

By Mr. HOOKER: Five petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of East Randolph, Franklinville, and Silver Creek, N. Y., praying for the prohibition of the sale of beer at Bedloes Island and Fort Wadsworth, on Staten Island—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

Also, petition of 37 voters of Little Genesee, Allegany County, N. Y., against Sunday-observance bill (H. R. 167)—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of the Chautauqua County Pomona Grange, against the manufacture and sale of filled cheese—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KULP: Petition in support of joint resolution (H. Res. 90), to revive the grade of Lieutenant-General in the United States Army—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of George P. Emerick and others, of Shamokin, Pa., praying for the passage of an act to secure a better grade of immigration, known as the Stone bill—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. LAYTON: Petition of S. B. Ellsworth, of Logansville, Ohio, favoring an amendment to section 4 of the act of March 2, 1889—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of United States Maimed Soldiers' League of Philadelphia, Pa., favoring House bill No. 851, for increase of pensions of certain maimed soldiers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of E. E. Perry, secretary of the Winter Wheat Millers' League, Indianapolis, Ind., asking for the passage of House bill No. 3212—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LEONARD: Petition of voters of Shinglehouse, Potter County, Pa., against Sunday-observance bill (H. R. 167)—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. LINTON: Resolution of the board of directors of the Saginaw Board of Trade, asking that certain Michigan docks be perfected—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. LIVINGSTON: Papers to accompany House bill for the relief of Cephas A. Christian, of Newton County, Ga.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky: Petition of the Equal Rights Association of Kentucky, in favor of woman suffrage—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McRAE: Resolution of the Western waterways convention, recommending the permanent improvement of the Ouachita River—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. MERCER: Petition of voters of North Loup, Valley County, Nebr., against Sunday-observance bill (H. R. 167)—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MINOR of Wisconsin: Petition of 365 resident electors of Waupaca, Portage, and Wood counties, Wis., asking for the improvement of Manitowoc Harbor, Wisconsin—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. NEILL: Petition of citizens of Lonoke County, Ark., for passage of a bill for the relief of the publishing house of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, Nashville, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. PAYNE: Petition of B. F. Rogers, E. W. Childs, and 22 others, against the Sunday-observance bill (H. R. 167)—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. PERKINS: Petition of members of Mathew Gray Post, No. 93, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Iowa, in behalf of service-pension legislation—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. POOLE: Petition of the Hansman Pipe Factory and citizens of Syracuse, N. Y., relating to tariff on clay smoking pipes—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of voters of Brookfield, N. Y., against Sunday-observance bill (H. R. 167)—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. QUIGG: Petition of American Authors' Guild, asking that authors' manuscripts be allowed to pass through the mails as merchandise—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of the Atlantic Coast Seamen's Union, praying that laws heretofore passed for the amelioration of the condition of American seamen be not repealed—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ROYSE: Petition of John C. Miles, A. B. Personett, and 26 other veterans of the late war, asking that a pension of \$8 a month be granted to those who served not less than ninety days in the Army or Navy and were honorably discharged—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RUSSELL of Connecticut: Resolutions of New London (Conn.) Board of Trade, favoring a harbor of refuge at Block Island, Rhode Island—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. SHANNON: Petition and papers of Edith A. A. Merriam, relating to letters patent No. 234417—to the Committee on Patents.

Also, petition of voters of the town of Verona, Oneida County, N. Y., against Sunday-observance bill (H. R. 167)—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. STAHL: Petition of citizens of New Cumberland, Pa., in favor of pension for Jacob Witmer, of Company E, Eighty-seventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteers, to accompany House bill No. 3319—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of Integrity Council, No. 197, Order United American Mechanics, of Mechanicsburg, Pa., praying for the passage of House bill No. 884, in relation to the improper use of the American flag—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEELE: Petition of A. J. Stakebrake, W. S. Diggs, and 60 others, to increase the pension of William Grose, colonel Thirty-sixth Indiana Infantry, brigadier and brevet major general of volunteers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STEWART of Wisconsin: Three petitions, respectively, of P. Chandler and 74 others, of Fifield; D. F. Tyler and 91 others, of Glidden; E. B. Gordon and 76 others, of Morse and other localities in the State of Wisconsin, memorializing Congress to further improve the harbor at Manitowoc, Wis.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. SORG: Petition of J. A. Patterson, C. T. Chambers, and 96 others, of Middletown, Ohio, praying for the passage of the Stone bill restricting immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, resolutions of the Toledo Produce Exchange, favoring the issue of long-term bonds in sums of \$50 and less at a rate of interest not to exceed 3 per cent, to be offered to the people of this country and no other—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SPENCER: Papers to accompany House bill for the relief of Leon Strauss, of Caddo Parish, La.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. TOWNE: Petition of G. M. Holland, M. L. Toole, and 68 other citizens of Minnesota, for the enactment of House bill No. 3821—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. WASHINGTON: Papers to accompany House bill for the relief of James J. Wylie, of Humphreys County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of Solomon De Brow, of Davidson County, Tenn., asking reference of his claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WHEELER: Papers to accompany House bills for the relief of the following-named parties of Madison County, Ala.: Senia McClelland, Edward Moore, William Jones, and Corland M. Miller—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of Mary Abernathy, of Lawrence County, Ala., praying that the war claim of R. B. Abernathy, deceased, late of Giles County, Tenn., be referred to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WOOD: Petition of John S. Cochennour, for increase of pension, to accompany House bill No. 3189—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, memorial and resolutions of public meeting of citizens of the city of Olney, Ill., praying action by the United States in regard to Armenian outrages—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

## SENATE.

FRIDAY, January 24, 1896.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.  
The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a communication from the Auditor for the State and other Departments, of the 23d instant, submitting additional items of deficiencies in appropriations for expenses of United States courts, and recommending that the same be included in the urgent deficiency appropriation bill; which, with the accompanying statement, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, in response to a resolution of December 30, 1895, the correspondence and other papers in his possession relating to the First National Bank of Orlando, Fla., and the receiver last appointed, and the transactions connected with the bank under his administration, together with a report of the Comptroller of the Currency; which, on motion of Mr. CALL, was referred to the Select Committee on National Banks, and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 13th instant, calling for information as to what amount is necessary to be appropriated for payment of the cost of sites for the purpose of erecting fortifications and coast defenses, a report of W. P. Craig-

hill, brigadier-general, Chief of Engineers, United States Army, on the subject; which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Coast Defenses, and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the Attorney-General, in response to a resolution of December 3, 1895, calling for the number of suits against the United States filed in the Court of Claims and not adjudicated at the commencement of the present term thereof, with certain specified details, stating that the suits against the Government in that court are separated into two distinct classes, the first class including all except suits for Indian depredations, and the second including those for Indian depredations; which was referred to the Committee on Indian Depredations, and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a communication from the Auditor for the War Department, submitting an estimate of deficiency in the appropriation for pay of two and three year volunteers' certified claims for the current fiscal year, amounting to \$75,000, and recommending that the same be included in the urgent deficiency appropriation bill; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

#### MARYLAND AND WASHINGTON RAILWAY.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the secretary of the Baltimore and Catonsville Construction Company, transmitting, in compliance with law, the first annual statement of the receipts and disbursements of the Maryland and Washington Railway Company of the District of Columbia; which, with the accompanying statement, was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and ordered to be printed.

#### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. ALLEN. I present the petitions of D. C. Zink, of Grand Island, Nebr.; of George C. McKay, of North Platte, Nebr., and of John H. Blacklock, of Baltimore, Md., in favor of the passage of the bill heretofore introduced by me authorizing the creditors of insolvent national banks to elect a permanent receiver. I move that the petitions be referred to the Select Committee on National Banks.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. VEST presented resolutions adopted by the Presbyterian Ministers' Association of St. Louis, Mo., indorsing the resolution upon the Armenian question lately offered by Senator Hoar; which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. CULLOM. I present a series of resolutions adopted by the First Congregational Church of Manasquan, N. J., relating to the Armenian question and calling upon Congress to demand of the Turkish Government that it protect our own citizens dwelling or passing through its Empire. As the subject has been reported upon, I ask that the petition lie on the table.

Mr. HILL. Will the Senator from Illinois pardon an interruption? What has become of the resolutions which were reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations relating to the Armenian question?

Mr. CULLOM. The resolutions are upon the table, and I have been waiting for two days since I reported them to call them up. As the Senator may remember, I asked to have them taken up for consideration at once, but it was suggested that they ought to be printed before being considered, and hence they went over. I desired to call them up yesterday.

Mr. PLATT. I understood they were to be taken up the next day after they were laid over.

Mr. CULLOM. They were to have been taken up yesterday, but several Senators were very anxious to address the Senate, and I gave way and gave notice that I would call them up this morning. I hope that immediately after the morning business, as I believe their consideration will take very little time, I may be given the floor for the purpose of calling up those resolutions.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The petition presented by the Senator from Illinois will lie on the table.

Mr. QUAY presented a petition of the Peace Society of Pennsylvania, praying for the enactment of legislation looking to the restoration of peace in Cuba through arbitration; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of the Peace Society of Pennsylvania, praying for the enactment of legislation creating a peace fund to consist of 1 per cent of all sums appropriated for war purposes; such fund to be drawn upon by the President for the purpose of settling difficulties by mediation, arbitration, and conciliation; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of the Board of Trade of Philadelphia, Pa., praying for the speedy passage of the pending tariff bill; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of the Maritime Exchange of Philadelphia, Pa., praying that appropriations be made for the completion of the general scheme of coast defenses; which was referred to the Committee on Coast Defenses.

He also presented a petition of the Maritime Exchange of Philadelphia, Pa., praying for the passage of Senate bill No. 179, to remove discriminations against American sailing vessels engaged in the coasting trade; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the Maritime Exchange of Philadelphia, Pa., praying for the passage of Senate bill No. 180, licensing masters and chief mates of sail vessels over 700 tons; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a memorial of the Maritime Exchange of Philadelphia, Pa., remonstrating against the passage of House bills Nos. 1227 to 1233, inclusive, proposing amendments to the navigation laws; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a petition in the form of resolutions adopted at the annual meeting of National Council, Order of United American Mechanics, held in Philadelphia, Pa., praying for the passage of House bill No. 884, making it unlawful for any person to print, stamp, or impress any words, figures, or designs upon the flag of the United States, or any representation thereof; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented petitions of H. H. Minnick and 29 other citizens of Rock, of H. C. McKinley and 73 other citizens of Meyersdale, of Frank Patterson and 22 other citizens of Fayette County, of H. C. Lewis and 94 other citizens of Cokeville, and of J. A. Warden and 270 other citizens of Allegheny County, all in the State of Pennsylvania, praying for the passage of the so-called Stone immigration bill; which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. PEPPER. I present a petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of the District of Columbia, praying for legislation in relation to Armenian affairs. The petitioners state that they represent a membership and following of not fewer than 1,000 people who believe that the protection of the home is the supreme duty of statesmen, and they earnestly and solemnly beseech Congress to take such action as shall put our home-loving Republic on record as having used its moral and material influence by the expression of its opposition to the Armenian outrages. I move that the petition lie on the table.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. LODGE presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Warren, Mass., remonstrating against the atrocities in Armenia; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. WILSON presented a petition of sundry citizens of the State of Washington, praying that an appropriation be made for the improvement of the Skagit River in that State; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. TURPIE presented a petition of the Maritime Exchange of Philadelphia, Pa., praying that appropriations be made for the completion of the general scheme of coast defenses; which was referred to the Committee on Coast Defenses.

He also presented a petition of the Maritime Exchange of Philadelphia, Pa., praying for the passage of Senate bill No. 179 to remove discriminations against American sailing vessels engaged in the coasting trade; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a memorial of the Maritime Exchange of Philadelphia, Pa., remonstrating against the passage of House bills 1227 to 1233, inclusive, proposing amendments to the navigation laws; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the Maritime Exchange of Philadelphia, Pa., praying for the passage of Senate bill No. 180, licensing masters and chief mates of sail vessels of over 700 tons; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. LINDSAY presented petitions of sundry citizens of Newport, Ky., praying for the passage of the so-called Stone immigration bill; which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. McMILLAN presented a petition of the Federation of Labor of the District of Columbia, praying for the passage of Senate bill No. 1247, creating a public circulating library for the District of Columbia; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. THURSTON presented a petition of sundry citizens of Falls City, Nebr., ex-soldiers and ex-sailors of the Union Army and Navy during the war of the rebellion, praying for the enactment of legislation granting a pension of \$8 a month to every man who served not less than ninety days in the Army or Navy and was honorably discharged, and also that a pension of not less than \$12 a month be granted to the widows of these soldiers or sailors; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. HOAR presented a petition of the managing board of the Boston Evangelical Alliance, of Boston, Mass., praying for the enactment of legislation granting protection to the American missions in Turkey, and extending sympathy to the suffering Armenians; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. HAWLEY presented a petition of the Board of Trade of New London, Conn., praying Congress to take such action as is necessary to make the Great Salt Pond in Block Island a permanent harbor of refuge; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. FRYE presented a petition of the Board of Trade of Portland, Me., praying for the further improvement of Portland Harbor; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

SENATOR FROM DELAWARE.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. I present the affidavit of William Michael Byrne, of Wilmington, Del., relative to the case of Henry A. Du Pont, claiming to have been elected a Senator from that State. I move that the affidavit be printed as a document, and referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. In this connection I ask for the adoption of the order I send to the desk.

The order was agreed to, as follows:

*Ordered*, That the Committee on Privileges and Elections be authorized to sit during the sessions of the Senate, for the purpose of considering the claim of Henry A. Du Pont to a seat in the Senate.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. BERRY. On the 23d instant the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McBRIDE], on behalf of a majority of the Committee on Public Lands, reported with amendments the bill (S. 36) to amend an act entitled "An act for the relief of certain settlers on the public lands, and to provide for the payment of certain fees, purchase money, and commissions paid on void entries of public lands." I desire, on behalf of the Senator from Florida [Mr. PASCO], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. ALLEN], and myself, to file the views of the minority, and I ask that they be printed.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The views of the minority will be received and printed.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon, from the Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (S. 753) for the relief of Margaret Kennedy, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. GIBSON, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 641) to promote Commodore Louis C. Sartori, now on the retired list of the Navy, to be a rear-admiral on said list, in accordance with his original position on the Navy Register, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 642) for the relief of Commodore Oscar C. Badger, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 716) to correct the naval history of John C. Dull, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. COCKRELL, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 982) to grant medals to survivors and heirs of volunteers of the Port Hudson (La.) forlorn-hope storming column, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

CRIPPLE CREEK DISTRICT, COLORADO.

Mr. HALE. I am directed by the Committee on Printing, to whom was referred the amendment of the House of Representatives to the concurrent resolution of the Senate relating to printing the paper entitled "Geology and mining industries of the Cripple Creek district, Colorado," to report back the amendment of the House of Representatives and move that it be concurred in.

The amendment of the House of Representatives was read and concurred in, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, January 20, 1896.

*Resolved*, That the foregoing concurrent resolution of the Senate to print a paper entitled "Geology and mining industries of the Cripple Creek district, Colorado," do pass with the following amendment:

Line 2, strike out all after "That," down to and including line 16, and insert: "There be printed, at the earliest day practicable, 5,000 copies, in separate form, with paper covers, of the paper entitled 'Geology and mining industries of the Cripple Creek district, Colorado,' constituting pages 1 to 209 of part 2 of the Sixteenth Annual Report of the United States Geological Survey, with the accompanying illustrations, of which 1,500 copies shall be for the use of the Senate, 3,000 copies for the use of the House of Representatives, and 500 copies for distribution by the Geological Survey."

EULOGIES ON DECEASED REPRESENTATIVES.

Mr. HALE, from the Committee on Printing, to whom was referred the following concurrent resolution of the House of Representatives, reported it without amendment; and it was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring)*, That the eulogies delivered in Congress upon the Hon. Charles O'Neill, late a Representative from the State of Pennsylvania; upon the Hon. Marcus C. Lisle, late a Representative from the State of Kentucky; and upon the Hon. George W. Houk, late a Representative from the State of Ohio, be printed as required by law.

DISTRIBUTION OF OFFICIAL RECORDS.

Mr. HALE. I am directed by the Committee on Printing, to whom was referred the joint resolution (H. Res. 88) authorizing the distribution of copies of the Official Records of the Union and Confederate Navies in Congressional districts where distribution has not been made, to report it without amendment. I ask for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It directs the Secretary of the

Navy to send the undistributed copies of the Official Records of the War of the Rebellion, both of the Union and of the Confederate navies, to such libraries, organizations, and individuals as may be designated before the meeting of the next Congress by the Representatives in the Fifty-fourth Congress of the districts whose Representatives in the Fifty-third Congress failed to designate the distributees of their quota of the Official Records or any part thereof, as authorized by the act of Congress approved July 31, 1894, and the joint resolution approved March 2, 1895, to the extent and in the manner and form provided in that act.

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

REPUBLICAN FORM OF GOVERNMENT IN ALABAMA.

Mr. JONES of Nevada, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to whom was referred the resolution submitted by Mr. ALLEN on the 7th instant providing for a select committee to make inquiry whether there is, and for the last two years and a half has been, a republican form of government in the State of Alabama, reported it back with the recommendation that it be referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections; which was agreed to.

PUBLIC BUILDING AT BLOOMINGTON, ILL.

Mr. QUAY. I desire to call the attention of the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. CULLOM] to the bill I am about to report. I am directed by the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to whom was referred the joint resolution (H. Res. 89) concerning the erection and completion (except heating apparatus) of the United States post-office building at Bloomington, Ill., to report it favorably, without amendment.

Mr. CULLOM. I ask the Senate to put the joint resolution upon its passage.

Mr. ALLEN. I desire to object to the present consideration of the joint resolution.

Mr. CULLOM. The joint resolution comes from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. It has been considered by that committee. It has been passed by the other House. The men employed on that work are laid off and are now simply waiting until this little change in the law shall be made. It does not incur a single cent of additional expense, and delay simply results in idleness on the part of the workmen who have been engaged upon that building for the last year or more. I hope the Senator from Nebraska will not object to its present consideration.

Mr. ALLEN. The statement the Senator from Illinois makes is true with reference to every public building. There seems to have been a little ring in the Senate on the question of obtaining public buildings. For instance, Illinois now has under construction in the city of Chicago a building for which an appropriation of about \$5,000,000 has been made.

Mr. CULLOM. Only \$4,000,000.

Mr. ALLEN. It will cost \$8,000,000 before it is completed.

Mr. CULLOM. The Senator has no right to make that statement.

Mr. ALLEN. The Senator from Pennsylvania a few days ago got a bill through for the construction of a public building. At the last Congress it was quite a common thing for the Eastern States and the Middle Western States to procure large appropriations for the construction of public buildings. We west of the Missouri River, with the exception of one or two instances, have been unable to get even \$25,000 or \$30,000 appropriated for the construction of public buildings at places where the Federal court is held at least twice a year.

It occurs to me that the proper thing to do is for the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds to take up all such measures that are pending before it and consider them all at the same time, so that every locality in the Union may have an equal opportunity to procure its fair proportion of the public expenditures.

Mr. CULLOM. If this were an original bill providing for the construction of a public building at the city of Bloomington I would not seek to put it upon its immediate passage, but for years the law has been passed providing for the construction of the building and the work has been going on. A point has been reached where it is necessary to change the previous legislation a little so that there may be changes of plans with reference to the construction in order to keep the cost of the building within the amount already appropriated.

Mr. WHITE. Will the Senator from Illinois permit a question?

Mr. CULLOM. Certainly.

Mr. WHITE. Is any appropriation whatever involved in the joint resolution?

Mr. CULLOM. Not one penny.

Mr. WHITE. Then there is nothing to be taken out of the Treasury by it?

Mr. CULLOM. Not a penny is asked to be taken out of the Treasury. A specific clause in the joint resolution provides that the change shall not cost a single additional cent.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator from Nebraska made a very sweeping remark. I think he is in the habit of doing that. He

says that in the last Congress a great many bills were passed for public buildings in the East. I will say to the Senator from Nebraska that not one single bill, as I recollect it, passed the last Congress for a public building in any one of the Eastern States. For my own State a bill had passed the Senate, I think twice, providing for a public building, but I could not even get a report from the committee in the last Congress. I think I am correct in saying that the Senator entirely misstates the fact when he says that numerous public-building bills passed the last Congress for States east of the Mississippi River.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, I desire to return my thanks to the Senator from New Hampshire for his kindly remark, wherein he says that I am in the habit of being a little bit extravagant in my language. I had no idea at the time I made the remark that the Senator from New Hampshire was any considerable portion of the East, nor do I have an opinion of that kind at this time.

Mr. GALLINGER. If the Senator will permit me—

Mr. ALLEN. I was not referring to New England. Therefore I think my remark does not come within the jurisdiction of a Senator from New England.

Mr. CULLOM. Will the Senator from Nebraska allow me?

Mr. ALLEN. I was referring to that portion of this country east of the Mississippi River that has constantly received appropriations amounting to millions of dollars for the construction of public buildings, and has studiously opposed, with here and there a rare and grudging exception, the appropriation of any money for the construction of needed public buildings in the trans-mississippi States. For instance, in my own State there are two points where a Federal court has been established for years, and where it is necessary for the transaction of public business that a public building shall be constructed. We have asked here from time to time for the mere pittance of \$25,000 or \$50,000 for the purchase of ground and for the construction of those buildings. Those propositions have been studiously met with resistance by the committee from which this report comes.

I am not unappreciative of the position of the Senator from Illinois, and yet it occurs to me that if this joint resolution is permitted to pass here without any objection and without due debate when taken up from the Calendar in its regular order we shall find the Senator from Illinois a little bit indifferent as to the result of public buildings that may be asked for points a little farther west than the State of Illinois.

Mr. CULLOM. Will the Senator allow me to make a remark right there?

Mr. ALLEN. Certainly.

Mr. CULLOM. The Senator from Nebraska will never find me opposing any legitimate appropriation that can be shown to be in the public interest, either for Nebraska or any other State in the Union. This is not a new measure, and it does not appropriate any money; it simply proposes to allow the work to go on; it has been suggested by the honored President of the Senate, the Vice-President of the United States, and I appeal to the Senator that he allow the joint resolution to go through so that those men may continue their work.

Mr. ALLEN. It is hard for me to resist the appeal of the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. CULLOM. I know you can not do it very well.

Mr. ALLEN. In view of the fact that the joint resolution does not involve an appropriation, I will withdraw my objection to its consideration; but I give notice here and now that I shall enter my objection to all such bills hereafter.

By unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

Mr. VEST. The Senator from Nebraska is unjust to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. He makes the statement that there has been some discrimination in favor of States east of the Mississippi River. It is true that the enumeration of public buildings and the expenditures for their construction show that the appropriations were unequal in some of the States, and that one State in New England particularly had received largely more in the shape of public buildings than any other State in the Union, population considered; but in later years such discrimination has not existed, and it certainly did not exist during the last Congress. As chairman of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds at that time I can safely appeal to the record. It is very well known to all the members of the committee that we resisted the most passionate appeals for appropriations as to new public buildings, and we made appropriations only to complete buildings already commenced and to prevent the decay and deterioration of the material by reason of a postponement.

I think if the Senator will look into the appropriations he will find that Congress for the last five years has been unusually liberal to the Western States. I call his attention to the fact that at the last session almost the only public-building bill we reported—there were several—but the bill of most importance was one giving to four of the new States a public building each; a sort of omnibus bill.

Mr. ALLEN. If the Senator will permit me to interrupt him

at this point, I will state that those were twenty-five-thousand-dollar public buildings at the capital of three of the important Western States; but outside of the appropriations for those three States there was not an appropriation of any consequence for the construction of public buildings in the transmissouri country.

Mr. VEST. I only know, I will state in reply to the last utterance of the Senator, that that bill was prepared and agreed upon by the Senators representing those new States, and the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds simply acceded to their request.

I wish to make one other remark and I am done with the subject. Any committee that undertakes to perform its duty and does not take into consideration the condition of the Treasury of the United States as to appropriations is absolutely derelict, if not criminal. When the present Secretary of the Treasury took charge of his office, and after the financial difficulties occurred, I had an official interview with him, in which he simply made the suggestion that the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds of the two Houses—it is a joint committee—should not recommend appropriations unless they were absolutely necessary, on account of the financial uncertainties that hung over the country. During my administration of the chairmanship of that committee in this present Administration of Mr. Cleveland, I have endeavored to be as economical as possible in regard to these appropriations because we were involved in financial uncertainty, and I think I did my duty.

If the Senator will reflect a moment he will see that it is impossible, speaking for myself, that I could have discriminated against my own section of the country, if I had any sectional views at all. There is a large public building unfinished in the State of Missouri, in the city where I live, and while I was urged and pressed by citizens for an additional appropriation in order that the money might be expended there during the hard times that were prevailing, I steadily refused to countenance any such appropriation, although I was a citizen and interested in the property of that city and a Senator from that State. I think the Senator is mistaken as to his facts, and he does injustice, without, of course, intending it.

Mr. GALLINGER. As I am exceedingly anxious that the Senator from Illinois shall get his joint resolution through, I will make a single observation in reply to the Senator from Nebraska.

If the Senator from Nebraska will refer to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to-morrow morning—and I assure him that it will not be changed—he will find that in my former remarks I did not allude to New England, but to States east of the Mississippi River. I so distinctly stated, and hence his disagreeable criticism on that point was very unjust.

The Senator from Nebraska says that a great many public-building bills have been passed in the last Congress for States east of the Mississippi River. I wish the Senator would examine the statutes and tell the Senate at his convenience precisely the number of public-building bills that did pass during the last Congress, either east or west of the Mississippi River. I feel confident that no such bill became a law. The only appropriations made in that Congress were to complete buildings the construction of which was already commenced.

That is all I care to say about the matter. We want to deal justly with all parts of the country, and I feel sure that we do that. If I remember correctly, an appropriation was made during the last Congress for a public building in the city of Omaha, in the State of Nebraska. I think I am correct in that, and I wish the Senator from Nebraska would note the fact.

Mr. CULLOM. Now I hope the joint resolution will be put on its passage.

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

The preamble was agreed to.

#### BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. MANTLE introduced a bill (S. 1742) for the relief of Thomas Cushing; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Depredations.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1743) to establish an additional land office in the State of Montana; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. HOAR introduced a bill (S. 1744) for increase of pension to George Hayes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. PRITCHARD introduced a bill (S. 1745) for the relief of Furneyfold Mercer; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. VOORHEES introduced a bill (S. 1746) granting an increase of pension to William H. Pulliam; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1747) for the relief of James L. Williams; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1748) appropriating money to pay the claim of James C. Wheat for expenses incurred as adjutant

of the Forty-ninth Indiana Volunteers, war of the rebellion; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. ALLEN introduced a bill (S. 1749) to provide for an irrigation survey of the Great Plains and semiarid lands of the United States; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1750) 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 the Judiciary.

Mr. QUAY introduced a bill (S. 1751) granting an invalid pension to Levi Moser; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1752) to correct the military record of John Glazier; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1753) to correct the military record of Joseph A. Coble; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1754) to correct the military record of Peter Slusser; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1755) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Susannah P. Swoope; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1756) for the relief of Jacob Johnson; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. HAWLEY (by request) introduced a bill (S. 1757) to amend section 1225 of the Revised Statutes so as to further provide for the detail of officers of the Army and Navy to assist in military instruction in the public schools; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1758) for the relief of Christopher Schmidt; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. TELLER introduced a bill (S. 1759) providing for the purchase and distribution of certain historical publications therein named; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. PLATT (by request) introduced a bill (S. 1760) relating to the incorporation and government of cities and towns in the Indian Territory, to authorize free schools therein, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. GALLINGER introduced a bill (S. 1761) to incorporate the National University; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. PETTIGREW introduced a bill (S. 1762) to promote and encourage experiments in irrigation and in reclaiming arid lands by the use of water from artesian wells; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1763) to provide for the construction and maintenance of two day schools among the Iowa tribe of Indians of Kansas and Nebraska, and the per capita distribution of the trust funds of said Indians; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. PERKINS introduced a bill (S. 1764) to reorganize the customs collection district of Alaska; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas introduced a bill (S. 1765) to refer to the Court of Claims the claims of the confederated Peoria, Piankeshaw, Wea, and Kaskaskia tribes of Indians against the United States; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. BLANCHARD introduced a bill (S. 1766) for the relief of certain employees of the United States mint at New Orleans, La.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. CALL introduced a bill (S. 1767) to provide for subports of entry and delivery; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. BACON (by request) introduced a bill (S. 1768) to amend an act entitled "An act to organize the Hospital Corps of the Army of the United States, to define its duty, and fix its pay," approved March 1, 1887; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also (by request) introduced a bill (S. 1769) giving apothecaries of the United States Navy and naval hospitals the title of naval pharmacists and the rank and pay of warrant officers; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also (by request) introduced a bill (S. 1770) providing for the appointment of pharmacists in the United States Marine-Hospital Service, and fixing their pay and allowances; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. CLARK introduced a bill (S. 1771) granting a pension to Richard King; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

#### MEDAL OF HONOR.

Mr. VILAS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution (S. R. 55) relative to the medal of honor authorized by the acts of July 13, 1863, and March 3, 1863; which was ordered to be printed, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

#### WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

On motion of Mr. FAULKNER, it was

Ordered, That the papers relating to the bill for the relief of Robert Thompson in the Fifty-third Congress be withdrawn from the files of the Senate under the rules of the Senate.

#### PROOF OF LOYALTY IN PENSION CLAIMS.

On motion of Mr. PRITCHARD, it was

Ordered, That the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from the further consideration of the bill (S. 901) amending section 4716 of the Revised Statutes, and that it be referred to the Committee on Pensions.

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. In accordance with the notice given yesterday, I desire, with the consent of the Senate, to call up the joint resolution (S. R. 43) directing the Secretary of Agriculture to carry into effect the provisions of the act making appropriation for the purchase and distribution of valuable seeds and for the printing and distribution of farmers' bulletins.

Mr. MILLS. I understand that the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. HANSBROUGH] wishes to address the Senate this morning. Therefore I ask that the bill (S. 1714) to repeal "An act to authorize the refunding of the national debt," approved July 14, 1870, and "An act to provide for the resumption of specie payments," approved January 14, 1875, introduced yesterday by me, and which had its first reading, may lie over until the next meeting of the Senate. I gave notice that I should ask for its second reading to-day, and that I wish to obtain a vote of the Senate on the passage of the bill.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. I am much obliged to the Senator from Texas.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will lie over, as requested by the Senator from Texas, in the absence of objection.

Mr. CALL. I ask the Senator from North Dakota if he has any objection to allowing the Calendar of resolutions to be called.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair will state that that order has not yet been reached. The present order of business is "concurrent and other resolutions." The morning business has not yet been concluded.

Mr. CALL. If the Senator from North Dakota desires to make a speech, he can do so after the Calendar of resolutions has been called and the morning business is over.

#### PAYMENT OF SUGAR BOUNTY.

Mr. CAFFERY. I ask unanimous consent to change the reference of the message of the President of the United States, received on the 22d instant, in response to the resolution inquiring what action had been taken, if any, in regard to the payment of sugar-bounty claims, and, if no payment had been made, to give the Senate the reasons therefor. I desire to have the reference of the message of the President of the United States changed from the Committee on Finance to the Committee on the Judiciary.

I would state, Mr. President, that I was not in the Chamber when the message was laid before the Senate and the reference was made to the Finance Committee. I suppose it was on the request of some Senator that it was so referred.

I desire to call the attention of the Judiciary Committee to the very grave matters springing out of this message. In the sundry civil appropriation act of March 2, 1895, there was an appropriation of some \$5,238,000 for the payment of a bounty on sugar.

Some time in July, 1895, immediately after the law went into effect, the claim of the Oxnard Beet Sugar Company for some \$11,000 was presented to the Commissioner of Internal Revenue and was by him certified for payment to the Auditor. The Auditor took the claim and certified it to the Comptroller of the Treasury. The Comptroller of the Treasury then took it under advisement, under the authority of the eighth section of the Dockery Act, declined to pay it on the ground of its unconstitutionality, and referred it to the Court of Claims under the powers given in section 1063 of the Revised Statutes.

In response to the inquiry contained in the Senate resolution referred to by me, the President writes thus to the Senate:

To the Senate of the United States:

In response to the resolution adopted by the Senate on December 16, 1895, respecting what action had been taken in regard to the payment of the appropriation for the bounty on sugar, contained in the sundry civil bill approved March 2, 1895, I herewith transmit a communication received from the Secre-

tary of the Treasury, which contains all the information I have upon the subject.

GROVER CLEVELAND.

EXECUTIVE MANSION, January 22, 1896.

The communication of the Secretary of the Treasury, which immediately follows, sets out that this bounty appropriation came up in the shape of a claim made by the Oxnard Company, was duly certified, as I have stated, was taken before the Comptroller, and that the Comptroller referred it to the Court of Claims for adjudication under section 1063 of the Revised Statutes referred to by me. The report of the Secretary of the Treasury does not state—perhaps it was not necessary for him to state—the reasons why the Comptroller of the Treasury referred this bounty claim or this part of the bounty claim to the Court of Claims.

Mr. President, the very grave question arises whether or not a subordinate official of the Treasury Department, when a claim is properly certified to him, when the law authorizing the claim has been construed so as to include that claim and to authorize that payment, can refuse to pay the appropriation on the ground that he thinks the law authorizing it to be unconstitutional. This sets up a new construction, never heretofore adopted by any subordinate official of the Treasury or any other subordinate official that I am aware of, and places in the power of subordinate officials the practical nullification of appropriations made by Congress.

In asking for the reference of the message to the Judiciary Committee, instead of the Finance Committee, I mean no sort of disparagement to the Finance Committee, but I imagine that with the volume of work now upon them in the shape of financial legislation they, although perhaps otherwise qualified, might not be able to devote to this subject the attention it deserves. I hope, therefore, Mr. President, that the request I make will be adopted.

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

#### ARMENIAN OUTRAGES.

Mr. CALL. I hope that the regular order will now be observed, and that the resolutions which are on the table of the Vice-President coming over from previous days will be laid before the Senate.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolutions referred to will be laid before the Senate at the proper time. Concurrent and other resolutions are now in order. If there be none such, the Chair lays before the Senate the resolutions reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. CULLOM], coming over from a previous day.

Mr. CULLOM. Let the resolutions be read.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolutions will be read.

The Secretary read the resolutions reported by Mr. CULLOM from the Committee on Foreign Relations January 22, 1896, as follows.

Whereas the supplementary treaty of Berlin, July 13, 1878, between the Ottoman Empire and Great Britain, Germany, Austria, France, Italy, and Russia contains the following provisions:

"LXI.

"The Sublime Porte undertakes to carry out without further delay the ameliorations and reforms demanded by local requirements in the provinces inhabited by the Armenians, and to guarantee their security against the Circassians and Kurds.

"It will periodically make known these steps taken to this effect to the powers, and will superintend their application.

"LXII.

"The Sublime Porte having expressed the wish to maintain the principle of religious liberty, to give it the widest scope, the contracting parties take note of this spontaneous declaration.

"In no part of the Ottoman Empire shall difference of religion be alleged against an individual as a ground for exclusion or incapacity as regards the discharge of civil and political rights, admission to the public service, functions, and honors, and the exercise of the different professions and industries.

"All persons shall be admitted, without distinction of religion, to give evidence before the tribunals.

"Liberty and the outward exercise of all forms of worship are assured to all, and no hindrance shall be offered either to the hierarchal organization of the various communions or to their relations with their spiritual chiefs.

"The right of official protection by the diplomatic and consular agents of the powers in Turkey is recognized both as regards the above-mentioned persons and their religious, charitable, and other establishments in the holy places;" and

Whereas the extent and object of the above-cited provisions of said treaty are to place the Christian subjects of the Porte under the protection of the other signatories thereto, and to secure to such Christian subjects full liberty of religious worship and belief, the equal benefit of the laws, and all the privileges and immunities belonging to any subjects of the Turkish Empire; and

Whereas by said treaty the Christian powers parties thereto having established, under the consent of Turkey, their right to accomplish and secure the above-recited objects; and

Whereas the American people, in common with all Christian people everywhere, have beheld with horror the recent appalling outrages and massacres of which the Christian population of Turkey have been made the victims:

Resolved by the Senate of the United States (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is an imperative duty, in the interest of humanity, to express the earnest hope that the European concert brought about by the treaty referred to may speedily be given its just effect in such decisive measures as shall stay the hand of fanaticism and lawless violence, and as shall secure to the unoffending Christians of the Turkish Empire all the rights belonging to them both as men and Christians and as beneficiaries of the explicit provisions of the treaty above recited.

Resolved, That the President be requested to communicate these resolutions to the Governments of Great Britain, Germany, Austria, France, Italy, and Russia.

Resolved further, That the Senate of the United States, the House of Representatives concurring, will support the President in the most vigorous action he may take for the protection and security of American citizens in Turkey, and to obtain redress for injuries committed upon the persons or property of such citizens.

Mr. CULLOM. Mr. President, I hesitate to take up the time of the Senate or to occupy its attention even for a moment, but I feel that the gravity of the subject requires that I should do so.

Mr. GEORGE. I hope the Senator will allow me to say that I shall be glad to have a full explanation of the resolutions before voting upon them.

Mr. CULLOM. If the Senator will listen to me for a few minutes he will see the serious condition which at least prevails in Turkish Armenia.

Mr. President, I am amazed—I am astounded and appalled at the brief accounts which I have had of the awful carnival of havoc, destruction, and blood which has prevailed for a time in a country with which the United States maintains amicable relations. The concurrent and accumulated testimony of hundreds and thousands of intelligent, humane, honest, and courageous Christians and Jews alike, Catholics and Protestants, Europeans and Americans, makes it absolutely certain as a dreadful truth that a massacre of innocence unparalleled for ages has been perpetrated in the Armenian provinces of Turkey. How can we believe that in 1894 and 1895, along the very borders of the land where scriptural history was made, and where the patriarchs of old fed their flocks, almost in sight of Hermon and Lebanon, and only a short journey from Bethlehem, the most gigantic and brutal enormities have been committed upon a wholly unoffending people?

We believe, without questioning, those words which have long been part of our religion, that "of one blood God made all the nations of the earth," but I confess that my faith is somewhat shattered in the accepted belief when I see the soldiers of an organized and recognized Government, where there is no war and no enemy, killing, bayoneting, and outraging an unarmed and unoffending people—a Turkish army, under the pay of the Turkish Government, composed of Circassians, Kurds, and other barbarian soldiers, led through the rural and pastoral districts to devastate and destroy every living thing, to rob, to murder, and flay alive, old and young, male and female. Destruction and rapine have been and now are the orders obeyed in the beautiful valleys and on the rugged hills of Armenia. There has been no war, no conflict between two contending powers, but a merciless, pitiless tornado of bloody ruin. Over many square miles of territory, fire and the sword have swept the last vestige of Armenian human life. Through hundreds of Eastern villages, towns blessed with schools and colleges, with churches and missionaries, the demon of damnable and fanatical hate has spread ruin, desolation, and death.

Has it come to this, that in the last days of the nineteenth century humanity itself is placed on trial? There is responsibility somewhere. There is to be retribution some time. Who is responsible? Not alone the poor, weak, slavish Sultan who sits at Constantinople, and has been forced to let Austria manage one province and to permit other nations to manage and govern other provinces. But there are what we know as the great powers of Europe who have practically determined that they will not allow Turkey to abdicate her autonomy until they can agree among themselves as to how her territory shall be apportioned between themselves. In my judgment, if Great Britain had consented that Russia should look after Armenia, as Austria has been permitted to control Bosnia for some years, this era of blood would not have stained the history of Europe. But the fear that Russia might obtain some greater share of the "sick man's" estate than herself caused England to prevent the establishment of decent government in Armenia.

But without going into the detail of the disputes between the countries of the European alliance, it is not wrong to say that upon those great powers rests the responsibility. They have for years practically "held up" the Turkish Government and allowed her to say nothing and do nothing which they did not direct. They could have in six days put a perfect and absolute stop to the reign of death. They are responsible for the policy which has allowed this. The Turk is the puppet in their hands, and his soldiers and people are but the toys of their will and pleasure.

Mr. President, I favor the adoption of the resolutions reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations in reference to the condition of affairs in the Turkish Empire. It is a matter of some embarrassment to this nation that it can not, consistent with its declarations in the past, consent to send a fleet and an army to that country with orders to use whatever power may be necessary to put a stop at once to the indiscriminate murder and slaughter of all classes of Armenians who have so far offered practically no resistance.

As I have shown, a condition of affairs has for some time past existed in the Armenian portion of Turkey so appalling to the human heart that it is scarcely fit to be told. The Committee on Foreign Relations are not disposed to sit idly by and take no no-

tice of such condition. They have, therefore, reported certain resolutions, reciting in connection with them certain provisions of the treaty made between the Ottoman Empire, Great Britain, Germany, Austria, France, Italy, and Russia which would seem almost sufficient to excuse any other nation from having anything to say with reference to the conditions existing in Turkey.

The treaty of 1878, made between the powers as above indicated, substantially obligates those powers to see to it that the Ottoman Empire shall in no way interfere with any class of its subjects on the ground of difference of religion. In that treaty the Ottoman Empire bound itself to make no distinctions for any reason whatever between one class of its subjects and another, and the combined powers in effect obligated themselves to give protection to the Armenian portion of that country, guaranteeing the same against any imposition by the Porte or any other authority in the Turkish Empire.

The people of the United States are intensely excited over the condition of affairs reported to exist in that country. It can not be questioned that such condition is well known to the Allied Powers, and yet, so far as we are informed, nothing has been done, except by diplomatic correspondence, to stop the further slaughter of innocent people or to care for the hundreds of thousands of Armenians who have been left homeless, helpless, and starving. The purpose of the resolutions reported and under consideration is to plead with great earnestness to those Allied Powers who have undertaken to care for those people to put a stop to such brutality as is practiced upon them by the Circassians and Kurds; and not entirely without the help or connivance of the Turkish soldiers themselves.

The sixty-first article of the treaty referred to recites that the Sublime Porte undertakes to carry out the ameliorations and reforms demanded by the local requirements in the provinces inhabited by the Armenians, and to guarantee their security against the Circassians and Kurds.

Mr. President, the Sultan appears to have done nothing to protect the Armenians from those savage robbers and murderers, but it is believed, and I think correctly, by the Christian world that the Sultan is knowingly allowing such slaughter to go on, the object being, it is said, to so reduce the Armenian population that they will no longer be of sufficient consequence to give him any concern.

Mr. President, it is unnecessary for me to say that it is amazing to the people of this country, at least, to witness such a terrible slaughter of those innocent people, and at the same time witness the apparent indifference manifested by the powers who agreed to see that they were protected.

Mr. Henry Norman, of the London Chronicle, in an article published recently, in the Star of this city, says:

Yet Abdul Hamid II seems to sit firmly on his throne, secure in the jealousies of the great powers unable to agree upon the division of his kingdom. One of them will do nothing to introduce stability or further autonomy into the Balkan Peninsula, preferring to wait until the ripe and rotten fruit shall drop into her lap, and the hands of the others are thereby paralyzed. And if the Sultan loses heart for a moment in the desperate game he is playing, he can find fresh courage by thinking, as Professor Grosvenor in his great book has recently reminded us, that the British embassy stands upon land presented to England in gratitude for help against France in 1801; that the site of the French embassy was given to France in thankfulness for aid against England in 1807; that the shaft among the cypresses of the cemetery at Scutari commemorates English and French support against Russia in 1857, and that another column on the Bosphorus tells how Russia saved Mahmoud II his empire in 1838. "You think us weak," said a Turkish statesman recently to a foreign ambassador, "but the truth is we are very strong, for our strength is rooted in your divisions."

Before the treaty of Berlin was entered into by the great powers in 1878, Great Britain announced its own treaty of defense with the Porte, which, it is said, caused a great sensation among the Allied Powers. This treaty between Turkey and England provides that England was to join His Imperial Majesty the Sultan in defending certain portions of his territory against any future attempt on the part of Russia to take possession of the same, and the Sultan promised England to introduce the necessary reforms, to be agreed upon between the two powers, in his Government, and for the protection of the Christian and other subjects of the Sultan. As a guarantee of good faith, the Sultan consented to the occupation by England of the Island of Cyprus. That compact was secretly signed at Constantinople on the 4th day of June, 1878, only a few days before the congress convened at Berlin to make the treaty of 1878.

So that, Mr. President, the English Government, making greater pretensions to the observance of the rights of the people than perhaps any other Government in Europe, has an additional obligation resting upon it to protect the Armenians in Turkey, and yet nothing has been done by it, notwithstanding this double obligation resting upon it, nor by any of the other powers looking to the enforcement of their treaty obligations beyond a mere diplomatic correspondence between them and the Sultan.

So, Mr. President, it seemed to the Committee on Foreign Relations that we could not do less, that we could not say less by way of a recital of the obligations of the Allied Powers to protect those people and an appeal to them to carry out their pledges than we have done by the resolution which is now under consideration.

It may be proper for me to say that yesterday dispatches came from that country saying that Turkey and Russia had made a treaty, by which Russia was to dominate Turkey and hold it as a vassal. I see, however, what I anticipated might be true, that the former dispatches have been substantially denied this morning. So the condition prevails that these several allied powers, having taken upon themselves practically the special right, if such a right could be conferred, to protect the Armenians by name, consisting of over 2,000,000 in European Turkey and more than a million and a half in Asiatic Turkey, have, notwithstanding that obligation, permitted the indiscriminate slaughter which has been going on there for the last year, to say nothing of what occurred before that time, almost distancing any description of slaughter in the history of the world. I do not myself believe that there can be found in all the history of the world such a condition as has existed in that country for the last year and a half.

It is not necessary for me to say that apparently the Allied Powers are watching each other, each hoping by its silence or nonaction to secure, if the Ottoman Empire should go to pieces, a portion of its territory. The heart of all Christendom is stirred to its very depths as it witnesses the piteous pleas of the suffering Armenians beseeching the Christian world to give them protection.

The Armenians are said to be a harmless, industrious, and honest people. They number, in Turkey, 2,500,000 people; in Russia, 1,300,000; in Persia and other parts of the East, 150,000; scattered through Europe, 100,000; outside of the places I have named and in the United States, about 10,000. What is called ancient Armenia is said to be divided between Russia, Turkey, and Persia. The area of Turkish Armenia is about 60,000 square miles.

Mr. President, it would be very interesting, perhaps, to go back to the early history of those people. It is said that the Armenian nation is one of the oldest in the history of the world; that its beginning was soon after the flood, in the land of Ararat, and it may be said that that region of the world is the birthplace of the human race. History tells us that the glory of the Armenian nation reached its height about eighty years before Christ, and that the cause of its downfall may be traced back to about the same period; that it resulted from a war with the Romans. Since the conquest of Armenia by the Romans the Armenians have passed through many and various vicissitudes; at times they have been tributary to some nation and at times independent. It is also said that the downfall of Armenia as an independent nation was the result of aid given the Crusaders in their effort to free the Holy City from the Arabs and Turks. They have been, as a people, subject to the persecutions, outrages, and massacres of what Gladstone terms "the unspeakable Turk" for seven or eight hundred years. They have, however, retained their distinctive language and religion to this day, and are said to be the leading class in commerce as well as in education in Turkey.

I said awhile ago that nothing had been done by the combined powers looking to putting a stop to the murder of the Armenians since the treaty of 1878, aside from mere diplomatic protests. I ought to say that some eight months ago a scheme of reform for the Armenian provinces was presented to the Sultan by the English, French, and Russian Governments, which was sanctioned October 17, 1895, by imperial irade for the provinces of Bitlis, Diarbekir, Seevas, Erzerum, Van, and Harpoot. These provinces cover the region where the majority of the Armenians reside. Since the sanction by the Sultan of this proposed reform wholesale slaughter and plunder have been perhaps more frequent than before.

It is unnecessary, Mr. President, for me to detail the history of what has been going on at any greater length, but it would seem, from all the information that can be obtained, that there has been a determination on the part of the Sultan of Turkey to allow the Armenian population to be almost exterminated. It appears to be an assault upon the Armenians because of their religion. The religious leaders of those engaged in the indiscriminate slaughter which has been carried on incite the people to action by crying from the housetops, "Woe to the Mussulman who does not kill at least one Christian and carry away some of their belongings, in the name of Mohammed and His Imperial Majesty the Sultan."

This country of ours may be said to be a neutral Government, so far as interference with the internal affairs of any Government in Europe is concerned. It has no disposition to interfere in the affairs of European Governments, except in the cause of humanity itself. And we now appeal most earnestly, in the name of humanity, to the Governments which have contracted to protect those people that they shall carry out their obligations. As to the right of this Government to protect American citizens everywhere we ask no odds from any nation upon earth.

In earlier days the crusaders from western Europe swarmed over this very country in their misguided efforts to establish religion through the agency of the sword. Of late it has seemed almost necessary to inaugurate another crusade in the interest of peace and humanity, that possibly a few people might be saved

from a nation numbering about 4,000,000 in all. They are greater in number than were the people of the American colonies in the days of the American Revolution. Is it necessary, in the economy of the civilized Governments of Europe, that the blood of 4,000,000 people shall be spilled, that it shall water the soil of that vast area of country?

The sympathy of America has always gone out to the oppressed and misgoverned peoples of other countries. We extended our hands and gave of our means to Greece when Turkey, years ago, strove to crush her to the earth. We sympathized with Hungary and did what we could to relieve the people there when they were held in bonds and difficulties.

Mr. President, I can not refrain from giving here the thrilling words of our great Webster, in an address referring to the affairs of Hungary. He said:

I see that the Emperor of Russia demands of Turkey that the noble Kosuth and his companions shall be given up to be dealt with at his pleasure, and I see that this demand is made in derision of the established laws of nations.

Gentlemen, there is something on earth greater than arbitrary or despotic power. The lightning has its power, the whirlwind has its power, and the earthquake has its power, but there is something among men more capable of shaking despotic power than the lightning, the whirlwind, or the earthquake, and that is the excited and aroused indignation of the whole civilized world.

Mr. President, I know of no condition which has existed in this world for centuries which has called upon civilized nations and peoples for interference equaling the necessity for stopping the indiscriminate slaughter which has been going on in Turkish Armenia for a number of years.

I ask that an article which I find in the Chicago Tribune, which is not long, be inserted at the close of my remarks. I also ask that a statement of the number of places where this indiscriminate slaughter has been going on shall also be inserted, which shows that not less than about 40,000 of these people have been killed; and the accounts show that not less than a half million of those who have not been killed are houseless, homeless, and starving, with no relief being afforded them from any quarter.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The papers referred to by the Senator from Illinois will be inserted in the RECORD, in the absence of objection.

The articles referred to are as follows:

#### MOSLEM OR DEATH.

It is another terrible statement of facts which E. J. Dillon sets forth in the last Contemporary Review. They are of exactly the same character as those presented in previous numbers of that Review by the same trustworthy eye-witness. These later accounts, specific and circumstantial, such as are already confirmed by a whole cloud of witnesses, only add horror upon horrors. All the world stands aghast at this modern infernalism of the Turkish ruler. But apparently there is not a power on earth that dares to face the horrid monster. Here is a strange spectacle; let history explain it as best it can.

In Asia Minor during the last two months, Dr. Dillon declares, the direct victims amount to at least 60,000, with double that number plundered of their all and sent forth as fugitives from the ashes of their pillaged and devastated homes to perish. The occasion of the massacres, he says, was the pressure put upon the Sultan to carry out certain reforms; the object of the massacres was to nullify those reforms and to carry out the established policy of the present Sultan by reducing the Christian population in this territory to an insignificant minority. That this is the simple fact in the case admits of no doubt.

To all appearances up to date the Governments of all the great civilized nations stand looking on as if smitten with insensibility and cowed into abject pusillanimity before this Abdul Accurst. Even the culminating insult in the Sultan's notification to the Society of the Red Cross to keep off seems to be tamely submitted to.

The issue could not be more sharply made up. It is the Turk against Christendom—"Moslem or die!" And yet the massacres that have been systematically going on now ever since a year ago last August are, in fact, but a minor part of all that systematic and comprehensive reign of oppression, torture, and terror. The facts presented in detail in the Contemporary Review and in a multitude of letters from other witnesses on the ground reveal a diabolism of all cruelties and wickedness such as give the world a new idea of the malign possibilities of human nature.

The writer in the Review referred to speaks of a woman who, having seen her husband butchered by a Moslem mob and her daughter tortured to death by the devilish indignities of the ruffians, not to speak of her own tortures and indignities in the wildness of her agony felt reason give way and went about declaring that God himself had gone mad and left maniacs and demons to rule the world.

The answer which the English poet, William Watson, gives in the Westminster Gazette to the question as to whether Great Britain will, after all, do anything about it is put by him in this way:

"She will act at last, when there is naught remaining to relieve! At last! When the last altar is defiled, when the last mother folds with famished arms to her dead bosom her last butchered child! Then shall our England, throned beyond alarms, rise in her might! Till this 'she bides her hour.'"

If such an outcry is not poetic, it is at any rate only too telling and pertinent.

[The Chicago Tribune, Monday, January 20, 1896.]

R. J. Suabian, a student at Northwestern University, read several extracts from letters showing the hostility the Turks bore to the Armenians. The writers said a stretch of 100 miles had been visited by the inhuman Kurds, who swept everything before them. As a result there were 50,000 killed, 500,000 made destitute, and \$3,000,000 worth of property lost to the owners. Men, women, and children had been pursued into the churches and killed there, and their blood reddened the steps.

Mr. Mangasarian said the work was done by troops attired in Kurdish costumes. He read a letter from relatives in Armenia in which the terrible tale was told in a thrilling manner. He said the Armenians had excited the jealousy of the Turks from the fact they represented and were impregnated with the ideas of Western civilization and wanted to be free. The fact they were progressive and the Turk represented the civilization of 1,000 years ago; that

at every turn they forced the Turk to the wall in trade, literature, and finance was enough to make the Turk envious and determined the Armenian should not have the liberty he sought.

Statement showing the number of Armenians massacred at different points in Turkey, taken from the Armenian, published in London, December 1, 1895:

Constantinople.....	500
Trebizond.....	920
Trebizond villages.....	200
Erzengan.....	450
Erzengan villages.....	250
Balboot and villages.....	1,550
Goomish-Khaneh.....	200
Bitlis.....	800
Erzerum and villages.....	1,200
Diarbekir and villages.....	6,000
Seevas.....	500
Shabeen-Karahissar.....	100
Gurun.....	400
Malateeyeh.....	100
Arabgheer and villages.....	500
Marash.....	300
Harpoot (and 37 villages, estimated).....	10,000
Kemakh.....	600
Keghi.....	200
Terdjan.....	100
Aintab.....	300
Zeytoun.....	50
Amasia.....	200
Marsivan.....	100
Samsoun.....	50
Moosh.....	50
Van and villages.....	50
Hadjin and villages.....	50
Ak-Hissar.....	100
Alexandretta.....	100
Guerjanis.....	50
Egin and its villages.....	100
Teharsanjak and 30 villages.....	300
Bayazeed.....	200
Urfa.....	100
Mosul.....	100
Total.....	28,870

Mr. CULLOM. I hope the resolutions will be promptly adopted, Mr. President.

Mr. BLANCHARD. I am glad, Mr. President, that the Committee on Foreign Relations have at last reported resolutions giving expression to the abhorrence felt by the American people at the atrocities which have been perpetrated upon the Christian inhabitants of Turkish Armenia. For more than a year the world has been shocked by what has been going on, and is still going on, in Turkey. Not only have there been indiscriminate massacres of men, women, and children, but, so far as the women are concerned, there have been worse than massacres.

These outrages in Turkey began in 1894. The world was shocked and horrified by the reports that reached us then. An expression in protest was sought from this Government then. On December 3 of that year I offered a resolution in the Senate, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, but never acted on. That resolution was as follows:

Joint resolution relating to the recent massacre of Christian inhabitants of Turkish Armenia.

Whereas the Christian inhabitants of Armenia, under the dominion of the Sultan of Turkey, were recently subjected to inhuman atrocities resulting in the indiscriminate massacre of thousands of men, women, and children; and

Whereas such outrages are a blot upon the civilization of the age, meriting the severest condemnation of mankind generally, and especially of the Christian nations of the earth: Therefore

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the people of the United States view with horror and detestation the atrocities aforesaid, and do hereby protest, in the name of common humanity, against the same.

Sec. 2. That the President of the United States communicate this remonstrance to the Government of Turkey.

Mr. HOAR. If the Senator from Louisiana will pardon me, he made one statement which I think was perhaps inadvertent, that the massacres and outrages began in 1894. I have in my hand now a statement from very high authority, indeed, describing the condition of things and what was going on there in the year 1890, and had been going on for several years before 1894. Undoubtedly the outrages were still more flagrant at the time of which the Senator speaks.

Mr. BLANCHARD. That is true. The outrages upon the Christian inhabitants of Turkish Armenia have been going on for years, but they became bolder and were more flagrant in the fall of 1894 than they had been previous to that time, so much so that the attention of mankind generally was called to them.

Mr. President, it may be true that the United States as a nation can do nothing within the dominions of the Sultan of Turkey save to protect the lives and property of American citizens who may be domiciliated there, but, I take it, it is not out of place for us as the representatives of a free people, a great Christian nation, to express in some official way our horror and detestation of the condition of affairs in that unhappy country.

The resolutions are timely. They perhaps do not go far enough, but they are, and will be considered by the world, an expression of the American nation and the American people of their repudiation of and protest against acts of this kind.

Mr. President, the people who are the victims of these outrages are all Christians. We do not hear that the Kurds and Circassians are committing robberies and rapes and murders upon the Moslem inhabitants of the Sultan of Turkey. They all seem to be confined to the Christian inhabitants of the Sultan's Empire, and from that the inference is inevitable that these atrocities are perpetrated upon an unoffending people because of their religion.

The Armenians as a race were the first people to embrace Christianity. It is recorded that they were converted to the religion of Christ thirty-six years before the Emperor Constantine even issued his Edict of Toleration. They and their descendants have remained Christians from that time to this, maintaining their religious creed through persecution amounting to martyrdom. Within their country is Mount Ararat, upon which, we are told in Holy Writ, the ark rested after the deluge. They are a people who would be desirable inhabitants of any country. We have some five or six thousand of them who have become citizens of our country.

Mr. CULLOM. Ten thousand.

Mr. BLANCHARD. Ten thousand. I have met and talked with some of them; one I recollect in particular, an Armenian merchant from Boston, who is a most cultured and well-informed gentleman. Something is due to these Armenian citizens of the United States in the way of expression of sympathy for their suffering countrymen, and certainly it is little enough for us to do to pass the resolutions under consideration.

Mr. FRYE. Mr. President, just one word.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. BLANCHARD] rather indicates by his first remark, in which he says he is glad that the Committee on Foreign Relations has at last evolved something, that there has been neglect on the part of the committee and on the part of Congress to take notice of the horrible condition of affairs in Turkey. From letters which I have received and from remarks I have heard made I am inclined to think that the religious people of America have looked upon Congress as moving very slowly in this affair.

Mr. President, I desire, in behalf of the Committee on Foreign Relations, to say that at the last session of the last Congress two missionaries appeared here from Armenia, both of whom I knew personally, one of whom was formerly a resident of my own city, and stated the grievances, the troubles, the massacres, their fears. They were asked what was the remedy, and they said to the committee that in their judgment if a consulate could be established at Erzerum and another at Harpoot and consuls appointed, then there would be no trouble in that great interior, because the eye of America would then be upon it. In less than a week after that the Committee on Foreign Relations reported a bill establishing two consulates, one at Erzerum and the other at Harpoot, and it became a law. The President of the United States appointed the consuls.

Surely the committee and Congress did everything then as expeditiously as anybody could ask, and did exactly what these missionaries desired should be done. Turkey refused exequaturs to those two consuls. I do not know what the executive department has done as to that refusal. I do not know what the executive department can do as to it; but it seems to me that some pressure ought to be brought somehow, that when there can be no objection to the persons of the consuls appointed exequaturs shall be granted.

Now, Mr. President, consider this incident. If that consul had been received by Turkey, had gone to Harpoot, a consulate building had been provided for, and an American flag raised, more than 20,000 lives would have been saved. One of the most terrible massacres perpetrated in Turkey anywhere took place at that point.

The good people of the United States have planted in Turkey over \$6,000,000 for a single purpose, to improve and better the condition of the people of that country. They have erected as fine colleges as there are in the world. They have been maintained by American money. They have educated thousands and hundreds of thousands of Turks, or Armenians, who are subject to Turkey. It has been a work of wonderful beneficence, a work which has had marvelous success, and yet it is stopped absolutely to-day. That American capital now is held up; it can not do an ounce of work. At Harpoot the American colleges were burned down and the Americans themselves were compelled to flee for their lives.

I do not know how far the United States of America can interfere in Turkey. I am in favor of these resolutions as an expression of our opinion upon the awful tragedies there; but if I had had my way, after the powers of Europe have waited now a solid year looking each other in the face with suspicious eyes and neither one daring to make a move lest the other shall receive a benefit—I say if I had had my way, I would have Congress memorialize Russia and say to her: "Take Armenia into your possession. Protect the lives of these Christians there. And the United States of America will stand behind you with all of its power." That, sir, is the memorial and resolution I would have passed.

Sir, American citizens are suffering there. I care not what our minister reports to the State Department. I know from better opportunity to learn it than Minister Terrell has or can have; that is, from the headquarters of the foreign missions of the United States of America, where information is received by every mail, and where the information is absolutely accurate, but where the informants dare not have their names known because their lives would immediately pay the penalty.

Mr. MILLS. I wish to say to my friend that Minister Terrell is in daily conference with those very people at Constantinople.

Mr. FRYE. I do not attack Minister Terrell. I do not know what his reports have been to the State Department, but I do know that American lives and American property are being interfered with day by day in the interior of Armenia. I know that they are compelled to flee to protect their lives. I know that they do not receive the protection of the Turkish Government there.

Mr. MILLS. Yet, if my friend will investigate and ask those very missionaries, they will tell him that Minister Terrell has done more for them than the minister from any other country. He is given universal praise by all the missionaries for what he has done. I do not know what he has reported to the State Department, but he is a personal friend of mine, I have letters from him frequently, and I have communications that he sends to me from the missionaries, who indorse everything that he has done, and say he is doing everything in his power.

Mr. FRYE. If Great Britain owned a college worth \$1,000,000 at Harpoot and by Turkish orders that college had been burned down, and if the teachers, they being British citizens, had been compelled to flee for their lives, does the Senator from Texas believe that the voice of Great Britain would have been silent? Does he not believe that the demand would have been made at once for damages for that destruction of property and that those citizens should be protected?

Mr. MILLS. There is some difference between the Government of Great Britain and that of the United States. The Senator from Maine is now speaking in the Congress of the United States, that has the sole power to declare war and use the armed power of this Government. It is not so with Great Britain. There the King can make war whenever he pleases to do so. If my friend would be for war, I do not know but that I would go with him; wherever people of the United States residing in foreign countries are not protected by foreign Governments I would send the ships of the United States, and I would batter down their capital, as Jefferson did in 1803 with the pirates.

Mr. FRYE. I have no doubt that the Senator would, and I agree with him entirely in his theory about the protection of American citizens. I do not cite Great Britain because I am fond of her.

Mr. President, one could not help admiring the glowing eulogy of England so eloquently uttered a day or two since by the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. WOLCOTT], but while I was compelled to unite in admiration of the speaker, I dissented from almost every word of the speech. I do not love Great Britain. I recognize her power on the land, her magnificent dominion on the sea, but I assert that in all our life as colony and Republic she has never done us a kind act or offered us a helping hand. While we were hers, her conduct toward us was antagonistic to all of our interests, repressive of our industries, domineering, unjust, and despotic, so that we were compelled to rebel.

As a Republic she was no more friendly. I can not forget that for fifty years she taunted us about our "flag of the free," our Declaration of Independence, our asserted equality of man, while we held black men in bondage, put manacles on ankle and hand, and yet when the South rebelled, undertook by arms to establish another republic whose corner stone should be slavery forever, she was prompt to recognize belligerent rights; aided France to establish a monarchy in Mexico, a perpetual menace to us; built, fitted out, and manned ships to destroy our commerce; did all in her power to establish the Confederacy, so that she might have a customer.

Sir, the British rulers are no friends of ours. Now she is sitting quietly by seeing these Armenians for a solid year murdered because they were Christians, when she was one of the very agencies agreeing to protect their lives or compel Turkey to do it, and she had the power in her hands any day to do it. So I say, regardless of what Great Britain might have thought, if I had had my way Congress would have memorialized Russia at once to take possession of Armenia, and the United States would back her in the doing of it.

Now, so far as American citizens are concerned, I would protect them there at any cost. We never agreed that the Dardanelles should be closed to us. There can not be found a line in the policy of the United States of America which ever permitted any great navigable water to be closed to our ships; not one. On the contrary, we have been ready to go to war at any time to keep navigable waters open to our ships. We have given no assent to the agreement of the concerting nations over there that the Dardanelles shall be closed. If it was necessary to protect our Ameri-

can citizens and their property, I would order United States ships of war, in spite of foreign agreements, to sail up the Dardanelles and plant themselves before Constantinople, and then demand that American citizens should have the protection they are entitled to.

Mr. President, I think one of the grandest things in the history of Great Britain, and one thing for which I admire her, is that she does protect her citizens everywhere and anywhere, under all circumstances. Her mighty power is put forth for their relief and protection, and it is admirable. I do not wonder that a British citizen loves his country. Why that little incident which all of you are familiar with is a marvelous illustration of that. The King of Abyssinia took a British citizen of the name of Campbell, about twenty years ago, carried him up into the fortress of Magdala, on the heights of a lofty mountain, and put him into a dungeon without cause. It took six months for Great Britain to find that out, and then she demanded his immediate release. King Theodore refused to release him. In less than ten days after the refusal was received, 3,000 British soldiers and 5,000 sepoys were on board ships of war sailing for the coast. When they arrived they were disembarked, were marched 700 miles over swamp and morass under a burning sun, then up the mountain to the very heights, in front of the frowning dungeon, and then they gave battle. They battered down the iron gates, the stone walls. King Theodore had killed himself with his own pistol. Then they reached down into the dungeon, with that English hand, lifted out from it that one British citizen, and carried him down the mountain heights, across the same swamps and morass, landed him on the white-winged ships and sped him away to his home in safety. That cost Great Britain \$25,000,000 and made General Napier Lord Napier of Magdala.

Now, sir, that was a great thing for a great country to do. A country that has an eye that can see away across an ocean, away across the many miles of land up into the mountain heights, down into the darksome dungeon one, just one, of her 38,000,000 people, and then has an arm strong enough and long enough to reach across the same ocean, across the same swamps and marshes, up the same mountain heights, down into the same dungeon, and pluck him out and carry him home to his own country a free man—in God's name who will not die for a country that will do that?

Well, Mr. President, our country will do it, and our country ought to do it. All that I ask of this grand Republic of ours is that it shall model itself after Great Britain, if it pleases, in this one thing, that the life of an American citizen shall be protected wherever he may be, whether in Great Britain or in Turkey, and in no other thing whatsoever.

Mr. President, I beg pardon of the Senate. When I started it was for a word or two only. [Applause in the galleries.]

Mr. CALL. Mr. President, the resolutions of the Committee on Foreign Relations are very feeble and emasculated utterances compared with the speech of the Senator from Maine. We fight our battles here on the Committee on Foreign Relations report of a resolution that has no significance in it, that protects no American citizens, and the Senator from Maine arises here and commends Great Britain for doing that which we refuse and fail to do, viz, not only protecting her subjects, but asserting her power everywhere.

I introduced a resolution in the Senate which I will send to the desk to be read, which did propose something for the relief of the people of Armenia and did support the dignity and power of the American Republic. Here we have a tame, insignificant declaration of opinion and sympathy, giving no protection and no relief to these people. Have we not more than that right here upon our very borders, under our eyes, within our hearing, in the Island of Cuba? The principles and spirit of the Monroe doctrine, which we seek to enforce and declare, are violated in the wholesale murder of people who have been invited by our example to take action for the establishment of institutions like our own. Yet we hear this empty declaration of duty of this Government and censure of the Executive of the Government, when we are the department upon which the responsibility rests, and upon no one else.

The President of the United States has no power but that which we give to him. I agree with the Senator from Maine that the Armenian people should have the protection of this Government, not because they are citizens of the United States, but because the people of the United States have a duty to civilization, have a duty to the progress of mankind, to perform. It is not because of any treaty between Russia and England or any other powers, but because it is our duty to maintain the principles upon which this Government and our civilization are founded. But when I introduce resolutions to that effect we find the Committee on Foreign Relations holding back, taking no action, and then introducing a mere expression of their sympathy, while murder, outrage, and ferocity such as beasts of the forest do not possess are perpetrated upon these Armenian people and upon the people upon our own immediate borders in the Island of Cuba.

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

The SECRETARY. A bill (H. R. 2904) to maintain and protect the coin redemption fund, and to authorize the issue of certificates of indebtedness to meet temporary deficiencies of revenue.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President—

Mr. CALL. I ask permission, before the matter goes over, to have the resolution read which I formerly offered and to which I referred.

Mr. CULLOM. I hope that the Senator from Arkansas in charge of the bill which is the regular order at 2 o'clock will consent to its being laid aside temporarily, that this question may be disposed of.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I should like to ask the Senator from Illinois how long he supposes it will take? There are some Senators who desire to be heard by the Senate on the regular order. One is on the floor now and desires to proceed. I do not like to interfere with the consideration of the resolutions reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations, and am anxious myself to have them disposed of, if it can be done in a short time.

Mr. CULLOM. Of course, I am not aware of the number who desire to speak on the resolutions, but I have not supposed that it would take more than a few minutes longer to dispose of them. I desire to say in justification of my own desire to have them finished to-day, that I am under promise to leave the city to-morrow night for ten days, or perhaps a little less; and I should be very glad indeed to have this question settled before I go away.

Mr. HOAR. Mr. President, may I be permitted to make one suggestion?

Mr. PEPPER. My colleague [Mr. BAKER] has been for several days expecting to address the Senate upon the unfinished business. He is now ready to proceed and has addressed the Chair for that purpose. I hope the matter referred to by the Senator from Illinois can be postponed.

Mr. CULLOM. I hope the Chair will submit to the Senate the request that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside that the resolution may be disposed of.

Mr. HOAR. Will the Chair allow me to make a suggestion before that is done?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. HOAR. I introduced the original resolution on this subject, and have taken great interest in it. I am prepared to speak on the question at some little length, for twenty or thirty minutes, but in order to have the matter disposed of, instead of going over until next week, I will forego my purpose of addressing the Senate. I ask unanimous consent that, at the conclusion of the remarks of the Senator from Florida [Mr. CALL], a vote may be taken on these resolutions. I think other gentlemen who might speak will be willing to forego that purpose. It will take only four or five minutes to reach a vote, I think.

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

Mr. CALL. I am entirely willing to go on and dispose of the resolutions, but the Senator from Kansas [Mr. BAKER] is upon the floor and desires to address the Senate.

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

Mr. CALL. I have an amendment to offer to the resolutions. I think the resolutions, as they stand, are discreditable to the Senate of the United States. If we are to take action upon the subject let us do something that will grant the people who are suffering these outrages—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Florida will please suspend. The Chair desires to inquire whether there is objection to the request of the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. HOAR. Will the Chair pardon me one observation? The Government of the United States (whether right or wrong I will not now detain the Senate by discussing) has undertaken to deal with this matter diplomatically, and diplomatic negotiations are now going on. A lady, an intimate friend of mine, who I am proud to say is my constituent and personal friend, is on her way to Turkey with the ministrations of the Red Cross at her command. Whatever we may think of the opinion of the Senator from Florida [Mr. CALL], however much we may sympathize with my honorable friend from Maine [Mr. FRYE], to whose stirring speech we all listened with pleasure, I hold that it is wrong for the Senate to thrust these extreme statements, which I sympathize with almost altogether, into the diplomacy of the United States. The Senator's indignation will keep for a week. Until we learn from our President that the function of diplomacy is over, I hope that we may content ourselves to withhold the expression of our natural indignation, however difficult for manly spirits like that of my friend from Florida it may be.

Now, I appeal to him. I think I know the opinion of the Armenians; there are more of them in my city than in any other. I think I know the opinion of the American Board for Foreign

Missions, with whom I have a thousand ties of personal union in the past and in the present. We may be obliged to come to what the Senator proposes, but let us wait until the diplomatic means are exhausted. When the President and the Secretary of State of the United States are endeavoring to save the families, the wives, of American missionaries still in danger from these lawless fanatics, when Clara Barton is on her way with the Red Cross in her hand, it is a pretty serious thing to thrust our intemperate and angry utterances into that diplomatic condition.

As to what the Committee on Foreign Relations have done, does anyone suppose that my friend from Illinois [Mr. CULLOM] is not as much stirred to the bottom of his heart with indignation at these things as anybody? Yet he, as the organ of that great committee, unanimously, as I understand the committee have acted, proposes for to-day this temperate and guarded expression. I say to the Senator from Florida he is taking great responsibility—and great responsibility in regard to the lives and the honor of women, which he has so much at heart—when he thrusts himself into that situation and breaks it up.

Mr. CALL. Mr. President—

Mr. CULLOM. Will the Senator from Florida allow me to make a suggestion?

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I should like to have the Chair first submit the request for unanimous consent which was suggested by the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. HOAR. Let that first be submitted.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. We can then proceed in a regular manner.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair will submit the request of the Senator from Massachusetts. The Senator from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the remarks of the Senator from Florida the vote may be taken on the pending resolutions. Is there objection?

Mr. PEPPER. I object for the present.

Mr. HOAR (to Mr. PEPPER). It will not take more than five minutes. Let us get this matter out of the way.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair will state that if objection is interposed to the request of the Senator from Massachusetts the regular order is before the Senate. Is there objection?

Mr. PEPPER. I do object for the present.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. There is objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Let me state that if the matter can be disposed of in five minutes I shall withdraw the objection.

Mr. HOAR. It will be disposed of at the close of the remarks of the Senator from Florida, and he is nearly through, I have no doubt.

Mr. PEPPER. If the Senator from Florida is nearly through I will withdraw my objection; otherwise not.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The objection is withdrawn; and the Senator from Florida will proceed.

Mr. CALL. I ask that the Secretary read the resolution heretofore introduced by me.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read the concurrent resolution submitted by Mr. CALL December 10, 1895, as follows:

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring). That humanity and religion and the principles on which all civilization rests demand that the civilized Governments shall, by peaceful negotiations, or, if necessary, by force of arms, prevent and suppress the cruelties and massacres inflicted on the Armenian subjects of Turkey, by the establishment of a government of their own people, with such guaranties by the civilized powers of its authority and permanence as shall be adequate to that end.*

Mr. CALL. Now, Mr. President, there was a resolution which proposed something that would protect the soldiers of the Red Cross, Clara Barton and her associates. There was a declaration by the people of the United States that in behalf of our common humanity the power of this people should be interposed to prevent outrages which were shocking to the civilized world. Do Senators say that our people can be endangered by a declaration that our power shall be exercised to prevent these outrages, when diplomacy has failed for half a century to accomplish anything? The history of Armenia has been one continued scene of bloodshed and outrage of women and murder of children for more than a century. We have now a resolution here reciting an agreement between the civilized powers connected with that portion of the world that these outrages should stop, when, in the very face of that agreement, the most terrible outrages the world has ever seen have been perpetrated.

Mr. President, I object to the pending resolutions. I object to them because they mean nothing; I object to them because it is an insult to the suffering people of Armenia and because the nations of the civilized world will look upon it as an empty and unmeaning declaration of sympathy.

I do not agree with the Senator from Maine [Mr. FRYE] in his denunciation of Great Britain or the British people. Whatever of courage, spirit, and character we have come from that race of people who have made glorious the English name and have carried civilization and Christianity into every quarter of the globe.

Admit that they are aggressive, admit that they have oftentimes created tyranny and wrong, yet they have been the pillars of civilization and the representatives of the virtue of every civilized people; they have advanced science and art; and what we possess we derive from their blood and from their teachings.

Mr. President, while I am in favor of maintaining the principles of the Monroe doctrine and protecting these two continents from aggression of any kind, while I am in favor of preserving civil liberty and opposing a government of caste and privilege, which was the meaning of the Monroe doctrine and its spirit and purpose, I desire to say that it is not because the Government of Great Britain will create upon this continent institutions hostile to civil liberty, for the colonies of Great Britain, New Zealand and Australia, are to-day more advanced than we are in the protection of the masses of the people in their personal rights; they are more advanced than we are in the progress of that civilization which made the Constitution of the United States. Land is free to every citizen, homes and labor are provided for the unemployed, and no part of the world presents a spectacle where the exercise of power is more for the people and for their elevation, happiness, and prosperity.

New Zealand, as a British colony, is fifty-five years old, and her European population is 690,000. She boasts the best temperate climate, the richest healing mineral springs, the most variedly beautiful and soul-inspiring scenery in the world, a coast line of 4,330 miles, and a rising generation passionately fond of the sea. Her agricultural land yields the largest and finest crops, her pastoral land supports the greatest number of sheep and cattle to the acre. Her people rule themselves by means of the most democratic central government and 500 local governing bodies. They own collectively 1,900 miles of railway, 14,000 miles of telegraph wire, all the telephones, 1,300 post-offices, 1,400 schools, and worship in 1,600 churches. They have the most complete system of compulsory, secular, free education, the lowest death rate, the lightest ratio of convictions for drunkenness, the highest standard of comfort, the most perfect land and labor laws in the world. It is not a vain dream for such a colony!

And yet, in her dream, in her aspirations, in her determined policy to stop the production of penury, New Zealand stands alone, and almost outside the pale of the sympathy of Christian England! Being alone and far ahead on that which it deems to be the right road, their small band of men and women get little guidance from the superior culture and experience of the mother country, of the great republic, or even of other colonies. What analogy can there be between a policy which starts from the principle that the land and all its hidden wealth belongs to the nation now and a policy which does not?

But this is foreign to the purpose.

We have a duty to perform. We are a great people, the light of the world, and we owe it to civilization and humanity that the power which has been given to us shall be exercised. We owe it to every principle of civilization that the people of Armenia, and by a greater interest and obligation that the people of Cuba, shall not be murdered by the brutal military despotism which now threatens to extinguish that entire race, and we owe it to the people of Armenia that we shall pass something more than an empty declaration of sympathy.

I offer the resolution heretofore submitted by me as a substitute for the resolutions reported by the committee.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on the substitute submitted by the Senator from Florida to the pending resolutions.

Mr. BACON. I ask that the proposed substitute be read.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The proposed substitute will be read. The Secretary read as follows:

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring). That humanity and religion and the principles on which all civilization rests demand that the civilized governments shall, by peaceful negotiations, or, if necessary, by force of arms, prevent and suppress the cruelties and massacres inflicted on the Armenian subjects of Turkey, by the establishment of a government of their own people, with such guaranties by the civilized powers of its authority and permanence as shall be adequate to that end.*

Mr. CULLOM. I move that the substitute offered by the Senator from Florida be laid on the table.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Illinois, that the substitute be laid on the table.

Mr. BATE. Before that is done, can we not have the original resolutions read so that we may understand precisely what we are to vote upon?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The original resolutions will be again read.

The Secretary read the resolutions reported by the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. CULLOM. Those resolutions were unanimously reported by the Committee on Foreign Relations, including my distinguished friend on my left [Mr. FRYE].

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. CULLOM] to lay the proposed substitute on the table.

The motion was agreed to.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question recurs on agreeing to the concurrent resolutions reported by the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The resolutions were agreed to.

#### THE MONROE DOCTRINE.

Mr. THURSTON. I wish to give notice that, unless interfering with some previous announcement, I shall, on Tuesday morning next, after the disposition of the routine business, submit some brief remarks upon the resolutions which have been pending in respect to the Monroe doctrine.

#### SILVER COINAGE AND COIN REDEMPTION.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2904) to maintain and protect the coin redemption fund, and to authorize the issue of certificates of indebtedness to meet temporary deficiencies of revenue.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The pending question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BUTLER] to the amendment reported by the Committee on Finance, on which the Senator from Kansas [Mr. BAKER] is entitled to the floor.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Before the Senator from Kansas proceeds, I ask him to allow me just one moment to request the unanimous consent of the Senate that a vote may be had at 4 o'clock on Thursday next on the pending bill.

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

Mr. HILL. I desire to assent to that, with the condition and understanding that the bill shall not be set aside for any other business, except by unanimous consent.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I presume there would be no objection to that.

Mr. HILL. With that understanding, I assent to it.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I do not suppose the Senator from Arkansas desires to put a condition of that sort on the procedure of the Senate.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. That is the rule of the Senate now. It adds nothing whatever to its force. The regular order can not be set aside except by unanimous consent.

Mr. GALLINGER. Or by a vote of the Senate.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Or by a vote of the Senate.

Mr. WOLCOTT. But the Senator from New York proposes that the Senate, no matter what crisis may arise, no matter what may happen, shall not act on anything else except by unanimous consent.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I do not presume the Senator from New York means to limit the Senate in that way.

Mr. WOLCOTT. My suggestion is only to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I presume it is the intention of the Senator from New York that the regular order shall not be set aside for the purpose of taking up any other matter except by unanimous consent.

Mr. HILL. My idea is not, after this consent shall be given, that to-morrow or Monday, by a vote of the Senate, some other business shall intervene three or four days and then on Thursday we shall take up this bill and a vote be insisted upon. It is for the very purpose of guarding against that, and the Senator sees the force of it, that I make the suggestion. With that understanding clearly, that the bill is to continue as the regular order of business simply from now until Thursday, then it is all right. With that understanding I assent to it; otherwise not.

Mr. ALLEN. I wish to enter my objection to the request of the Senator from Arkansas.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Objection being interposed, the Senator from Kansas will proceed.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I desire to give notice that on Thursday next I shall ask the Senate to remain in session until the pending bill shall be disposed of.

Mr. BAKER. I ask to have read the amendment I offered the other day.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment intended to be proposed by the Senator from Kansas will be read.

The SECRETARY. At the end of section 1 of the bill it is proposed to add the following proviso:

*Provided, however, That this section shall apply to the coinage of the silver mined in the United States of America only.*

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I have offered as an amendment to the bill under consideration the proviso which has just been read, limiting it to the free coinage of American silver only, believing it to be a reasonable compromise between the conflicting views of the gold monometallist and the silver monometallist. I do not believe in either gold or silver monometallism; nor am I in favor of legislation which will produce the one or continue the other. The people are divided in their opinions upon the money question, and the politicians, judging from their divergent views, are in a hopeless state of "innocuous desuetude." However, I think all shades of opinion and belief may be classified as follows:

First. Gold monometallists.

Second. Silver monometallists.

Third. Bimetallists.  
A gold monometallist believes in gold only as a measure of value and the money of final redemption and silver as subsidiary coin. A silver monometallist believes in the free and unlimited coinage of all the silver of all the world at the ratio of 16 to 1, regardless of present conditions or of other nations.

The extreme views entertained by the gold and silver monometallists appear to be irreconcilable.

The gold monometallist claims that the legislation now proposed, if enacted into law, would produce disaster, panic, and repudiation. The silver monometallist, on the other hand, claims that the same bill, if enacted into law, would be immensely beneficial to the people and restore immediate prosperity to the country.

Thus extremes meet in legislation. Both claims can not be true. No act of legislation can produce such opposite results at one and the same time, and I am of the opinion that the awful calamity predicted by one extreme would not follow any more than the beneficial and glorious results predicted by the other.

Mr. President, I am a firm believer in what I understand to be bimetallism. Our legislation should be along the line of equality and parity between the metals at the ratio of 16 to 1. In the discharge of our duty we should not lose sight of the great central idea in all legislation, to wit, "the greatest good to the greatest number." Of course, this beneficial rule should be limited to legislation for our own people. We are not the guardians or trustees of the people of other nations. Nor should we be influenced by the charges and countercharges of extremists, nor by unjust and unfriendly criticism of the press, which frequently "condemns without evidence and executes without trial."

Mr. President, it is refreshing as well as instructive to recall the history of silver legislation in this country since 1792. The first silver dollar was coined in 1794. And from that time until 1806 less than one and one-half million silver dollars were coined. Owing to the ratio of 15 to 1 then existing between gold and silver, it was believed that our silver dollars went abroad and found a market and recoinage in France, as the ratio there was 15½ to 1.

President Jefferson, in order to retain, as he believed, our silver at home, laid his Democratic hand on the coinage of silver dollars, as will appear by the following copy of a letter written by the Secretary of State, Mr. Madison, to the Director of the Mint:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE, May 1, 1806.

SIR: In consequence of a representation from the director of the Bank of the United States that considerable purchases had been made of dollars coined at the mint for the purpose of exporting them, and it is probable that further purchases and exportations will be made, the President directs that all the silver coined at the mint shall be of small denominations, so that the value of the largest piece shall not exceed a half dollar.

I am, etc.,

JAMES MADISON, Secretary of State.

ROBERT PATTERSON, Esq.,

Director of the Mint.

At that time two half silver dollars were exactly the weight and value of a silver dollar. It therefore appears quite incomprehensible how such an order could have any material effect on the purchase and exportation of silver for recoinage and mintage purposes abroad. It would appear to most people that the cost and expense of exportation of 10,000 silver half dollars of precisely the same weight and value of 5,000 silver dollars would be practically the same. This evidently was an experiment in silver. The order so promulgated at the instance of Mr. Jefferson, although not a law, seems to have been obeyed for thirty-four years, and during such time and down to 1840 no silver dollars were coined. In 1840 the coinage of silver dollars was resumed and was continued in a tentative way until 1873. From 1840 to 1873 only about 7,000,000 of standard silver dollars were coined. In course of time it became quite apparent that the order promulgated at the instance of Mr. Jefferson relating to the coinage of silver did not have the desired effect, for, notwithstanding such order, silver still went abroad. Gradually it dawned upon the minds of statesmen that as two half dollars weighed as much as one standard dollar and were of the same value the difficulty was not merely in the coinage, but must be attributed to some other cause. Finally it was agreed that the commercial ratio of 15 to 1 between gold and silver, fixed under the act of 1792 upon recommendation of Mr. Hamilton, by and with the approval of Mr. Jefferson, was not quite right, as the ratio then existing in France was 15½ to 1. And this difference in value of about 3 per cent was sufficient inducement and profit to cause our silver to be exported. And to stop such exportation the act of June 28, 1834, was passed reducing the number of grains of gold in the eagle, half eagle, and quarter eagle theretofore prescribed by the original act of 1792.

It was believed that this change of about 6 per cent in the value of gold would keep silver at home. It did so, what little there was of it, but gold, being now undervalued, went abroad. This was, of course, unsatisfactory, and after nearly three years of trial, and on the 18th day of January, 1837, another act of Congress relating to mintage and coinage was passed. This act repealed the act of 1834 and changed the ratio theretofore existing between gold and silver and established it at practically 16 to 1.

It provided that of the silver coined the dollar should be of the weight of 412½ grains, nine-tenths fine; the half dollar should be of the weight of 206¼ grains, nine-tenths fine, and other fractional coins of like proportional grains. It also provided that the eagle should contain 258 grains of gold, nine-tenths fine, and smaller coinage a like proportional number of grains of gold.

From 1837 to 1853, a period of sixteen years, we had equal laws relating to gold and silver. But the production of the two metals during this time was not equal, largely because of the discovery of gold in California in 1849. The production was so heavily in favor of gold during this period that we had no just or practical experience with the two metals at the ratio of 16 to 1 under the act of 1837. The California gold fields were so vast and extensive, so wonderfully productive, that silver in the monetary race was distanced for the time being. And those friendly to the gold metal, ever alert, aggressive, and active, were not slow in taking advantage of the situation in fortifying and intrenching themselves behind legislation. In proof of this allegation I now refer to the act of February 21, 1853, entitled "An act amendatory of existing laws relative to half dollars, quarter dollars, dimes, and half dimes." So much of the act of 1853 as is pertinent to the discussion is as follows:

That from and after the 1st day of June, 1853, the weight of the half dollar or piece of 50 cents shall be 192 grains, and the quarter dollar, dime, and half dime shall be, respectively, one-half, one-fifth, and one-tenth of the weight of said half dollar.

At this time the number of grains in the standard silver dollar, as fixed by the act of 1837, was 412½ grains, and the half-dollar contained 206¼ grains, and all fractional coins were exact fractional parts of the silver dollar. Under the act of 1853 the silver half-dollar contained but 192 grains, or 14½ less grains of silver than under the act of 1837. In other words, it was made an inducement to the owners of silver bullion to coin it into fractional currency. This act discriminated against the standard silver dollar and in favor of fractional currency nearly 7 per cent. The owner of silver bullion by coining it into fractional currency instead of standard silver dollars would reap a profit of nearly \$70 in every thousand dollars coined. The profit was immense. As a necessary result standard silver dollars were not coined to any considerable extent while the act of 1853 remained in force.

The reason assigned for this legislation is well stated in the report of the chairman of the House Committee on Ways and Means, as follows:

We intend to do what the best writers on political economy have approved, what experience, where the experiment has been tried, has demonstrated to be necessary and proper, to make but one standard of currency and to make all others subservient to it. We mean to make gold the standard coin and to make those new silver coins applicable and convenient, not for large, but for small transactions.

Here is a plain declaration of the object sought to be accomplished by the act of 1853:

We mean to make gold the standard coin and to make the new silver coins applicable and convenient not for large, but for small transactions.

Gold for large transactions; silver for small transactions. The advocates of the single gold standard by this act attempted to put the nation on a gold-standard basis, and they were successful in their undertaking, in so far as such object could be attained by legislation. A bounty of nearly \$70 to the silver bullion owner on every thousand dollars of bullion coined was amply sufficient to induce the coining of it into fractional currency, especially when every two half dollars thus coined were the equal of a standard silver dollar in purchasing and debt-paying power. From 1853 to 1861 all large transactions were in gold and small ones in silver. The legislation of 1853 was Democratic. Both branches of Congress were overwhelmingly Democratic. The President was "I am a Democrat." And thus the silver dollar was demonetized by Democracy. Not by direct means, because Democracy never moves in straight lines, but rather prides itself upon indirect methods. This act dealt such a fatal blow to the silver dollar that from 1853 to 1873 less than eight millions were coined. This act just as effectually destroyed the parity and equality between gold and silver as the much scandalized act of 1873. If the act of 1873, by its direct method in demonetizing the standard silver dollar, was "the greatest crime of the nineteenth century," then, pursuing the same line of declamation, the act of 1853 in its indirect method of demonetizing the standard silver dollar was the greatest crime of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.

From 1861 to 1873 we had no opportunity of fairly testing the equality of the metals. The rebellion of 1861 retired to private life gold and silver. Both could not maintain the flag in the heavens. They were not sufficient in amount and patriotism. The constitutional rock of finance was struck by loyal hands and bounteous streams of revenue leaped forth. The greenback and bluecoat became very much in evidence. This was long before the greenback had been wrought into an endless chain by a discredited and shortly to be ended Democratic Administration. The unity of the States and the integrity of the nation were preserved and maintained. And a few years after the close of that memorable contest

gold and silver, having finished their period of retirement and mission abroad, came "swaggering" home to find a dwelling place beneath the stars, boasting their loyalty and patriotism. If the purpose of the Democratic act of 1853 was to establish a gold standard and to make gold convenient and applicable "to large transactions and silver to smaller ones," then it is quite apparent that the act of 1873 was merely supplemental to such act, or merely a continuation of the Democratic act of 1853. And I presume it was so understood at the time by the Democratic party, as I find by the RECORD that the great leaders of that party in the Senate voted for the act of February 12, 1873, now popularly referred to as "the crime of 1873." Thurman, Bayard, Salisbury, and others voted for this "alleged crime."

Very much has been said about the act of 1873 which is not true. It has been claimed that it was surreptitiously passed; that it went through Congress with "the stealthy tread of a cat."

Anyone at all conversant with the record knows that this is imagination pure and simple, originating, perhaps, from troubled and disordered minds. Few bills were ever more thoroughly discussed. It was before Congress for nearly three years. Its Congressional career is recorded on more than 140 pages. It is true that the act of 1873 prescribed that the unit of value should be gold. It was done in direct language, recording the practical result of the Democratic act of 1853. It is also true that the bill was discussed to no considerable extent by the press of the country; but this is not unusual. Everyone knows that important bills are passed at every session of Congress which are not discussed by the press generally. The fact that silver as a commodity was at a premium at the time is to my mind the principal reason why the act of 1873 did not provoke more discussion. Silver bullion was at that time, largely because of its scarcity and because of its demand for other uses, worth from 3 to 4 per cent more than gold in the market. The silver barons of the West, if they thought about it at all, had not the slightest idea but that it would continue at a premium, and because thereof some of the present free silver extremists voted for the act of 1873—an act to which they now refer when a safe distance from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as "the greatest crime of the nineteenth century."

The senior Senator of one of the silver States who now loads the air by day and by night with his free-silver lamentations voted for the act of 1873, and in its advocacy said:

I want the standard gold; no paper money not redeemable in gold; no paper money the value of which is not ascertained; no paper money that will organize a gold board to speculate in. Gold is the universal standard of the world. Everybody knows what a dollar in gold is worth.

His demand for gold and his championship of the so-called crime of 1873 was loud, long, aggressive, and most persistent. This same Senator now leads in the cause of silver with as much vehemence and energy as he did then in the cause of gold. As champion par excellence he stands preeminently at the head of a party which demands that the standard silver dollar shall be restored to its coinage place, as in the law of 1837—a unit of value, full legal tender, of the weight of 412½ grains—and that upon one side thereof there shall be an impression emblematical of liberty and upon the other the eagle. And the love for the white metal is now so ardent that all the people of all the world, irrespective of race, color, or previous condition, are invited to bring their silver, coined or uncoined, to our mints, which shall be open to them for the coining of their silver, without cost, into standard American dollars, each of the value of a gold dollar, which shall have an impression thereon of liberty and of the eagle, irrespective of its value as a commodity or of its quantity.

The silver monometallist claims that the act of 1873 struck down one-half of our constitutional money. This is a serious charge, if true. I think I have already shown that if silver has ever been stricken down by an act of legislation it was by the act of 1853. I would therefore kindly suggest to the free-silver Democrats and Populists, who appear to be joined in wedlock by silver bonds, the propriety of redating their marriage certificate from 1873 to 1853. The truth is that we did not really begin to coin silver into money to any considerable extent until after the passage of the so-called demonetization act of 1873.

From the passage of the act of 1873 up to 1878 the coined silver trade dollars amounted to \$31,699,460, and from 1878 to 1893 \$4,266,460 more were coined, making in all 35,965,924 trade dollars. And each of these trade dollars contained 7½ grains more of silver than the standard silver dollar. And from 1873 to 1878 the mints were busy coining silver halves, quarters, and dimes, amounting to the enormous sum of \$47,073,863, making a grand total of silver coinage for these five years of \$78,722,323.

The silver industry was booming, the mints in full blast, notwithstanding the alleged crime of 1873. The silver extremists strenuously claim that fully one-half of all the silver mined in America is used in the arts and for purposes other than coinage.

There is probably much truth in this statement, and for the purpose of this argument I shall assume it to be true. It follows

then that practically all the silver of America from 1873 to 1893 was coined into money, except that used in the arts and for other than mintage purposes.

From the passage of the Bland-Allison Act of 1878 until November, 1893, when the Sherman Act was repealed, we coined of standard silver dollars \$421,175,051. From 1878 to November, 1893, we coined of fractional silver currency \$23,844,365. The silver account from 1873 to November, 1893, when summed up, is as follows: Standard dollars, \$421,175,051; fractional silver, \$70,817,227; trade dollars, \$35,965,924; total silver coinage, \$527,958,202.

Practically amounting to one-half of all the silver mined during those twenty years, and all this vast sum has been coined since the alleged crime of 1873. Only about eight millions of silver dollars were coined prior to that time, or during twenty years, practically under Republican Administration, we coined nearly seventy times as much silver into money as during all the preceding eighty years. Does it not look very much as though the so-called crime of 1873 is largely a Democratic and Populistic nightmare?

The United States stock of silver is now estimated at about six hundred and twenty-five millions, of which sum about five hundred and forty-seven millions is full legal tender for general purposes, and some seventy-five millions in fractional coin possessing limited legal-tender qualities.

Notwithstanding the alleged "greatest crime of the nineteenth century," we have coined more silver and have more silver money now than Russia, Germany, Austria, and Great Britain all combined, and more silver money than France. Does it not appear as though the "great and awful crime of 1873," in so far as silver is concerned, was a blessing in disguise to silver-mine owners? During twenty years time they put upon the Government nearly \$500,000,000 of silver. While the Government was buying silver of the mine owner, was consuming his product, it purchased no large quantities of wheat or corn from the farmer, or of iron, or lead from mine owners. For twenty years the Treasury of the United States has been the dumping ground and market place of the silver barons.

Since 1873 the production of silver has greatly increased. By the discovery of new processes the cost of production has been greatly facilitated and cheapened. As a natural consequence, the increase of the production lessens its price as a commodity, in the same manner as like large productions of corn and wheat cheapen such commodities. Notwithstanding the extensive use of silver as money, it has steadily depreciated as a commodity since 1873. The silver monometallist claims that as a necessary result flowing from the act of 1873 property has been cheapened, and, figuratively speaking, cut in two. The gold monometallist claims that since the act of 1873 the price of property has held its own or advanced in value, and that the people have benefited thereby.

A strange law, indeed, if such contentions are true—that at the same time it raises and lowers the values of similar property similarly situated. Of course, this can not be true.

The silver extremist exclaims that 50-cent silver produces 50-cent wheat and fifty-dollar horses. The gold extremist exclaims, it produces 40-cent corn and seventy-five-dollar steers, and thus the contention goes bravely on between the theorists. The bimetalist claims that the act of 1873 has necessarily and logically no effect upon cheapening wheat or horses, and at the same time enhancing the price of corn or steers. All such changes in value can be accounted for in accordance with facts and a moderate application of common sense.

In some parts of the country farm lands have increased in value from \$5 to \$50 per acre, and in other localities they have depreciated from \$50 to \$5 or less per acre. It is not possible that such enhanced and depreciated prices are caused at the same time by the alleged crime of 1873, but by other causes and conditions.

One faction exclaims that an increase of our circulating medium to \$40 per capita would enhance the price of all commodities. The other contends if there is enough money and credit with which to easily transact the business of the country an enlarged per capita circulation would not necessarily appreciate the price of lands and commodities; that five hundred millions of business is easily transacted with ten millions of actual money; that the business of this great country is carried on with an actual cash capital of 5 per cent on the dollar of its value. One side refers to France with its \$40 per capita, and the other to England, Germany, and Russia with their \$20 and less per capita. And then the inquiry comes, If the circulating medium in France is double that in England, Germany, or Russia, why are not like commodities twice as high in France as in England, Germany, or Russia? We all know they are not, and that there is a common price level for all like commodities in those countries, and that the per capita theory does not accord with actual facts.

But why follow the line of argument of these extremists further? We know that their theories run counter to facts and experience, and therefore should not be followed. What, then, should be done to restore prosperity to the languishing industries of the country?

Before answering this question I wish to pay my respects a little more fully to the pretended love of Democracy for the white metal. The Democratic party in its national platform of 1893 demanded in effect the repeal of the Sherman Act of 1890, under and in pursuance of which nearly fifty millions of standard silver dollars were annually added to the currency.

If all the silver of all the world is to be coined into standard silver dollars, then I fail to see why the coinage of about fifty millions of standard silver dollars per annum was not a pretty good thing, as it practically consumed the entire annual American product of silver, less that used in the arts and for other purposes. It so appears to me, and for fear that I may be misunderstood I now quote from a speech delivered in the Senate on February 18, 1893, by one of the greatest Democrats of the nineteenth century. Among other things he said:

I would have voted the other day to take up what is known as the Sherman Act and for its repeal but for the fact that its passage would absolutely demonetize silver and leave it unsupported by not one word of legislation. I thought the measure was audacious. I thought it was an outrage to ask men like myself and others to absolutely sweep from under the silver currency every vestige of law. That is not what we meant at Chicago. That is not what the people mean. I would not vote for the repeal of the Sherman Act because it is vicious in principle, but it must be connected with something better.

A few months later the repeal came, at the special session of 1893, without any reservation or limitation.

This is not at all strange, for we are told that in those days Democratic conversions were very numerous and very rapid, some of them in speed almost rivaling that of "Saul of Tarsus," who was converted "in the twinkling of an eye." This much, however, should be said in Saul's favor: He was marching on to no administrative pie counter.

It is true the repealing act contains something more than was necessary for an actual repeal of the Sherman Act; but is this the something better intimated? If so, then it logically follows that nothing is something better in connection with silver.

The repealing clause says:

It is hereby declared to be the policy of the United States to continue the use of both gold and silver as standard money, etc.

Silver had then been practically demonetized by the Democratic act of 1853 for more than forty years. Yet this repealing clause says it is the policy to continue the use of both gold and silver as standard money. How can a thing not in existence be continued? Shall the dead live again without resurrection?

Silver as a unit of value was eliminated by the act of 1873. It no longer went to the mint on an equality with gold.

For more than twenty years it was treated as a commodity by legislation, yet it is declared by this repealing clause to be the policy to continue the use of both gold and silver as standard money. By "standard money" is meant primary money, redemption money, money on an equality and parity in every respect.

Is this what is meant by the word "continue" in the repealing act, when the equality did not exist and had not existed for forty years—certainly not for twenty? Was not the currency by the repeal of the Sherman Act contracted nearly fifty millions per annum? And was not this repeal under Democratic Administration? And were not both branches of Congress Democratic? Therefore, the striking down of silver and the contraction of the currency nearly \$50,000,000 per annum must be charged to the Democratic party. I know that some Republicans voted for its repeal, and I also know that some alleged Democrats voted against its repeal. However, the bill emanated from a Democratic Finance Committee; it passed a Democratic House, a Democratic Senate, and was approved by the greatest of all living, yet politically dead, Democrats, and thereby it became a Democratic act.

It is well known that the President and his followers are gold monometallists, and that the present bill, if it should pass both branches of Congress, would never become a law. It is also apparent that the people now believe Democracy incapable of properly administering national affairs. Whenever it has been intrusted with power by the people it has signally failed. Its theories, traditions, beliefs, tendencies, and policies are not in harmony with national supremacy. In 1846 it passed a bill known as the "Walker tariff." This act was practically in force until 1861. During those years the balance of trade was against us nearly \$437,000,000, and this vast sum had to be paid in gold. During such time more than four hundred millions in American gold went abroad. This balance represented just that amount of business which should have been done in this country by American labor and capital. From a Democratic standpoint this was a great tariff bill. Under it our gold went abroad and our labor was largely done in foreign lands. Democracy was so enamored of this act that in 1848 they resolved at their national convention—

That the fruits of the great political triumphs which elected James K. Polk have fulfilled the hopes of the Democracy of the Union in the noble impulse given to the cause of free trade by the repeal of the tariff of 1842 and the creation of the more equal, honest, and productive tariff of 1846.

The tariff act of 1842 was protective. The tariff act of 1846 was practically free trade. The balance of trade under the tariff act

of 1842, during the four years of its existence, was in our favor \$40,092,164. This balance was paid with foreign gold. Democracy extolled the act of 1846 as productive in revenue. This was a misconception. It was productive, not in revenue, but in the exportation of gold and in the transportation of business and labor abroad. It was truly "a noble impulse given to the cause of free trade," from a Democratic standpoint. It built up and stimulated industries abroad and destroyed those at home. Mr. Buchanan was at last compelled to say the following of this Democratic measure:

With all the elements of natural wealth in abundance, our manufactories were suspended, our useful public and private enterprises were arrested, and thousands of laborers were deprived of employment and reduced to want.

Some amendments were made to the act of 1846, some more ad valorem duties were imposed. Yet gold went abroad and labor was not done at home. Our revenues for current expenses were insufficient. Bonds bearing a high rate of interest were sold at a large discount in order to raise money to supply the deficiency. The condition of the people was most deplorable. Little money in circulation, and Democratic State banks broken and insolvent. History repeats itself. In 1892, Democracy, hungry, bold, and defiant, made an assault upon the business interests of the country. It boldly announced that the method which had been pursued for more than a half century in raising revenue, principally by indirect taxation, was a fraud, and it was intimated that such taxation was unconstitutional. Upon this issue Democracy was intrusted with power in the legislative and executive branches of the Government. Immediately upon its becoming known that the Government had passed under Democratic control, business faltered and fell by the wayside, manufactories were shut down, and large numbers of men and women were thrown out of employment; banks failed; railroads went into the hands of receivers; consternation and panic stalked throughout the land. Amid all this disaster, and to add still more to the misery of the people, the industries of ten States and Territories were almost annihilated and our currency contracted many millions annually by the repeal of the Sherman Act. In 1893, after having repealed the Sherman Act, Democracy, still bold and defiant, destroyed the tariff bill of 1890 and turned to the act of 1846 for inspiration. It consulted its "curios and antiques," and brought forth, after much travail, another act of "perfidy and dishonor."

It took up again the noble impulse in the cause of free trade where it had left off in 1846. The general effect upon our industries under the Wilson bill of 1894 was the same as under the act of 1846, only more deplorable. Again, "with all the elements of natural wealth in abundance, our manufactures were suspended, our useful public and private enterprises were arrested, and thousands of laborers were deprived of employment and reduced to want."

We are now informed by Democracy that the Wilson bill is a great getter of revenue; even more productive and luxuriant than the McKinley bill; that it produces ample revenue to pay current expenses. Of course this statement is not generally believed to be true.

Under the McKinley bill, while Republicans were in control, ample revenues were collected to pay current expenses, and large annual reductions were made in the national debt. Our labor was done at home and our gold did not go abroad. The balance of trade under this act was in our favor for the year ended June 30, 1891, \$39,564,614; for the year ended June 30, 1892, \$202,875,686. The balance of trade from June 30, 1892, up to and until the election in November, 1892, was largely in our favor. The result of that election immediately paralyzed business, and the balance of trade on June 30, 1893, under President Cleveland was against us \$18,737,728. And it has been ever since enormously against us. Since March 4, 1893, more than \$350,000,000 in gold has gone abroad. The national debt has been increased by the sale of over \$162,000,000 of bonds and is soon to be increased \$100,000,000 more, which vast sums of money have been and will be ultimately used in paying the current expenses of the Government. It therefore appears from a Democratic standpoint that an empty Treasury under a free-trade bill and an annual increase of the national debt by the sale of interest-bearing obligations with which to raise money to pay current expenses is preferable to a full Treasury under a protective bill and the annual reduction of the national debt. The severest blows ever dealt American labor and American industries were delivered at the election in November, 1892, and by the subsequent enactment of the Wilson bill in 1894. From the wounds thus inflicted labor and capital have not yet recovered and will not for years to come. The true date of the Wilson bill in its destructive effects was November, 1892, and not August, 1894. The days of Buchanan over again. Selling bonds to obtain money to fill empty treasuries in time of peace. The gold of the country going abroad and the labor of the country being done by foreign hands on foreign soil. One declaring that a State had no right to secede, yet he could find no constitutional power to coerce a sovereign State; the other annulling the Monroe doc-

trine in one of its most important features. Then, as now, Democracy believed in State rights, State banks, free trade, and a gold standard.

Mr. President, a majority of the people demand two things: First, the enactment of a tariff law not quite so prohibitive in some respects as the McKinley bill and not quite so luxuriant in its free list; second, the coinage of American silver only at the ratio of 16 to 1. The people believe with a proper tariff law the balance of trade will be speedily restored and foreign gold will flow into the Treasury; and that with the coinage of American silver the money of the country will not be so easily cornered, and that panics and lockouts will not so frequently occur. We are told, however, that even the coinage of the American product would greatly inflate prices. I hardly believe this statement to be true. In case of free coinage of the American product, our mines would probably produce annually from seventy-five to eighty million dollars for a few years, when the output would undoubtedly decrease, as many mines by that time would be worked out and exhausted.

There must be an end to silver mining in this country whether we have free silver coinage or not, because large quantities of silver will be annually required for use in the arts and other purposes; many millions are now annually shipped abroad. The end, however, would come more quickly with free coinage, because of a larger use of silver. It is estimated that from \$25,000,000 to \$30,000,000 in value of silver per annum is used in the arts and for other purposes. If this is true, then with the coinage of the American product our mintage of silver dollars and fractional currency would probably not exceed forty or forty-five million dollars per annum. Thus it will be seen that our increase of money per capita would be less than 75 cents per annum—an amount hardly sufficient to inflate the currency to any appreciable extent, nor sufficient to cause decadence and decay, nor, if we relied upon this only, to bring much prosperity. It is quite apparent that free coinage of silver will not work miracles nor do all that is claimed for it by its advocates. It also ought to be equally apparent to the gold-standard apostle that an increase of less than \$1 per capita in our circulating medium per annum would not cause panic and disaster. With the free coinage of the silver produced in America it would take fully ten years of constant and active mining and the work of our mints to their fullest capacity to increase our circulating medium as much as \$5 per capita. And in all human probability at the expiration of that time the production of silver in this country would gradually decrease instead of increase, because of the exhaustion of many of the mines. Is it not apparent, therefore, that the crimination and recrimination of the extremists are without substance or just foundation?

To most people the battle now being waged between them appears harmless, and its resemblance to those of Don Quixote with the wind mills very striking. Exaggeration seems to be a potent weapon. Facts are not wanted; theories predominate.

From the loud and persistent assertions of the free-silver Democrats and Populists some are led to believe that since 1873 our industries have been paralyzed, and that as a nation we have not progressed. The truth is, we never had much prosperity or much business in this country until after the rebellion of 1861; and the golden age of American industries was between 1865 and 1893.

During that time we constructed and equipped more than 100,000 miles of railroad, and in such business expended more than a half million dollars daily. We settled the public domain, organized States, and built cities. America stepped to the front as the greatest manufacturing nation of the world, and to-day she exceeds in power England, France, and Germany combined. In the field of labor one American is the equal of two Englishmen, two Frenchmen, or two Germans. In agricultural pursuits here one American can produce as much as two Englishmen, three Frenchmen, four Germans, or five Austrians. In the last thirty years the inventive genius of man has taken new flights. We have outrun all other nations in intelligence, wealth, and enterprise, and to-day 70,000,000 of Americans own one-quarter of all the wealth of all the world. During those years our progress was marvelous, incomparable. Therefore, Mr. President, does it not plainly appear that the silver question has been expanded beyond all reasonable proportions by extremists; its benefit or injury most grossly exaggerated? It is not, in my opinion, the greatest and most important question of the hour. It is not the sole cause of hard times by any means.

There are other industries which are now languishing that far exceed in value and importance the production of the silver mines.

Less than 2 per cent of the land of the great State of Colorado is under cultivation, yet its annual agricultural productions exceed in value its annual silver output. The agricultural products of Kansas for the year 1895 exceed in value the entire silver output of the Western States for any one year. The value of the products and commodities produced annually in America exceed many hundred times the annual output of the American silver mines. Thus we see that the silver product per annum is almost

infinitesimal when compared with the aggregate value of our other products and commodities.

It is but a drop in the great commercial bucket. Therefore is it not apparent that the effect of the coinage of the American silver would not be injuriously felt, and that the danger apprehended by the gold monometallist is largely theoretical and imaginary? The greatest benefit to be derived from the coinage of American silver would be to give employment to a few thousand idle laborers, the investment of some capital, and a slow, gradual, and healthful expansion of our primary or redemption money. The inflation of the currency caused by the coinage of the American product, I believe, would be beneficial, not injurious.

It would stimulate business some, but it alone would not produce general prosperity. Our misfortune is not wholly due to the demonetization of silver or a failure to coin it, although it is a factor which enters into the situation to some extent.

In my opinion there is a vastly more important question involved than the mere coinage of silver. When I see the champions of Democracy parading around the prostrate form of the silver queen, shedding copious floods of briny tears, I am led to believe that such great show of grief and sorrow is not from the heart, but rather in the nature of an exhibition before a susceptible public for political purposes. The majority of the American people do not believe in the tenets of Democracy. They have overthrown its most sacred principles, State rights, State banks, and free trade. And in my opinion they will resent its assumed leadership in finance. In the past Democratic theories have been unsound, Democratic policies unfortunate. Why will they not prove equally so in the future? What new and recent assurances have the people that they will be safe leaders in the cause of bimetallism? In discussing this question we must not forget the glorious history of the Republican party or its fundamental principles. Free speech, free schools, free press, free ballot, protection to American industries and American labor, and a currency as national as the flag and as strong as the Government. All other questions are minor and subordinate, and upon such minor questions Republicans can not afford to be led into Democratic and Populistic camps with the vain and delusive cry of the free and unlimited coinage of all the silver of all the world unaided and alone at the ratio of 16 to 1.

In my opinion, the chief cause of our misfortune originated first in the great and unfortunate mistake made by the people in the election of November, 1892, conferring power upon the Democratic party. And this most deplorable mistake was intensified by unfortunate laws relating to our revenues which Democracy placed upon the statute book. The Wilson bill is too near a free-trade act to suit the industries of the nation. Its blighting and destructive effect has been felt in all branches of industry. Nearly three years of Democratic administration has proved more expensive to the people than the national debt incurred because of the rebellion of 1861. Thus we learn that some things are more expensive though not quite so deplorable as war. When we shall have placed upon the statute book a proper revenue bill, then American labor will find full hours of employment at home and good compensation. Then the balance of trade will be in our favor and not against us. Then gold will come from abroad and remain in the Treasury, and the endless chain will be no more. Then the mints of the country can be safely opened to the coinage of American silver only. Then the fears of the gold monometallist as to the danger of bimetallism will have disappeared. His disordered brain will have assumed its normal condition. Then in the head of the silver extremist wheels will cease to revolve. Exaggeration will be forgotten. Then prosperity and contentment will be in every home, gladness will penetrate every heart, and labor will make the nation resound with its joyous acclaim. Then Democracy, what little there is of it, will again consult its "curios and antiques" and arrange its feeble battle lines along State rights, State banks, and free trade. The loud clarion voice of Populism will be heard no more in the land, sounding the praises of the free and unlimited coinage of all the silver of all the world at the ratio of 16 to 1.

Its voice will be lower, and in sad and melancholy tones it will sing of the beauties of irredeemable paper money based upon nothing, and of the inestimable blessing to be derived from free subtreasuries, maintained at governmental expense, in which the people may store their perishable and nonperishable products.

Mr. President, I do not believe that the issue of all issues at this time is the money question. I fully realize that the question is at the front, not, however, because of its merit only, but rather because of hard times, caused largely, if not wholly, by bad legislation, and because of its industrious and persistent cultivation by ambitious men, aided by the discarded and dissatisfied politicians of the old parties.

Mr. President, I am ready and willing at this time to vote for the free coinage of the silver produced in the United States only, not because money is the paramount issue of the hour, but rather because I believe that we are shortly to have more favorable laws

governing our greater and more important industries, when prosperity will return.

And then good, and only good, in my judgment, can come by an increase in our redemption or primary money. I am also ready and willing to vote for a bill providing for the coinage of our silver at the rate of 16 to 1 as an object lesson. If the law proves beneficial we will retain it; if injurious, repeal it.

Whatever the result, it will stand as a monument on the highway of time as a warning or blessing to those coming hereafter. Our country is too wealthy, our resources too great, to be permanently injured by the experiment.

Mr. President, the people, as demonstrated by the elections of 1893, 1894, and 1895, have determined to place the entire control of this great Government in the hands of the Republican party as speedily as possible. It is ready and willing to accept the great trust so to be devolved. It will meet every question and decide it properly. It will be equal to every emergency. It will settle the questions of tariff and finance unaided and alone. It will establish and maintain the equality and parity between gold and silver at the ratio of 16 to 1 to the entire satisfaction of the people. Then we shall have no personal Administration in opposition to the will of the people. The people will never forget that whatever there is in this Government for the last thirty-five years worthy of emulation or preservation is due solely to the wisdom, statesmanship, and patriotism of the Republican party. In the future, as in the past, guided by that power which controls the destinies of men and of nations, its mission will still be onward and upwards.

Mr. NELSON. I had intended to submit some remarks upon the pending measure to-day, but it is now rather late in the day and I will let it go over until Monday, when I shall ask for a short time the privilege of submitting a few remarks upon the bill.

#### ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I move that when the Senate adjourn to-day it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to.

#### POTOMAC RIVER MEMORIAL BRIDGE.

Mr. DANIEL. I ask unanimous consent to call up the bill (S. 176) to provide for the construction of a memorial bridge across the Potomac River, which has been reported from the Committee on Commerce with amendments. I will state, if I may, sir, that this bill is very heartily recommended by the Secretary of War, who regards it as important for military purposes, and it has the earnest support in this body of a distinguished gentleman who was the Secretary of War under a former Administration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PLATT in the chair). The Senator from Virginia asks unanimous consent that the pending measure may be temporarily laid aside for the purpose of proceeding to the consideration of the bill indicated by him. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill at this time?

Mr. PUGH. I understand that the consideration of that bill will not interfere with the unfinished business?

Mr. DANIEL. Not at all.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Not at all. Unanimous consent is asked.

Mr. CHANDLER. By unanimous consent it can be done.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the bill is before the Senate as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. BLANCHARD. One moment, Mr. President. I was on my feet not for the purpose of objecting to the bill, but before unanimous consent is given I should like to ask the Senator from Virginia if it is anywhere provided in the bill that one-half of the expense of this structure shall be paid by the District of Columbia?

Mr. DANIEL. No.

Mr. BLANCHARD. I hope the Senator will agree to an amendment to that effect. Otherwise I shall feel constrained to object to the bill, much as I dislike to do it.

Mr. DANIEL. If the Senator will allow the bill to be read I think I can appropriately answer his suggestion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair must inquire whether there is objection to the present consideration of the bill.

Mr. BLANCHARD. I reserve the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is before the Senate as in Committee of the Whole and will be read.

Mr. BLANCHARD. The bill is before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understood the Senator from Louisiana to state that he does not object to its consideration.

Mr. BLANCHARD. I have arranged with the Senator from Virginia about it. I do not object.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to the consideration of the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce with amendments.

The amendments were, in section 2, line 1, after the word "That," to strike out "the cost of said bridge shall not exceed the sum of,

\$600,000; and"; in line 5, after the word "of," to strike out "securing designs and of commencing the construction of said bridge; which," and insert "making the necessary surveys, soundings, and borings on the line of the proposed bridge, and for securing designs and estimates of cost of said bridge, which"; so as to make the section read:

SEC. 2. That the sum of \$100,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the purpose of making the necessary surveys, soundings, and borings on the line of the proposed bridge, and for securing designs and estimates of cost of said bridge, which shall be used exclusively for foot passenger and vehicles, and prohibited to all tramways, whether propelled by steam, electric, cable, horse, or other power.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, the bill having been perfected, I beg leave to say just a few words.

The report of the Secretary of War is not yet published in the form in which we usually have it, but no doubt Senators have read it. In that report will be found the considerations set forth in favor of the erection of this bridge by the United States Government. There is an important military post near the capital, at Fort Myer, just across the river. In addition to that, the Government is the owner of the soil. It owns some 1,100 acres of land adjacent to the city, the former Arlington estate, in which is a large national cemetery, and on which also is an immense flat, near the Potomac, which the Secretary of War considers would be of desirable use for troops in maneuvering and drilling and for the large bodies which often visit the capital to encamp.

The considerations set forth by the Secretary of War in favor of this bridge are that it is to be erected for the purpose of connecting the national capital with the military post which is its guard and with the property which is under the control of the Secretary of War, which holds a great national cemetery and a field appropriate for future military uses, both of the Army and the militia. These considerations are so weighty that in considering them we should lose sight of any view as to the mere government of the District of Columbia. I think, sir, that this is a fair charge directly upon the Treasury of the United States. It not only has the support of the present Secretary of War, but the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. ELKINS], who once occupied that position during the Administration of President Harrison, is now one of the committee which has passed upon and is supporting this bill.

I hope it may be the pleasure of the Senator from Louisiana to recognize the broad national considerations from a military point of view which have controlled the advocacy of this bill on the part of the War Department, and that he may not offer the amendment which had occurred to his mind, and which would be very pertinent and just if this were a mere local improvement for the benefit of the city of Washington. Though incidentally advantages will undoubtedly accrue both to the District of Columbia and to the State of Virginia, the chief benefit is that to be derived by the Government of the United States, which for its convenience desires this bridge to connect the national capital with the military post which defends it, with the military cemetery which is so often visited by citizens of this country from all portions of it, and with a military parade ground upon which both regular troops and militia and other large bodies may encamp.

An additional consideration is found in the fact that should the Government ever desire to dispose of any portion of this large area the accretion in value would be immense.

Mr. President, access to the national capital ought to be made easy to the citizens who approach it from any quarter, and communication between the Headquarters of the Army and the fortifications which concern it should also be made by an easy highway always ready to be used. It is a shame, in my humble judgment, that we have so long neglected this matter and that communication is so poor and imperfect between the capital and the places to which I have referred.

I will now throw myself upon the magnanimity and place myself at the mercy of the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. BLANCHARD. Mr. President, I did not rise a while ago for the purpose of preventing the passage of this bill for the construction of a memorial bridge across the Potomac River to connect the District directly with the military post at Fort Myer and with the national cemetery at Arlington. I believe the bridge should be built. I agree with the Senator from Virginia that the facilities for crossing the Potomac River at the city of Washington are inadequate. My purpose chiefly was to suggest the propriety of the payment of one-half of the expense by the District of Columbia.

The Government of the United States pays now and has been paying for many years past, certainly as long as I have had any connection with either House of Congress, one-half of the public expenditures in the District of Columbia. That was all right so long as Washington was a straggling town, but now when Washington has grown to the colossal proportions of a city of 250,000 people, it is not just to the people of the United States at large

that the Federal Treasury should continue to be taxed to pay one-half of the municipal expenses of the District. This system had its origin in the idea that the Government owned one-half of the area of the city of Washington; hence, should bear one-half of the expenses of the city. But in order to debit the Government with the ownership of half of the area of the city, they charged the area occupied by the streets and avenues to the Government. This was done when Washington was a small town as compared with its proportions now. Now, Mr. President, it is not right to charge to the Government the streets of the city. They are common to everyone and should be excluded from the computation.

Mr. FAULKNER. Will the Senator from Louisiana permit me to correct him there?

Mr. BLANCHARD. Certainly; if I am in error I desire to be corrected.

Mr. FAULKNER. Fifty-one per cent in area of the entire property within the limits of the city of Washington is in streets and reservations, not counting at all the property owned by the Government, on which its public buildings are situated, nor does it include the hundreds of lots owned by the Government as proprietor, and which the Government has the power to sell and is selling at different times, paying no taxes whatever upon it.

Mr. BLANCHARD. My remarks had reference not to the structures erected by the Government on lands owned by it, but to the area constituting the city of Washington. By the Senator's own statement 50 or 51 per cent of this area is in streets and parks. This must be according to a survey made a long time ago. I venture to say a survey made now would show no such results. Washington has been built up and spreads out over a large space.

The time has come, and I hope in the near future it will crystallize into law, when the amount that the Government will be called upon to pay of the municipal expenditures of the city of Washington will be less than one-half. What was fair and just in this regard twenty-five years ago ceases to be so now. Conditions have changed, but the policy complained of has not changed; it still exists.

Inasmuch, then, as we are still contributing one-half out of the public Treasury to the expenses of the District of Columbia, it is not an injustice to ask that when structures of this kind are sought to be built, connecting the District of Columbia with the adjacent Virginia shore, one-half of the expense of such structure should be borne by the District.

If I mistake not, one-half of the expense of the bridge that spans the Potomac River at Georgetown was paid by the District. If I am in error in this, I trust the Senator from Virginia or the chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia will correct me. If that bridge was constructed by the joint expenditure of moneys pertaining to the District of Columbia and the Federal Treasury, why should not the same rule obtain in regard to this bridge, which, though it is called a memorial bridge, is nothing but an additional bridge over the Potomac River for the accommodation of the District of Columbia and the people who desire to cross the river to get into the District?

Mr. President, I shall not object to the consideration of the bill by the Senate. There was an understanding between the Senator from Virginia and myself that, notwithstanding the fact the bill was laid before the Senate, if I insisted upon urging an objection, it would go over. I do not insist upon its going over, but I do hope the Senator from Virginia will accept an amendment which I offer to the bill. I send up to be read by the Secretary a proviso to be appended at the end of the second section of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana moves to further amend the bill by adding to it what will be read by the Secretary.

The SECRETARY. At the end of the bill add the following proviso:

*Provided*, That one-half of the cost of said bridge shall be paid by the District of Columbia and one-half by the United States.

Mr. DANIEL. I can not acquiesce in the amendment. I would be glad to have it passed upon by the Senate, but it hardly seems to me to be just.

Mr. CHANDLER. I do not want to object to the bill if this amendment can be adopted. I will vote for it if we can have the bill disposed of, so that we can proceed to the consideration of executive business. If there is to be further debate I must object to the further consideration of the bill at this time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

Mr. VEST subsequently said: I enter a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill in regard to the memorial bridge was passed,

on account of an amendment which I understand was adopted while I was temporarily absent from the Chamber. If I had been here I should have expressed my opinion about it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion to reconsider will be entered.

#### LANDS AT PORT ROYAL, S. C.

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

Mr. TILLMAN. Will the Senator from New Hampshire withdraw that motion for a moment?

Mr. CHANDLER. Certainly. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. TILLMAN. I ask unanimous consent to call up the bill (S. 1297) to provide for the purchase of lands adjoining the United States naval station, Port Royal, S. C., a small bill which the Navy Department wishes to have passed, and which has been reported by the Committee on Naval Affairs favorably.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Naval Affairs with an amendment, in section 2, line 2, before the word "thousand," to strike out "ten" and insert "three"; so as to make the section read:

That for the purchase of the lands hereinbefore described there is hereby appropriated the sum of \$3,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated.

Mr. TILLMAN. I move to amend the amendment of the committee by increasing the amount from \$3,000 to \$5,000. I have conferred with the Secretary of the Navy, and this is proposed in order to gain time. It is feared that the land will not be sold if an amount so small as \$3,000 is offered for it. I have consulted the members of the committee and they have agreed that the amendment I propose shall be made. I ask, therefore, that \$5,000 shall be inserted as the amount named.

Mr. CHANDLER. That is the appropriate amount which should be inserted.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

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

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

#### FORT ASSINNIBOINE MILITARY RESERVATION.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. President—

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. CARTER. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 626) providing for disposal of lands on abandoned portions of the Fort Assiniboine Military Reservation in Montana, and for the relief of certain settlers thereon.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. CARTER. There are certain amendments reported by the Committee on Public Lands which I ask to have considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments reported by the committee will be stated.

The amendments reported by the Committee on Public Lands were, in section 1, line 10, before the word "act," to strike out "an" and insert "any," and at the end of the section to insert:

*Provided*, That if the entire reservation be abandoned for military purposes this act shall not apply to an area 1 mile square embracing the Government buildings at Fort Assiniboine.

So as to make the section read:

That all lands which have been or may hereafter be excluded from the limits of the Fort Assiniboine Military Reservation in the State of Montana shall be open to the operation of the laws regulating homestead entry, except section 2301 of the Revised Statutes, and to entry under the town-site laws and the laws governing the disposal of coal lands, desert lands, and mineral lands, and shall not be subject to sale under the provisions of any act relating to the sale of abandoned military reservations: *Provided*, That if the entire reservation be abandoned for military purposes this act shall not apply to an area 1 mile square embracing the Government buildings at Fort Assiniboine.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

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

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. CHANDLER. I now renew my motion 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 five minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 4 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, January 27, 1896, at 12 o'clock meridian.

#### NOMINATIONS.

*Executive nominations received by the Senate January 24, 1896.*

##### UNITED STATES MARSHAL.

Patrick S. Nagle, of Oklahoma Territory, to be marshal of the United States for the Territory of Oklahoma, vice E. D. Nix, removed.

##### COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE.

John A. Mason, of New York, to be collector of internal revenue for the Second district of New York, to succeed John A. Sullivan, resigned.

##### SURVEYOR OF CUSTOMS.

George H. Cleaves, of New York, to be surveyor of customs for the port of Greenport, in the State of New York, to succeed E. S. Havens, resigned. Mr. Cleaves is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate. This nomination to correct error in name of Mr. Cleaves, nominated as George S. Cleaves December 17, 1895, which nomination is withdrawn.

#### CONFIRMATIONS.

*Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 24, 1896.*

##### POSTMASTERS.

Francis Riley, to be postmaster at Hoosick Falls, in the county of Rensselaer and State of New York.

William Killefer, to be postmaster at Paw Paw, in the county of Van Buren and State of Michigan.

Jonathan L. Pettyjohn, to be postmaster at Olathe, in the county of Johnson and State of Kansas.

#### SENATE.

MONDAY, January 27, 1896.

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. W. J. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed the following bills:

A bill (S. 1) granting a pension to Mrs. Eva Davis Cogswell, widow of Brig. Gen. William Cogswell;

A bill (S. 138) granting an increase of pension to James H. Osgood; and

A bill (S. 142) granting a pension to Annie M. Greene.

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

A bill (H. R. 147) granting a pension to George W. Case, late private Company B, Twenty-seventh New York Cavalry;

A bill (H. R. 711) to increase the pension of Uzziel B. Church;

A bill (H. R. 925) to pension Annie J. Corbett;

A bill (H. R. 994) granting an increase of pension to Andrew B. Keith;

A bill (H. R. 1020) granting an increase of pension to Gilman Williams;

A bill (H. R. 1141) granting a pension to Miss Mary E. Hull, dependent sister of John A. Hull, deceased, late of Company F, Eighty-first Regiment of Illinois Volunteer Infantry, in the late war of the rebellion;

A bill (H. R. 1605) granting a pension to Anna Kelley;

A bill (H. R. 1616) granting a pension to Michael E. Bricker, of Edgerton, Ind.;

A bill (H. R. 2340) granting a pension to Caroline Parker; and

A bill (H. R. 3698) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. Jane Dulany.

##### SENATORS FROM UTAH.

Mr. DUBOIS. Mr. President, I take great personal pleasure, and a peculiar pleasure, in presenting the credentials of Frank J. Cannon, elected a Senator from the State of Utah. I ask that the credentials be read and that the Senator-elect be qualified as a member of the Senate.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The credentials will be read.

The Secretary read the credentials of Frank J. Cannon, chosen by the legislature of Utah a Senator from that State.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The credentials will be placed on file. Mr. BURROWS. Mr. President, I present the credentials of Arthur Brown, a Senator-elect from the State of Utah, and ask that they may be read and that the oath of office be administered to him.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The credentials will be read. The Secretary read the credentials of Arthur Brown, chosen by the legislature of Utah a Senator from that State.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The credentials will be placed on file. Mr. DUBOIS. There being no question about the regularity of the proceedings, I ask that the Senators from Utah be sworn in.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senators-elect will come forward and receive the oath of office.

Mr. Cannon and Mr. Brown were escorted to the Vice-Presi-