she will be two-thirds of the way across the Pacific. As an English possession Hawaii would exact tribute and homage from every vessel which plowed the waters of that great ocean.

Hawaii will either be a Chinese stepping-stone, an English stronghold, or an American bulwark. Which shall it be? I claim it for America. [Applause.] Our traditional foreign policy was suddenly changed in 1893, or the Stars and Stripes would float there now. Every great American statesman has looked forward to the time when the monarchy would fall and the

proffer be made to freely accept what by manifest destiny belongs to this Republic. Malice and inexperience in high places may obstruct the policy of Marcy, but that policy will nevertheless finally triumph.

Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question there?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. POST] has expired.

Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be allowed three minutes more, in which to answer a question which I wish to ask him.

There was no objection.

Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky. The question I desire to ask my friend from Illinois is this—

Mr. POST. Before you ask me that question, let me say that all I want is that you shall support the policy which has heretofore been upheld by Webster, by Marcy, by Douglas, and by Seward.

Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I deny that any Democrat who has ever been President of the United States has advocated the annexation of the Hawaiian Islands to the United States; and in this connection I want to ask my friend this question: Are you in favor of taking in islands that are 2,000 miles away, which have a population of 89,000 persons, more than half of whom are Chinese, Japanese, Portuguese, and Polynesians, nearly all the rest of whom are Kanakas, and only 4,000 of whom are white people. Do you want to annex that country to this country, and pay three millions and a quarter dollars for the privilege?

Mr. POST. Now, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman's first statement was, as I understood him, a denial that any Democratic President had favored the annexation of those islands. Was that the idea?

Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky. Annexation on the terms now proposed.

Mr. POST. I want to say that the treaty of annexation made by Marcy was made under a Democratic Administration, was it not? With reference to the population, Chinese and Japanese will continue to come there, and the longer the present condition exists the worse it will be. Shall we permit the outwork for the defense of western America to be captured by China or Japan? The sooner the United States accept those islands the better. It would have been very much better if Marcy's policy had succeeded. Marcy was a pretty good Democrat, but he had correct ideas with reference to the position of the Sandwich Islands in relation to the commerce of the Pacific.

I have not the time to describe what I conceive to be the situation of the Sandwich Islands. They are toward the center of that great bowl which contains the North Pacific, and the nation which holds those islands can control the commerce of earth's greatest sea. Gentlemen will remember that we are on both sides of the North Pacific, and those islands are the strategic point for commerce and for war. They will be an absolute necessity in the future to the United States.

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

Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky. I would like to have a minute to answer the gentleman.

Mr. POST. You could have it, but I have no more time to yield. My time has expired.

Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky. I want to refresh the gentleman's recollection a little about his own party. He has quoted from Marcy. Marcy was a Democrat, but at the time Marcy was seeking to annex both Cuba and Hawaii his policy was not indorsed by the Democratic party, and he was unable to secure the annexation of either Cuba or Hawaii and the Republican party in convention passed this resolution:

Resolved, That the highwayman's plea that might makes right, embodied in the Ostend circular, was in every respect unworthy of American diplomacy and would bring shame and dishonor upon any government or people that gave it their support.

That was the position of the gentleman's party.

Mr. POST. Now, Mr. Speaker, just one moment. The objection to acquiring Cuba was that it would extend the area of slavery; a good objection, for no one foresaw its sudden disappearance. Who doubts the wisdom of the annexation of Texas, though I believe it was opposed by the Whig party at that time. I have always admired and gloried in the conduct of the heroes of the Alamo who went over and secured that magnificent empire for the United States.

Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky. But Texas voted unanimously to come into this Union, and there was no vote taken in Hawaii at all.

Mr. POST. Not yet. They must wait.

[Mr. STALLINGS addressed the House. He withholds his remarks for revision, and they will appear hereafter.]

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LACEY] is recognized.

Mr. LACEY. I yield five minutes of my time to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE].

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE] is recognized.

Mr. MORSE. I desire first to say a single word in reply to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. OUTHWAITE] who this morning called me to order for unparliamentary language. I think if he will examine the files of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD he will find that what I said was mild, tame, and insipid compared with some utterances from his own side as applied to this side during the recent tariff debate. Take the speech of Mr. CLARK of Missouri as an illustration, which all who heard it will recall, in which he referred to the Republican side as "hell."

[On page 190 of the Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will be found the following:

"Mr. MORSE. May I ask the gentleman a question?

"Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Certainly, with delight. [Laughter.]

"Mr. MORSE. If I understood the gentleman correctly, he said a while ago that when a man entered this House by the main door and walked down the main aisle and turned to the right, he was in hell; and I want to know whether the gentleman included in that description the "Cherokee Strip" over here?

"Mr. CLARK of Missouri. No, sir. The Cherokee Strippers, who are Democrats, were forced by circumstances into close proximity to the protectionist hell."

Mr. Speaker, I have repeatedly heard the great manufacturers and business men of Massachusetts—and they include some men on this floor—I say I have heard these men frequently denounced as "Shylocks," "robber barons," "extortioners," "gold bugs," etc.

In view of these utterances, I submit that any charge of unparliamentary language comes with a bad grace from the Democratic side of this House.

Mr. Speaker, the uncompleted sentence of my speech, which was hung up like Mahomet's coffin when my time expired, and which I desire to complete and add to my speech of Saturday evening, was the following:

The Democratic party on this floor has denounced Minister Stevens and President Harrison for taking sides, not only with the white man's government, but with a government of intelligence, virtue, and decency, and for siding against royalty, in harmony with all our practice and traditions from our earliest history. I say after this let us hear no more against negro rule and a white man's government, the Democratic party having here and now indorsed the former as against the latter, for Hawaii at least.

Mr. Speaker, I firmly believe that were an election to be held next week, my State would repudiate Grover Cleveland and his economic and foreign policy by 100,000 majority. I tell you that the Democrats of the North are disgusted. They do not believe in "Populist," "Socialist," and "free-trade" leadership. Many Democratic papers have denounced Mr. Cleveland's foreign policy, and every Democratic paper in my State, so far as I know, has denounced the odious, inquisitorial "income tax." They do not like to hear her great business men, manufacturers, and merchants called the names to which I have referred—"Shylocks," "robber barons," "extortioners," such as has been the case frequently in the tariff debate just closed.

Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky. Will the gentleman yield to me for a question?

Mr. MORSE. I will if I have the time.

Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky. I want to know if you indorse the foreign policy of President Harrison?

Mr. MORSE. I most heartily do.

Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky. Do you indorse that foreign policy of his which took a savage king named Malietoa and put him back on his throne within the first three months after Mr. Harrison was inaugurated President of the United States?

Mr. MORSE. I am not as familiar with the Samoa matter as the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky, but so far as I know I indorse President Harrison's foreign policy. I indorse President Harrison's foreign policy fully, as relates to the Chilean complication, in which he displayed the finest statesmanship; in relation to the troubles with Italy over the New Orleans affair, avoiding war and maintaining the dignity and honor of the country; and last but not least, his masterly Bering Sea arbitration, avoiding war and making a long stride toward settling all national disputes by arbitration. President Harrison's foreign policy and diplomacy was honorable to himself and reflected glory and honor upon his Administration and upon his country.

Mr. LACEY. Mr. Speaker, ever since this Administration has come into power, "sufficient unto every day has been the evil

thereof." I will not, therefore, be willing to yield a portion of my time, at the suggestion of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. McCREARY], for the discussion of the Samoan question. The Sandwich Islands question is enough to occupy the brief time I have to address this House. The question before Congress now is an important one. This body has been awaiting with much interest for a long time for information from the Executive in regard to affairs in Hawaii. That information has been kept back, and yet finally, by slow degrees, we have been enabled to procure from the State Department a portion, at least, of the facts in the case.

In this House my friend from Maine [Mr. BOUTELLE] has in like manner been suppressed from day to day and repressed all the time; and at last, Mr. Speaker, a rule has been brought in for a brief discussion of the question. The time has been very limited, and of the character of the rule we might well complain, as under it this discussion has been forced into the night, instead of giving a sufficient opportunity for daylight discussion in a full House. It is not surprising, Mr. Speaker, that the Democratic members of this body have been unwilling to enter upon this discussion.

The secrecy and the mysterious plottings of the Hawaiian game, with two weeks between the moves, is very irritating indeed, and the fact that our earliest information came from English sources did not make the matter any more pleasant. The great error of the present Administration arose from a neglect of the most simple of all diplomatic rules, and that was the duty of every Administration to recognize and uphold the acts of its predecessor, at least those acts that have been fully completed.

One ministry goes out, one administration goes out, another comes in, the king dies, his successor is crowned; but in foreign affairs the king never dies, the administration never ends. In foreign countries the people are always taught to look upon the government as continuing, and the amazing and fatal mistake made by the present Executive was in attempting to bring into contempt and disrepute the action of his predecessor in matters abroad. It was a policy evidently started in petty spite, possibly from a hostile former rival in the Republican party; and a half-baked Republican does not make a good Democrat.

Surely the Democratic Administration ought to have been controlled by its friends. A deserter from one army does not shed tears when he sees his new comrades dying around him, and so when a recent convert to the Democratic faith finds himself in power and in control of the Democratic troops he can not feel the same grief at the misfortunes of his surrounding friends as one of the old guard would if placed in charge of the State Department. It takes a little time to get used to the new duty of caring for one's former political foes. The resolution that has been brought in is one that seems to me unworthy of the distinguished Democrat [Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky] who has introduced it in this House. It starts in by attacking the former Administration. That Administration has passed and gone, and a new Administration is upon trial.

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. Will the gentleman read that part of the resolution which he says condemns the previous Administration?

Mr. LACEY (reading):

That it is the sense of this House that the action of the United States minister in employing United States naval forces and illegally aiding in overthrowing the constitutional Government of the Hawaiian Islands, in January, 1893, and in setting up in its place a Provisional Government not republican in form in opposition to the will of a majority of the people, was contrary to the traditions of our Republic and the spirit of our Constitution, and should be, and is, condemned.

Now, ex-President Harrison sent the treaty negotiated with the representatives of that Government for approval by the Senate of the United States.

The chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs is Democratic. He believes in the Monroe doctrine, I presume. His party has prided itself upon sustaining that doctrine in the past; and here is a resolution which that committee brings in in regard to interference in foreign affairs with other countries. The resolution says:

That foreign intervention in the political affairs of the islands will not be regarded with indifference by the Government of the United States.

This weak and washy, namby-pamby resolution laid before the Democratic party here is an evasion of the Monroe doctrine. Now, it is hardly proper to refer to a resolution offered in another body of like jurisdiction with our own, but it seems to me that we might well copy from the resolution that is pending in another body, in which it is said that—

Any interference in the Sandwich Islands by any foreign power will be looked upon by the United States as an unfriendly act.

But in this resolution we are expected only to say that it will not be regarded with indifference.

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. The very resolution introduced by the gentleman from Maine [Mr. BOUTELLE], which

all you gentlemen on that side have been complimenting so much, does not say a word about foreign intervention, while the resolutions reported by the majority of the committee declare that foreign intervention will be looked upon with disfavor by the United States.

Mr. LACEY. Why not go further? The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BLACK] this afternoon said that the people of the United States "would not tolerate any foreign power interfering with those islands." Why not take these manly words and insert them in your resolution instead of this weak declaration?

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. Why did you not put in the resolutions introduced by Mr. BOUTELLE and Mr. HITT some declaration about foreign intervention?

Mr. LACEY. Now, let me ask you a question. Why did not you introduce a plain, simple resolution: Resolved, That we stand by and uphold the action of the President of the United States in his attempted interference with the government now existing in the Sandwich Islands? [Applause on the floor and in the galleries.]

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. I will answer that. If such a resolution had been introduced it would not have been based upon the facts. The resolutions that have been introduced are resolutions that do bear upon the case. President Harrison had attempted to put through the Senate an annexation treaty which pledged this Government to expend \$3,250,000 for the Hawaiian Islands, and to take those islands without consulting the people of Hawaii, and the present President of the United States, Mr. Cleveland, withdrew that treaty from the Senate; and we indorse that position.

Mr. LACEY. Let me call my friend's attention and the attention of the House and of the country to the wording of that portion of the resolution:

That we heartily approve the principle announced by the President of the United States, that interference with the domestic affairs of an independent nation is contrary to the spirit of American institutions.

In other words, we commend the President's policy in abandoning his policy. [Laughter.] It was said of another decedent that "nothing so became him in this life as his leaving it." So this resolution says, in substance, that there is nothing so becoming the policy of President Cleveland in this matter as his abandonment of it. [Laughter.] This resolution commends not the policy of the President, but the abandonment by the President of his policy of intervention and interference abroad. [Applause on the Republican side.]

But the President in asking so modest a thing of the government of the Sandwich Islands as to step down and out, perhaps overestimated his strength. He had got accustomed to asking of Congress for everything he wanted, and getting it without objection, and he thought he could not be refused so modest a request by the Islands of the Pacific. [Laughter.] Mr. Commissioner Blount, an excellent and estimable gentleman, who sacrificed the governorship of Georgia and an almost certain seat in the United States Senate for the doubtful honor of restoring a colored queen in Hawaii [laughter], in a letter printed on page 164 of his report made the significant statement that I am about to read. This letter is addressed to Mr. Gresham, the Democratic Secretary of State, but lately a Republican candidate for the Presidency.

This is what Mr. Blount wrote:

I have discharged my duty the best I could, considering I was surrounded by persons interested in misleading me.

How did that occur? When Mr. Blount landed, Mr. Stevens went to him and said: "Here is a widow lady who keeps a comfortable and respectable house where you will not be surrounded by people interested in misleading you; or, if you prefer, you can go to the legation;" but no, Mr. Blount would not go there; so he went to the royalist hotel where he was surrounded, as he says, by persons who were not only interested in misleading him, but who undoubtedly did mislead him, to the detriment of this Government and of the gentleman himself. In the same letter he says:

The present government can only rest on the use of military force, possessed of most of the arms in the islands, with a small white population to draw from to strengthen it. Ultimately it will fall without fail. It may preserve its existence for a year or two, but not longer.

Here we have this weak, feeble government of thirteen people, as it is described, with a little force of twenty or thirty men, who are described by Mr. Gulick in this same report as deserters from the ships and ex-convicts—a government resting upon substantially no power whatever, with the great mass of the people of the islands against it, and Mr. Blount predicting that it can not stand; that ultimately it must fall. Well, Mr. Blount went out there and took down the American flag, and what was the result? The result was stated by Mr. Castle in a mass meeting held a few weeks after that.

Mr. STOCKDALE. Do you mean to say that that flag was properly flying there?

Mr. LACEY. I am not discussing that question. That flag was placed there for the protection of American citizens; it was placed there provisionally, and it was taken down, without investigation, upon the arrival of Mr. Blount; and the result was described by Mr. Castle in a speech which I find reported as follows in the Honolulu Star of November 27, 1893:

The President of the United States sent out here his paramount commissioner, and the first act of that commissioner was to take down the American flag. Then he stood by to see us tumble. Well, gentlemen, we did not tumble worth a cent.

He stood by there, the American flag having been taken down, and the marines having been sent back to the ship; and then this weak Government, which he expected to see crumble, stood up manfully, and in the very meeting to which I have referred the shout went back to Mr. Castle, "When we give up the Government of Hawaii, it will be with our guns hot and our cartridge boxes empty." That was the manly reply which was made.

Now, let me call the attention of the House to the conduct of this gallant little body of men carrying republican institutions into the very heart of the Pacific. I read from this same journal—

Mr. TATE. Before the gentleman proceeds further, I would like to ask him a question. Do I understand you to criticize Mr. Blount for not taking the house which had been rented for him by the annexation committee—

Mr. LACEY. No, sir.

Mr. TATE. Mr. Blount states in his report that the annexation committee had rented a house for him, provided it with servants, etc.; that Mr. Stevens met him and tendered him the house, telling him that he could pay something or nothing. Do you think it was improper for Mr. Blount to decline to accept this residence under the circumstances?

Mr. LACEY. Mr. Blount was invited by the American minister to occupy that residence. There was no reason why Mr. Blount should go out there with the idea that the American minister was a disreputable man seeking to mislead him in any way. He was invited into a private house, but instead of accepting that as his residence he took up his abode in the hotel which was frequented and controlled by the royalists, where he was surrounded by influences which, he himself says in his report, were calculated to mislead him.

Now, as to the propriety of allowing the rent of that house to be paid by the annexation committee, the sense of delicacy exhibited by Mr. Blount in that regard was no doubt very proper. I do not care to say anything against Mr. Blount; I think he is a worthy gentleman who has been sacrificed in a bad cause.

Mr. TATE. When Minister Stevens informed Mr. Blount that the annexation committee had prepared this house for him, do you think it was right or not for Mr. Blount to decline to accept that house as his residence?

Mr. LACEY. I can not see that there would have been any impropriety in his taking up his residence in a house of that kind. He was surrounded by no improper influences there. The Government was not in charge. He was surrounded by no influences from either side. If he had gone there, he would have been there alone, and sometimes it is well to be alone.

Now, Mr. Speaker, when interrupted, I was about to call attention to the manner in which this Provisional Government was being conducted. In the same paper to which I have referred I find advertisements, under the list of legal notices, published "by authority." I find, for instance, the appointment of a fire commissioner by the Provisional Government; then I find the adjournment of the public schools for one week during the Christmas holidays. Then comes an invitation for tenders for the building of a steel bridge known as the Wailua bridge. Then proposals are invited for the building of a county jail in one of the counties. Finally there is another advertisement, announcing some Government land near Punch Bowl Hill, at Honolulu, for sale by the Provisional Government. I insert these advertisements in full:

BY AUTHORITY.

George W. Smith, esq., has this day been appointed member of the board of fire commissioners for the city of Honolulu, vice W. A. Keech, resigned.

J. A. KING,
Minister of the Interior.

INTERIOR OFFICE, November 20, 1893.

SCHOOL VACATION NOTICE.

The regular Christmas vacation of all public schools in the country will extend from Friday, December 22, to Monday, the 8th of January next.

By order of the board of education.

W. JAS. SMITH, Secretary.

OFFICE OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION,
November 22, 1893.

SEALED TENDERS

Will be received at the office of the minister of the interior till 12 o'clock noon, on Thursday, November 30, 1893, for the erection of the steel bridge at Wailua, Kaaui.

Plans and specifications at the office of the superintendent of public works.

Each tender must be indorsed "Tender for Wailua bridge." The minister of the interior does not bind himself to accept the lowest or any bid.

J. A. KING,
Minister of the Interior.

INTERIOR OFFICE, November 20, 1893.

SEALED TENDERS

Will be received at the office of the minister of the interior, until 12 o'clock noon, Monday, December 4, 1893, for the construction of a jail at North Kohala, Hawaii.

Plans and specifications at the office of the superintendent of public works, also at the office of C. H. Pula, deputy sheriff, North Kohala.

Each tender must be indorsed "Tender for Kohala jail."

The minister of the interior does not bind himself to accept the lowest or any bid.

J. A. KING,
Minister of the Interior.

INTERIOR OFFICE, November 18, 1893.

SALE OF A STRIP OF GOVERNMENT LAND, SOUTH SLOPE PUNCHBOWL HILL, HONOLULU, OAHU.

On Wednesday, December 27, 1893, at 12 o'clock noon, at the front entrance of the executive building will be sold at public auction a strip of Government land on the mauka side of Prospect street, South Slope Punchbowl Hill, Honolulu, Oahu, containing an area of 6,875 square feet, a little more or less.

Upset price, \$75.

J. A. KING,
Minister of the Interior.

INTERIOR OFFICE, November 25, 1893.

Does that look like a government that was feeble? Here was a government that was going on, running schools, adjourning them from time to time, building jails and bridges for the use of the people. Does not that look a little more like the Anglo-Saxon methods of the United States of America than those of a feeble and disorganized body, ready to tumble at the first hint from some foreign country? When Hannibal was besieging Rome, as you will remember, they put up and sold in the city the very camp upon which his soldiers were quartered; and a few days after that Hannibal moved away and abandoned the siege. And this Government that Mr. Willis was inviting to step down and out—to give up its authority to the Queen—goes quietly along, builds jails and bridges, sells public lands, and transacts all the ordinary business of a republican government.

From the report of Mr. Blount we find also that the very night before the Queen was dethroned they had a band concert which all the people attended in gala costume; and on the night of the organization of the Provisional Government Judge Wideman, one of Queen Liliuokalani's cabinet, says that everything was quiet; "there was not a dog barking nor a cock crowing." (Report, 537.) Yet they tell us that this revolution was something which was simply brought up upon the spur of the moment on the instigation of the American minister! Mr. Gulick, one of the Queen's adherents, in his account of the revolution, shows how feeble the rotten Government was. I read from the Blount report, page 302:

At 2:40 o'clock p. m. on the following day, January 17, 1893—nearly twenty-four hours after the American troops landed—thirteen white men, several of them lately arrived in the country and not entitled to vote, appeared in front of the Government building, and the leader proceeded to read a proclamation deposing the Queen and establishing a provisional government. The only audience to this function was composed of a few loungers in the corridors of the building. Near the close of the reading some twenty-seven armed men ran in from the back and side entrances of the premises and gathered around the thirteen men above mentioned, apparently as supporters of the movement. This supporting force was composed of vagrants and ex-convicts who were at that moment under police surveillance, deserters from merchant ships in port, and the like, only two or three being known as residents of the town. Before the arrival of the thirteen men in front of the Government building the American troops quartered near by (as already described) were under arms; the crews of the Gallies were handy by their respective places; everything seeming to indicate complete readiness for any emergency.

Mr. Speaker, revolutions like this do not come in a day. As the minister tells you, "the Hawaiian pear was ripe." Yes, it was rotten, and ready to fall. A government can not be overthrown in this way if it is worthy to stand for a single moment; and then when all outside aid was withdrawn and the Government of the United States not only has ceased in any way to support this Provisional Government, but all the influence of 65,000,000 people was thrown against this struggling Government, they simply defied the minister of the Government and appealed to the public opinion of the United States of America to stand above the party in power; and the people that put the party in power will turn the party out of place if it disregards public opinion. [Applause.]

The same meeting to which I have referred passed resolutions that they would not submit to the destruction of their government. I insert those resolutions as a part of my remarks:

Resolved, That we have read with surprise and regret the recommendation of the Secretary of State of the United States to the President to restore the monarchy lately existing in Hawaii;

Resolved, That we condemn the assumption of the Secretary that the right of the Provisional Government to exist was terminated by his refusal to submit to the Senate the treaty of union pending between the two countries; and also his assumption that the Provisional Government had at that very

time submitted the question of its continued existence to the arbitrament of the President or of any other power:

Resolved, That we support to the best of our ability the Provisional Government in resisting any attack upon it which may be made contrary to the usage of nations.

The weakness and imbecility, as well as the venal character of the Queen is shown by the report (page 25), where it appears that she appointed one Paul Neumann her attorney-in-fact—

To arrange and agree upon such pecuniary considerations, benefits, and advantages as can be or may be secured * * * from the United States * * * in the form of payment at one time in a sum of money to myself, or of stated sums annually or oftener for a fixed period of time, * * * and to accept the same and in my name and behalf to make, execute, and deliver such * * * acquittances of my claims, demands, and pretensions whatever upon the throne of the Hawaiian Islands.

Liliuokalani thus contracted in regard to the Hawaiian people as she would for the sale of a sugar plantation.

A little nation of 90,000 people, with a monarchy surrounded by all the machinery of a European court, was bound sooner or later to shake off so absurd a clog to its growth and progress. Remember that it was not an ancient monarchy, revered on account of its antiquity, but an anachronism created out of season and wholly unadapted to the wants or condition of its people.

Such a government was bound to fall, and the only wonder is that it did not fall sooner. King Kalakaua reigned seventeen years, and during that time had two constitutions and twenty-six cabinets. The late Queen, too, had a weakness for new constitutions. Metternich tells us that when the Pasha of Yanina had revolted he wrote to that celebrated diplomatist to "send him a constitution-maker at once."

A people who attend band concerts while revolutions are going on are not very deeply attached to the government which is going to pieces, and Mr. Blount tells us that the people attended the concert as if nothing was going to happen, and when the flag of the United States was taken down and the standard of Hawaii raised in its stead, not a cheer, not a shout greeted it as it floated to the breeze.

In all the numerous revolutions in the islands only seven persons were killed and seven wounded.

But there is another thing, Mr. Speaker, of which I wish to complain. This resolution submitting this question to the House was brought forward the other morning, and after it had been adopted and after the motion to reconsider had been laid on the table, the Speaker laid before the House a message from the President, and in that message we find a letter from Minister Willis, in which he says that he had just received a fifty-page letter from Minister Dole; that he had received it at 6:30 in the evening; that the ship was to leave at 2 o'clock the next day, twenty hours afterward, and that he had not time to copy those fifty pages in the twenty hours intervening between the receipt of that letter and the time the ship sailed.

I will incorporate this letter of Minister Willis in my remarks. It is as follows:

[Confidential.]

No. 27.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
Honolulu, Hawaiian Islands, January 12, 1894.

SIR: Yesterday, at 6:30 p. m., I received the Hon. S. B. Dole's answer to my letter of January 1 requesting him "at his earliest convenience" to give me the specifications contained in a prior letter. His letter is about fifty pages of closely written official paper, and has been delivered too late to either copy or reply to in time for the steamer leaving at 2 p. m. to-day.

There is one extract, however, to which I think your attention should be called, wherein it is stated: "This Government has been and now is subjected to the necessity of increased watchfulness and a large additional expense, which but for such attitude would have been unnecessary." The emphasis above is mine. In a previous letter of December 27, Minister Dole had stated: "The Government offices have been placed and still continue in a condition of defense and preparation for siege, and the community has been put in a state of mind bordering on terrorism." Some portions of the letters from which these extracts are made confirm the above statements, while others seem to negative them. With this explanation I submit them to your consideration.

The next steamer leaves here February 3, which would place you in possession of Mr. Dole's letter and my purposed reply thereto about February 18.

Very respectfully,

ALBERT S. WILLIS

The Hon. W. Q. GRESHAM,
Secretary of State.

There is just enough of this to make us anxious to see the rest.

So it will be seen that this letter, stating the case of that little Government out there in the sea, was held back for two weeks because the American minister could not get fifty pages copied in twenty hours. It would be remarkable indeed, Mr. Speaker, if a copy of that letter had not been sent by that same ship to some one here representing the Sandwich Islands. It was very remarkable that a certified copy was not sent to the Secretary of State, in order that it might be laid before Congress without waiting two weeks.

I ask my friend from Kentucky [Mr. MCCREARY], chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, so near to the Administration as he is, whether it is not true that a copy of that letter is to day in the possession of the State Department, and whether it has not been withheld instead of being laid before us in order

that the action of this House might not be taken intelligently, with the statement of the Government of the Sandwich Islands before it?

Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I am surprised that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LACEY], who is usually so fair, and who I know is a good lawyer, should be so driven to distress in his argument to-night as to make the statement he has just made. Last Friday the President sent in a message here, and with that message sent a letter from Minister Willis, in which the minister said, "I have only a few hours before I mail this letter received a communication from President Dole fifty pages in length. I have not time to copy it. I will send it as soon as possible."

The gentleman knows that the letter of Mr. Willis was sent here. I want to say further in this connection that the President of the United States, within two weeks after this Congress assembled, sent all the information he had about Hawaii; and as fast as he has received any information since he has been sending it to Congress. No President of the United States ever has sent, with greater rapidity everything he received from a country with which we were having trouble than President Cleveland has; and I feel sure that the Dole letter which the gentleman speaks of has not been received here by Mr. Cleveland or by the Secretary of State. If it had been he would have sent it immediately to Congress. Nothing has been held back by the President of the United States connected with Hawaii except a letter written by this man Stevens, which the Republicans dare not press to have sent in here.

Mr. LACEY. Mr. Speaker, my friend is a little unfair, or else he forgets the terms of Mr. Willis's letter. The letter says:

Yesterday at 6:30 p. m. I received the Hon. S. B. Dole's answer to my letter of January 1.

And then he says:

His letter is about fifty pages of closely written official paper, and has been delivered too late to be either copied or replied to in time for the steamer leaving at 2 p. m. to-day.

That is, the letter was received twenty hours before the sailing of the steamer.

Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky. That is exactly what Minister Willis said, that he did not have time to have it copied; and I will promise the gentleman now, that as soon as that Dole letter gets here the President of the United States, with the same candor and justice which have animated him all the time, will send the letter in to Congress.

Mr. LACEY. I will ask my friend to make one more promise. This debate runs all day to-morrow. This House convenes at 11 o'clock. I will ask my friend to kindly call at the State Department and ask them to send in the certified copy of that Dole letter, if it is on file. Tell us to-morrow whether it is not there.

Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky. The gentleman from Iowa knows that if a member of Congress were to go to the State Department and demand to have anything sent in in that way, he would make himself ridiculous. The only way you can get information from there is to pass a resolution. Every time any member, Republican or Democrat, has offered a resolution, it has been reported by the Committee on Foreign Affairs immediately to this House, so that you have had every avenue to get all the information you wanted.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The time of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LACEY] has expired, and the Chair understands that the gentleman desires leave to incorporate in his remarks certain data.

Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky. If it is printed matter I have no objection.

Mr. LACEY. It is printed matter. As I have been interrupted, I would like to have a little more time. I can finish in a few minutes.

Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman have ten minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. LACEY. Mr. Speaker, the question we are now discussing is full of fate to the United States. Already two-thirds of the property in the islands is owned by Americans. It is true that they are 2,000 miles away, but so is Alaska, and with modern means of communication the great Pacific is as small as the Mediterranean was a hundred years ago, measuring distance by time rather than space. The time will come when the commerce of the Pacific will be claimed by the American people. As Archimedes said: "Give me a place for my fulcrum and I will move the world." So the people who will dominate the trade of the greatest of oceans must have the resting place of the Sandwich Islands.

American capital owns them; American customs have taken foothold there to such an extent that monarchy is no longer possible. If we do not take possession, England will. The House is traditionally the keeper of the honor and power of the Ameri-

can people. How far this House, elected in 1892, is now at variance with the American people is best told by the elections of 1893. How tame and timid, how mild are the resolutions we are asked to adopt—how unlike the Democracy of Jackson:

Foreign intervention in the affairs of the islands will not be regarded with indifference by the Government of the United States.

What a homeopathic prescription of the Monroe doctrine satisfies the present Democratic Representatives in Congress! We will not be "indifferent" when England takes these islands. The world would laugh at our lack of "indifference."

Another body, not so near the people, has not been afraid to discuss the question much more boldly, and has had the nerve to investigate for itself. That body has a resolution, drawn by a Democrat, which on this question says:

Foreign intervention in the political affairs of these Islands will be regarded as an act unfriendly to the Government of the United States.

Here is a veritable Garden of Eden, where the roses ever bloom and the sun ever shines. These islands stand out but 2,000 miles from the Golden Gate. They are the key which will control the commerce of the Pacific. Had Benjamin Harrison been reelected they would already have been added to the domain of American freedom. An Administration like that under which we now suffer may retard the movement of this great Republic; but an Administration that stands in the way of the growth and the future greatness of this Republic must be prepared to go hence, and not to stand upon the order of its going.

The future progress of this country is too well assured to be blocked by the mistakes and perversity of any four years of rule or misrule. It is the manifest destiny of this Republic to control the North American continent.

The great ocean that washes our western shores must some day carry the commerce of an American Republic of 200,000,000 souls. Let us not place ourselves as stumbling blocks in the road of this mighty march of progress and of civilization. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. STOCKDALE. Mr. Speaker, do I understand there is permission to extend remarks on this subject into the RECORD?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The present occupant of the Chair does not know what action has been taken in regard to general leave to print.

Mr. STOCKDALE. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks, as I want to be very brief.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman from Mississippi asks unanimous consent that he may have permission to extend his remarks into the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. STOCKDALE. Mr. Speaker, I do not desire to make a speech; I only want to make a few remarks to define my own position. There has been a great deal of talk about a "revolution" in this discussion. If there is any gentleman upon this floor who knows of any revolutionary act, by any of the Hawaiian people, he has failed to furnish the evidence to the House. There was no revolution. My friend from Illinois, in answer to the gentleman from Kentucky, stated how the troops were landed, and the gentleman from Kentucky said the committee of thirteen and Mr. Stevens were in conspiracy together. The gentleman from Illinois replied that if Mr. Stevens landed the troops before the committee were ready, they could not have been in conspiracy. But the history of that transaction shows that the committee of safety had very little to do with the movement, except to act as the tools of Mr. Stevens.

It was Minister Stevens's movement, and the Hawaiian people had not anything to do with it. The committee of thirteen moved only at his suggestion. You will remember that Mr. Damon said, in conversation with Mr. Blount, that this committee of thirteen went by different streets to the Government buildings. Why? Because they did not want to attract attention! Is not that remarkable? Here was a "revolution," engaged in overturning a monarchy at the head of 89,000 people, and thirteen men were engaged in that revolution; and those thirteen went by different streets, in small squads, for fear they would attract attention. Now, if there is anything more laughable than that, I never heard of it.

Mr. POST. As you state it.

Mr. STOCKDALE. That is the truth about it, and that is what Mr. Damon said himself; the committee itself said so; and here we are, a grave body of men, in a debate in the Congress of the United States, talking about a "revolution."

I will insert a portion of the interview between Mr. Damon, of the committee of safety, and Mr. James H. Blount.

Mr. Blount to Mr. Damon—

Q. Where were you on the 14th of January, 1893, at the time the proclamation deposing the Queen and establishing the Provisional Government was read?

A. I was at Honolulu. I was one of the members of that body who went up.

Q. How many of you were there in that body—which went up—about?

A. The whole body. There would be four of the executive and fourteen of

the advisory. * * * Thurston was not present, and I do not think Wilhelm was there.

Q. Where did you start from?

A. From W. O. Smith's office on Fort Street.

Q. What street did you take going from there?

A. We walked up directly to the Government House on Merchant street. It was suggested that a part should go by way of Queen street, but a majority of us went by way of Merchant street.

Q. What was the idea for dividing the committee?

A. So that we should not attract so much attention and it would be safer, perhaps, to have it divided than going in mass.

Later in the same interview—

Q. What did Mr. Carter say?

A. He gave us to understand we would be protected.

Q. By United States troops?

A. Yes; and when we were not protected by them I wanted to know the reason why.

Q. Do you mean by that that you expected them to march over?

A. I was under the impression that they would.

Why, Mr. Damon—and I take his statements now, and not anything that the royalists have said—Mr. Damon was asked by Mr. Blount about the time of the recognition, and he replied that he had been so excited and that they had all been so excited that they took no note of time. Mr. Blount asked him why. He said it was because the marines did not come. "Were you expecting the marines?" asked Mr. Blount. "Yes," said Mr. Damon, "that was the understanding." "How long did this state of suspense exist?" inquired Mr. Blount. "Fifteen minutes," replied Mr. Damon.

Mr. Speaker, there were those revolutionists, these great Americans that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LACEY] and other gentlemen on his side have talked about; these glorious men about whom and about the American flag the gentleman from Maine [Mr. BOUTELLE] read us a poem to-day—there they were in a terrible state of fright and excitement for fifteen minutes because the marines had not come. [Laughter.]

Mr. POST. This was not a bloody revolution.

Mr. STOCKDALE. No; that is true; there was no bloodshed about that revolution. There were those fifteen men in this awful state of suspense because the United States marines had not come, and now we are told that they have a republican government down there with thirteen people, and the right of habeas corpus suspended, and a military despotism prevailing.

Is it not laughable in the extreme?

Now, Mr. Speaker, this discussion was not started to get at anything fair. It was not started on the Democratic side. It was started on the Republican side for political purposes. It was started on the other side for the special purpose, as subsequent events have shown, of getting an opportunity to hurl epithets at the President of the United States. I will ask the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LACEY] if he is going to let that word stand that he used awhile ago about this resolution?

Mr. LACEY. What word?

Mr. STOCKDALE. The word "cowardly." What appropriate language would he use to describe the conduct of men on that side who have used epithets against the President of the United States that are not decent?

Mr. LACEY. I will modify that word "cowardly," and substitute "tame and timid." Will that do?

Mr. STOCKDALE. I do not care what phraseology you use. I only submit the question for your own self-respect. There has never been such language used in regard to the President of the United States on this side of the Chamber as has been used here within the past three or four days by gentlemen on the other side.

If some of them were present I would call their attention to the language they have used about him, disreputable epithets, such as they would not dare to employ to a member on this floor in his presence, or to any gentleman in his presence. However much he may be mistaken in any policy, no man will say that he is not great intellectually, and no man will say that he is not honest. Then upon whom does the reflection fall when such contemptible epithets are applied to a man like that? Do they not react to the discredit of their authors?

Now, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Stevens has been pretty well discussed here. I have asked other gentlemen before; I have asked the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LACEY] to-night, who is a lawyer, whether he believes that a minister of the United States has any legal authority, or any authority, to hoist the United States flag over a foreign soil and declare a protectorate over its government. No lawyer will risk his reputation by answering that he has. No lawyer will risk his reputation by saying that the President has any such authority. Therefore the conclusion is inevitable that the flag of the United States was hoisted in Hawaii over a foreign soil and a protectorate declared over a foreign government without authority and illegally, and therefore the flag of the United States was in that act disgraced. It was hoisted there as an emblem of oppression to cover an illegal and vandal act.

Whatever may be said here about its authority and its dignity

as an emblem of greatness and of glory, it never should have been used for any such purpose. Allusions have been made to the position of some of us thirty years ago. I fought four years, not against that flag, but to withdraw certain territory from under its control, because I believed that the spirit of the Constitution had been perverted with reference to that part of the country, but that was more than a quarter of a century ago, and I say now that whenever it is in peril I am ready to fight four years more in its defense [applause], and if that time ever comes, you will find every State of the South as far to the front in the battle line as any other part of the country. But that does not mean that if the flag is misused the people must rally to place it or to keep it where it never ought to have been. In the interest of its own dignity and its own glory that flag ought to be removed from any place where it has been reared to its disgrace, and that is what Mr. Cleveland ordered to be done.

Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky. Does my friend from Mississippi [Mr. STOCKDALE] desire any more time?

Mr. STOCKDALE. As I am the last man on the list for this evening, I shall not encroach upon the time of anybody else if I continue for about ten minutes.

Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky. The gentleman can not occupy ten minutes, as we must adjourn under the order of the House in seven minutes.

Mr. STOCKDALE. Very well.

Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Mississippi be allowed seven minutes more time.

There was no objection.

Mr. STOCKDALE. Mr. Speaker, that the Government of Hawaii was a constitutional, a legally constituted government, is in proof from the fact that we have been sending ministers accredited to that Government for fifty years. That it was overturned by a minister accredited to it can not be denied. That that act was illegal and revolutionary follows.

It follows, then, that the Republican party (since partyism has been brought into this matter) was perfectly willing to take that territory by an illegal revolutionary act, involving the President and the Government of the United States in the unlawful transaction. Now, I will not denounce Mr. Harrison or use any epithets in regard to him, for he has been President of the United States, although I have but little respect for him since he tried to destroy a part of his own country, over which he presided. Much less would I use language of that character of a gentleman while occupying that office.

But my views do not accord with the whole language of this resolution; and for that one purpose I wanted to say a few words to-night. If by any implication my vote for this resolution could be fairly construed into approving the conduct of Minister Wilis after the Queen had informed him that she intended to behead the people who had engaged in this revolution, I would vote against the resolution; for I do not think his conduct was defensible at all, and the President has not indorsed it. If gentlemen on the other side would be as honest, they would say that the conduct of Minister Stevens was indefensible from the beginning. This was his revolution—not the people's. It is idle to talk about this revolution being theirs. It was the strong act of the American Government, misused by its minister, that took possession *vi et armis* of those islands, destroyed their Government and set up another.

The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LACEY] says that Americans own the property there, and therefore those islands must belong to America. What a declaration for a lawyer! Those citizens acquired that property under the laws of the Government of Hawaii, and hold it only by those laws. Is it true that when foreigners—British subjects for instance—come here and acquire property under our Government, that therefore our Government belongs to England? To what straits you are driven in order to support an illegal act. When lawyers talk that way, is it not almost as remarkable as this revolution?

I am not prepared to concur in the latter part of this resolution. I can readily and earnestly say that I am opposed to any interference with foreign governments, no matter what may be the nature of the government undertaken to be set up. Interference under such circumstances is not American; it is not republican. I am ready to say that we are opposed to the annexation of the Hawaiian Islands. I am not ready to say that we are unalterably opposed to establishing it as a doctrine of this Government that we shall never declare a protectorate over those islands.

Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky. The resolution does not say that.

Mr. STOCKDALE. Well, it says about that.

Reading from the resolution:

It is further the sense of this House that the annexation of the Hawaiian

Islands to our country or the assumption of a protectorate over them by our Government is uncalled for and inexpedient.

I would much prefer that this language had been omitted, Mr. Speaker, and I decline to subscribe to it. Suppose that in the future—it is not impossible—the Government of those islands should make to the Government of the United States this proposition: "Here is an opportunity for you to declare a protectorate at our request, over these islands. If you do not do this, England will, and we shall be transferred to the control of that country." What should we do under those circumstances?

For one I would vote to accept such a proposition. If I had a few moments more I would like to explain my reasons on this question in connection with the Isthmus canal. The whole southern half of this country is very much interested in this matter. Those islands will form an important station on the line of commerce from the west, through the Nicaragua Canal.

I am not interested in the character of that woman. That ought not to have been introduced into this discussion. I say we belittle ourselves when we discuss her private character. I was astonished at the gentleman from Iowa objecting to this Queen because she was colored. Why, sir, such a consideration is against the Constitution of the United States; for is it not declared that no distinctions shall be made on account of color or previous condition of servitude? [Laughter.] I am favor of a white man's government; that is true; and I will stand by it, and am glad that the Republicans show signs of coming to that position.

Mr. LACEY. I am surprised at a Mississippian taking issue with me on this question.

Mr. STOCKDALE. I am not surprised that a Mississippian should take the position I do; otherwise I would be surprised at myself. But I will say that if that woman is as bad as she has been described on the other side of this Hall, she is virtue itself beside the woman upon whose testimony Mr. Tilden lost his seat as President of the United States. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER *pro tempore* (Mr. BROOKSHIRE). The hour of half-past 10 o'clock has now arrived.

Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky. I move that the House adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and accordingly the House adjourned until to-morrow morning at 11 o'clock.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

By Mr. HERMANN, from the Committee on War Claims, the bill (H. R. 897) for the relief of Charles H. Pierce. (Report No. 358.)

Also, the bill (H. R. 1866) for the relief of Richard W. Johnson. (Report No. 359.)

PUBLIC BILLS, MEMORIALS, AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and a memorial of the following titles were introduced, and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. WALKER: A bill (H. R. 5593) to amend an act entitled "An act in amendment of the various acts relative to immigration and the importation of aliens under contract or agreement to perform labor," approved March 3, 1891—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. DOOLITTLE: A bill (H. R. 5594) to provide salaries for the clerks of the United States circuit and district courts in the district of Washington—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WARNER: A bill (H. R. 5595) to provide for a safe and elastic bank-note currency—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HEARD (by request): A bill (H. R. 5596) to regulate the sale of intoxicating liquors in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. JOHNSON of North Dakota: A bill (H. R. 5597) to provide for the destruction and extermination of the noxious plant or weed known as Russian thistle or Russian cactus (technically, *Salsola kali tragus*)—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TERRY: A bill (H. R. 5599) to authorize sale of lot 8, block 93, city of Hot Springs, by school directors thereof, and use of proceeds for school purposes—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5600) to place surgical instruments, cotton bagging, and fence wire upon the free list—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FLYNN: A bill (H. R. 5601) to authorize the construction of a wagon and foot bridge across the South, or Main Canadian River at or near the town of Noble, in Oklahoma Territory—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5602) to provide for writs of error in criminal cases to the supreme court of Oklahoma, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGUIRE: A bill (H. R. 5603) to repeal an act entitled "An act to amend the laws relative to shipping commissioners," approved August 19, 1890—to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MCGANN: A resolution to investigate and report whether or not the Hon. J. G. Jenkins, judge of the United States circuit court for the seventh circuit, has not abused the powers and process of said court, or oppressively exercised the same to oppress the employes of the Northern Pacific Railroad Company—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee: A resolution to amend Rule XIV—to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MORSE: A resolution of the Massachusetts Legislature, protesting against the passage of certain schedules in the Wilson tariff bill as destructive and fatal to industries of Massachusetts—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills of the following titles were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. BRANCH: A bill (H. R. 5604) to provide for the examination and survey of that branch of the Pasquotank River known as the Turners Cut—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. BROOKSHIRE: A bill (H. R. 5605) granting a pension to John H. Linn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CANNON of Illinois (by request): A bill (H. R. 5606) for the relief of the officers and crews of the United States gunboats Kineo and Chocoma—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. DE ARMOND (by request): A bill (H. R. 5607) for the relief of the legal representatives of James M. Lindsay, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. DOOLITTLE: A bill (H. R. 5608) for the relief of Martin Johnson—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5609) for the relief of C. W. Kennard—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5610) for the relief of John W. Wilder—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5611) for the relief of C. P. Rollins—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HEARD: A bill (H. R. 5612) to pay to Joseph L. Walls the amount found due him by the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. PENDLETON of Texas: A bill (H. R. 5613) for the relief of Mary E. Wright and J. M. Wright—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. PRICE: A bill (H. R. 5614) for the relief of J. C. Mathiers, Ascension Parish, La.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. RAWLINS: A bill (H. R. 5615) fixing the limit of indebtedness which may be incurred by Ogden City—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHAW: A bill (H. R. 5616) granting a pension to Mary Tuttle—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5617) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Francis Melvin—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5618) granting an increase of pension to William Taylor—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STONE of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 5619) for the relief of the legal representatives of Jonah Hood, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. TERRY (by request): A bill (H. R. 5620) to correct the record and muster of Henry N. Posey, Company A, Fourth Arkansas Volunteer Infantry, and to discharge him from Company I, Second Arkansas Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WHEELER of Alabama (by request): A bill (H. R. 5621) to increase the pension of Ann Catherine Hull—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WHITING: A bill (H. R. 5622) for the relief of E. A. Lutwyche—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

By Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania: Petition of citizens of Phil-

adelphia, in favor of House bill 4897—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. BARWIG: Petition of Fort Atkinson, Wis., asking for the passage of House bill 4897, to admit to the mails as second-class matter periodical publications issued by or under the auspices of benevolent and fraternal societies, orders, and institutions of learning, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of citizens of Stone Bank, Wis., asking for the passage of House bill 4897 to admit to the mails as second-class matter periodical publications issued by or under the auspices of the benevolent and fraternal societies and orders and institutions of learning, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. BRODERICK: Resolution of A. O. U. W. at Sabetha, Kans., in the interest of the fraternal society and college journals—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of A. A. Cook and 75 others, of Sabetha, Kans., in the interest of fraternal society and college journals—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. BURROWS: Petition of citizens of Kalamazoo, Mich., asking that the fraternal society and college journals be admitted to the mails as second-class matter—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. CANNON of California: Petition of the State of California for the establishment of a Government telegraph and telephone service—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CARUTH: Resolutions of Carbuilders' Union, No. 729, of Louisville, Ky., in support of bill for the establishment of Government telegraph lines, H. R. 4487—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Antiquity Lodge, No. 30, Ancient Order United Workmen, of Louisville, Ky., in favor of H. R. 4897, in behalf of the fraternal society and college journals—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, papers to accompany House bill 5412, granting an increase of pension to A. Loomis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COMPTON: Petition for an appropriation to improve the channel of Piscataway Creek, Maryland—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. CURTIS of Kansas: Resolution of Oakland Council, No. 496, and petition of the citizens of Oakland, Kans., in the interests of the fraternal society and college journals—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. DALZELL: Resolution of the Philadelphia Typographical Union, in favor of Government telegraph lines—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, resolution of National Paint, Oil, and Varnish Association, in favor of House bill 2012, known as the procedure act—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DAVIS: Petition of residents of Minneapolis, Kans., for the free coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

Also, petitions of citizens of Minneapolis, Hope, and Munden, all of Kansas, in favor of the admission of fraternal and college journals into the mails as second-class matter—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of Homer M. Canan and 25 others, citizens of Paxton, Ind., in favor of House bill 4897—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of J. Clingman and 32 others, of Dakota, Ill., to admit as second-class mail matter fraternal society and college journals—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. FITHIAN: Petitions of citizens of Greenup and Dundas, Ill., for the admission of fraternal society and college journals to the mails as second-class matter—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. FLETCHER: Resolutions of Itasca Council, No. 1206, of Royal Arcanum, of Minneapolis, Minn., in the interest of the fraternal society and college journals—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, resolutions of the Trade and Labor Assembly, of Minneapolis, Minn., protesting against the issue of interest-bearing Treasury notes—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GEARY: Petition of Eureka, county of Humboldt, Cal., for the establishment of a Governmental telephone and telegraph service in the United States—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HERMANN: Memorial from the North Pacific Sheep-Breeders and Woolgrowers' Association, for protection to wool—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HILBORN: Petition from Oakland, Cal., for the passage of House bill 4478, establishing a Government telegraph

and telephone service—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois: Petition of citizens of Illinois for the removal of the duty on books printed in the English language—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, three petitions of the citizens of Illinois to admit fraternal society and college journals to the mails as second-class mail matter—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. HUDSON: Petition from citizens of Osage Mission, Kans., asking for the admission to the mails as second-class matter papers of benevolent and literary organizations—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petitions from citizens of Howard, Kans., in favor of the Manderson-Hainer bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. IKIRT: Petition of Carpenters and Joiners' Brotherhood of Canton, Ohio, asking the enactment of the law of domicile, and the restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. REILLY: Resolution of Philadelphia Typographical Union in favor of House bill 4478—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RITCHIE: Petition of L. Franc & Co., and other merchants of Toledo, Ohio, protesting against extension of bonded period on distilled spirits—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of A. Wehrle & Son, and 150 other citizens of Ohio, protesting against clause 242 of Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Toledo (Ohio) Council, No. 21, Royal Arcanum, in the interest of fraternal society and college journals—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. LINTON: Petition in the interest of the fraternal society and college journals—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. LOCKWOOD: Petition of Gen. Stanley Garrison, No. 36, of Buffalo, N. Y., in favor of the passage of the act to amend the act of February 14, 1865, placing enlisted men upon the retired list—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of H. F. Boshu and 100 others of Buffalo, in the interest of fraternal society and college journals, relating to postage—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of citizens of Buffalo, N. Y., in favor of the Manderson-Hainer bill, relating to postage of fraternal society and college journals—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. LUCAS: Petition to Congress in the interest of fraternal society and college journals—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota: Petition of A. H. Nichols and other citizens, of Tracey, Minn., favoring the Manderson-Hainer bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. MEIKLEJOHN: Exhibits to remove the charge of desertion from the record of George K. Bullock—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MILLIKEN: Remonstrances of John G. Rowe and others, of Augusta, Me., of James L. Treadwell, of Jere H. Jordan, and of Daniel McPhee and others, against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, remonstrance of L. Palmer and G. B. Foster and others, of Ellsworth, Me., against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PAYNE: Petition of 64 residents of the Twenty-eighth New York district, for passage of proposed Manderson-Hainer bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of 82 residents of Cayuga County, N. Y., for the establishment of a Government telegraph and telephone system—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Pennsylvania: Resolutions passed by the caucus meeting of Republicans of Lower Chester Township, Delaware County, Pa., protesting against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of citizens of Pennsylvania, praying for the passage of the Manderson-Hainer bill, H. R. 4897—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, preamble and resolutions of the State Horticultural Society of Pennsylvania, praying for the continuance of the appropriations for an experimental station—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SHAW: Petition of William Bonell and 34 others, residents of Eau Claire, Wis., in favor of the passage of House bill 4897—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. SIMPSON: Petition of G. W. Riley and 105 others of Stafford County, Kans., against the issuing of United States bonds—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, two petitions in favor of fraternal society and college journals—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of H. L. Wolf and 144 others in the interest of fraternal society and college journals—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. UPDEGRAFF: Petition of Cottonwood Camp, No. 238, of Modern Woodmen of America, of Lime Spring, Iowa, for a law giving to the fraternal beneficiary press the same postage classification as that enjoyed by other newspapers and periodicals—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of C. N. Flagler and 80 others, of Lime Spring, Iowa, for Manderson-Hainer bill, to admit as second-class mail matter the periodical publications of benevolent and fraternal societies—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. WELLS: Resolutions from Council of Royal Arcanum, of Fond du Lac, Wis., asking the passage of the Manderson-Hainer bill, 4897—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of Emile Leitgin and 28 others, asking the passage of House bill 4897—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. WHITING: Petition of George O. Hough and 28 other citizens of Lapeer County, Mich., in the interest of the fraternal society and college journals—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. WRIGHT of Pennsylvania: Memorial of Philadelphia Typographical Union, in favor of Government ownership of telegraph lines—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE.

TUESDAY, February 6, 1894.

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

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. T. O. TOWLES, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 758) extending the time allowed the Umatilla Irrigation Company for the construction of its ditch across the Umatilla Indian Reservation, in the State of Oregon.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE PAN-AMERICAN MEDICAL CONGRESS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of State, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 4th ultimo, manuscript copies of the proceedings of the Pan-American Medical Congress held in Washington City in September, 1893, under authority of law; which was ordered to be printed, and, with the accompanying document, referred to the Committee on Printing.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. TURPIE presented a petition of Maumee Lodge, No. 50, Ancient Order of United Workmen, of Fort Wayne, Ind., in the interest of fraternal society and college journals, praying for the passage of the Manderson-Hainer bill, proposing to amend the postal laws; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented the petition of Oliver N. Fretageot, of Mount Vernon, Ind., praying that in adjusting an income tax to aid tariff reduction a special provision be made requiring railroads, express companies, and telegraph companies to pay a percentage of their gross receipts; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of the United States Brewers' Association, remonstrating against the proposed increase in the internal-revenue tax on fermented liquors; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of the Custom Foremen Tailors' Association, of Indianapolis, Ind., remonstrating against the passage of schedule 690 of the Wilson tariff bill, which proposes to allow the admission free of duty of \$500 worth of foreign-made garments in the possession of an American citizen returning from a foreign country; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented the memorial of W. R. Stokes, of Lebanon, Ind., remonstrating against the proposed reduction of the duty on lead ore, and praying for the adoption of a tariff measure which will place one uniform ad valorem duty upon all imports; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. QUAY presented petitions of R. M. Ermentrout and 38 other citizens of Reading; of lodge No. 239, Ancient Order or United Workmen of Kennard; of Mount Penn Council No. 495,