

Also, a bill (H. R. 7943) for the relief of Peter Parris—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7944) for the relief of Elizabeth S. Mullins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. BABCOCK: Petition of the State Epworth League of Wisconsin, to raise the age of consent in the District of Columbia to 18 years—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of the State Epworth League of Wisconsin, in favor of a Sunday-rest law for the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of the State Epworth League of Wisconsin, for the appointment of a commission to investigate the labor question—to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of the State Epworth League of Wisconsin, to substitute voluntary industrial arbitration for railway strikes—to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of the State Epworth League of Wisconsin, to repeal the ninety-day divorce law in Oklahoma—to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, petition of the State Epworth League of Wisconsin, to enforce the compulsory-education law and suppress child labor in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia: Papers relating to the claim of Richard Morris, of Henry County, Ga.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BOWERS: Remonstrance and petition of 55 citizens of San Diego, Cal., for the removal of the statue of Marquette from Statuary Hall—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. BRODERICK: Petition of J. G. Ellis and other ex-prisoners of war, citizens of Osage County, Kans., favoring House bill No. 396, granting \$12 per month pension and \$2 per day for time served in rebel prisons—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DALZELL: Petition of sundry citizens of the Twenty-second Congressional district of Pennsylvania, asking that religious publications be given the advantage of the act of Congress of July 16, 1894, relative to second-class matter—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. EVANS: Petition of Thomas M. Hicks and others, of Louisville, Ky., in relation to the Marquette statue in Statuary Hall—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. GRISWOLD: Petition of Summit Grange, No. 1079, Patrons of Husbandry, asking for the passage of House bill No. 2626, for the protection of agricultural staples by an export bounty—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GROUT: Petition of citizens of Worcester, Vt., in the matter of granting a pension to Caroline H. Hatch at the rate of \$12 per month—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAINER of Nebraska (by request): Petition of B. W. Cowan and other citizens of Nebraska, relating to the matter of the Marquette statue—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. HARTMAN: Remonstrance of T. B. Hammond and others, of Butte, Mont., against permitting the statue of Marquette to remain in Statuary Hall—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. HERMANN: Petition of the White Ribbon Women's Association of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, for the adoption of a resolution and appointment of a commission looking toward the establishment and continuance of peace—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition and remonstrance of citizens of Oregon, against the acceptance of a statue of Père Marquette, presented by the State of Wisconsin—to the Committee on the Library.

Also, petition of citizens of Aumsville, Oreg., in favor of the passage of the joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States recognizing God in the preamble—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of F. W. Chausse, of Grants Pass, Oreg., in favor of the passage of House bill No. 4566, to amend the postal laws relating to second-class matter—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of Milwaukee Grange, No. 268, Patrons of Husbandry, of Milwaukee, Wis.; also petitions of sundry citizens of the State of Oregon, favoring the passage of House bill No. 2626, for the protection of agricultural staples by an export bounty—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Portland, Oreg.; also petition of citizens of Oregon, protesting against Senate bill No. 1055, providing for compulsory military drill in the public schools of the States and Territories and for the establishment of a bureau of military education—to the Committee on Education.

Also, petition of soldiers and sailors of the late rebellion resid-

ing at Forest Grove, Oreg., and vicinity, for the passage of a service-pension bill of at least \$8 per month to every honorably discharged soldier, sailor, and marine who served ninety days in the late war on the Union side—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOOKER: Petition of A. B. Kenyon and 14 others, of Alfred, N. Y., favoring a bill to fix the standard of weights and measures by the adoption of the metric system of weights and measures—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. HULL: Papers to accompany House bill No. 5562, authorizing the Secretary of War to reorganize the organizations of the Sons of Veterans as part of the military reserve of the United States—to the Committee on the Militia.

By Mr. LINTON: Remonstrance and petition from citizens of Omaha, Nebr.; also from P. A. Rice and 18 others, of Memphis, Tenn.; also from L. B. Griffith and 38 others, of Philadelphia, Pa.; also from T. A. Lickhart and 114 other citizens of Elizabeth, N. J., against the statue of Père Marquette remaining in the Capitol of the United States—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. LONG: Petition of E. G. Nettleton, also of Lyman Nangle, protesting against the passage of House bill No. 4566, to amend the postal laws relating to second-class matter—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. LOUDENSLAGER: Petition of the Liquor Dealers' Association of West Hoboken, N. J., against the passage of House bill No. 6668, to amend an act regulating the sale of intoxicating liquors in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MOODY: Petition of 102 citizens of Gloucester, Mass., for the enactment of House bill No. 7866, requiring vessels carrying small boats of any description to equip such boats with a provision safe—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ODELL: Petitions of citizens of Newburg, N. Y., in favor of joint resolution No. 11, to amend the Constitution of the United States—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TAFT: Memorial of the Cincinnati Chamber of Commerce, in favor of the establishment of a department of commerce and manufactures—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TATE: Papers to accompany House bill for the relief of Jesse Combs—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany House bill for the relief of Enos N. Gribble—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Elizabeth S. Mullins, widow of Alfred W. Mullins, of Company B, First Georgia Volunteers, United States Army, to remove the barrier to the payment of her claim for pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TRACEWELL: Petition of Lanesville Post, No. 527, Grand Army of the Republic, of Harrison County, Ind., favoring a general service pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also (by request), petition of N. P. Watts and 85 other citizens of Nebraska, Ind., asking for the removal of the Marquette statue from Statuary Hall—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. SNOVER: Petition of N. S. Boynton, mayor, and 316 other citizens of Port Huron, Mich.; also of Ed. Allurn, master, and 128 other citizens of Port Huron, Mich., for the establishment of a live-saving station, to accompany House bill No. 7262—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. WHEELER: Papers of Nathaniel Kennemer, of Jackson County, Ala., relating to his claim—to the Committee on War Claims.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SATURDAY, April 4, 1896.

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

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

NEW ORLEANS PACIFIC RAILROAD COMPANY.

Mr. OGDEN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask unanimous consent to call up for present consideration the bill (S. 2132) for the relief of settlers upon lands within the indemnity limits of the grants of the New Orleans Pacific Railroad Company.

The SPEAKER. The bill will be read, subject to the right of objection.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That authority be, and is hereby, given the New Orleans Pacific Railroad to relinquish any lands within the indemnity limits of its grant, which by decision of the Land Department of the Government has been awarded it, in favor of any settler entitled to the right of entry under the laws of the United States who has been allowed to make entry thereof, or who has resided upon and improved the same for five years, and to select in lieu thereof an equal quantity of other lands, from any of the public lands not mineral, and within the limits of its grant and not otherwise appropriated at the date of selection, to which it shall receive title the same as though originally granted.

Mr. OGDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa to make an explanation of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to its present consideration?

Mr. DINGLEY. Before consent is given I would like the gentleman to make an explanation of the effect of the bill.

Mr. LACEY. This can be done, Mr. Speaker, in a word.

There are 75 to 100 settlers who have taken possession of lands, which proved to be railroad lands, lying along the line of this road. After a contest they were adjudged to belong to the railway company. The company, however, is averse to turning the settlers off the land, and is willing to take wild lands in lieu of those the settlers are occupying, and the Department requests that this permission be given to them. That is all the bill does.

Mr. DINGLEY. The lands when selected in lieu will be ordinary lands?

Mr. LACEY. Yes; ordinary wild lands. Perhaps not so good as those on which the settlers have made their homes, but the railroad company does not want to disturb them any more than possible.

There being no objection, the bill was considered and ordered to a third reading; and being read the third time, it was passed.

On motion of Mr. OGDEN, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

PUBLIC LANDS, VALVERDE COUNTY, TEX.

Mr. NOONAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask present consideration for the bill (H. R. 7395) to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States to reconvey to the former owner the said tract of land in Valverde County, Tex.

The bill was read, as follows:

Whereas on the 15th day of April, A. D. 1880, the San Felipe Agricultural, Manufacturing, and Irrigation Company, by deed of conveyance, did convey to the United States of America a certain tract, piece, or parcel of land then in Kinney County, now in Valverde County, Tex., containing 409 acres of land, and fully described in said aforesaid deed of April 15, 1880, for the purposes of a military garrison and reservation; and

Whereas the United States of America, not wishing to use said land for the said purposes aforesaid, and having by its proper officers renunciated title to said land, and is willing to reconvey the same to the grantees, the said San Felipe Agricultural, Manufacturing, and Irrigation Company: Therefore

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States of America is hereby authorized by proper deed to reconvey by quitclaim deed said aforesaid land to said aforesaid company.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to its present consideration?

There was no objection.

The bill was considered, and ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being read the third time, it was passed.

On motion of Mr. NOONAN, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

REPORTS OF SUPERVISING INSPECTORS OF STEAM VESSELS.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Committee on Printing I desire to submit at this time for present consideration a concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER. The resolution will be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, etc., That there be printed, for the use of the Treasury Department, Steamboat Inspection Service, 300 copies each of the proceedings of the Board of Supervising Inspectors of Steam Vessels for the years 1895 and 1896.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered, and agreed to.

REPORT OF UNITED STATES COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY.

Mr. PERKINS. I am also requested, on behalf of the Committee on Printing, to ask consent for the present consideration of the joint resolution (S. R. 116) authorizing the Public Printer to print the Annual Report of the Superintendent of the United States Coast and Geodetic Survey in quarto form and to bind it in one volume.

The joint resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That paragraph 8, section 73, of the act of January 12, 1896, providing for the public printing and binding, etc., be amended by striking out all of said paragraph after the word "survey," at the end of the first and beginning of the second lines, and substituting in lieu thereof the following words: "Two thousand eight hundred copies in quarto form, bound in one volume, 200 for the Senate, 600 for the House, and 2,000 for distribution by the Coast and Geodetic Survey."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. PERKINS. The committee recommends an amendment to the resolution, and I report it in the shape in which it is desired to be passed.

The SPEAKER. The question will be taken on the joint resolution as reported from the committee.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

CIRCULAR, BUREAU OF EDUCATION.

Mr. PERKINS. On behalf of the Committee on Printing I desire to submit another resolution for present consideration.

The SPEAKER. The resolution will be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed and bound, in paper covers, 25,000 additional copies of Bureau of Education Circular of Information, No. 200, Catalogue of the American Literary Association Library; 5,000 copies for the Senate, 10,000 copies for the House of Representatives, and 10,000 copies for the Bureau of Education.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered, and agreed to.

COMMERCIAL RELATIONS FOR 1894 AND 1895, ETC.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I have one more resolution from the Committee on Printing.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. PERKINS], on behalf of the Committee on Printing, presents a concurrent resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Public Printer be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to print, for distribution by the Department of State, 2,500 copies of Commercial Relations for 1894 and 1895, and (in separate form) 10,000 copies of the "Review of the world's commerce," etc., being pages 1 to 235, inclusive, of said Commercial Relations.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There was no objection.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. RICHARDSON, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

DISTRIBUTION OF SEEDS.

Mr. FISCHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Secretary of Agriculture be, and he is hereby, directed to comply with the letter and spirit of the act heretofore adopted by Congress, and that he deliver to each Senator and Representative, for distribution, the quota of seeds to which he is entitled, and that the packages be made up as each Senator and Representative may direct.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, that resolution ought to be amended by saying that these packages shall be done up in fives.

Mr. FISCHER. "As each Senator or Representative may direct." One may want 5 and one may want 10.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. That is too indefinite.

Mr. FISCHER. Some may want 5 and some may want 15.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. "In blocks of 5."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. LOUD. Mr. Speaker, I object.

SEWERAGE SYSTEM AT FORT MONROE, VA.

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the present consideration of the joint resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk. This is the same resolution which was offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HULL] yesterday. Upon an informal consultation with members of the Committee on Appropriations, I am directed to report this resolution and to ask for its immediate consideration.

The joint resolution was read, as follows:

Joint resolution (H. Res. 163) to amend the act approved August 1, 1894, making appropriations for fortifications and other works of defense, etc.

Resolved, etc., That the act approved August 1, 1894, entitled "An act making appropriations for fortifications and other works of defense, for the armament thereof, for the procurement of heavy ordnance for trial and service, and for other purposes," be, and the same is hereby, so amended as to remove the restriction that the United States shall bear only one-half of the expense of the cost of construction of the sewerage system at Fort Monroe, Va., provided for in said act, in so far as may be necessary to authorize the Secretary of War to expend for the completion of the construction of said sewerage system, including a flushing system therefor, so much as may be necessary, not exceeding \$5,000, of the balance now remaining from the appropriation of \$37,500 made in said act for the construction of one-half of said sewerage system, the funds to be immediately available and the work to be done by contract or otherwise, as may be deemed by the Secretary of War most economical and advantageous to the Government.

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, in further explanation, I desire to send to the Clerk's desk a letter from the Chief of Engineers.

The SPEAKER. This requires unanimous consent.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, yesterday morning I objected to the consideration of this resolution. I have examined it, and I withdraw my objection. I think it ought to be passed, and I hope it will be passed.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the letter.

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE CHIEF OF ENGINEERS, UNITED STATES ARMY,

March 9, 1896.

Respectfully submitted to the Secretary of War.
Congress, by act approved August 1, 1894, appropriated \$37,500 for one-half

of the cost of construction of a sewerage system at Fort Monroe, Va., the other half to be paid by the owners of nonmilitary buildings at the fort. Plans were prepared and approved for a sewerage system, which, with contingencies, inspections, superintendence, etc., was estimated to cost \$45,000, and on that estimate the moiety was assessed against and collected from nonmilitary interests, thereby making the sum of \$22,500 available from the appropriation made by Congress, and leaving a balance of \$15,000 from the appropriation.

The construction of the sewerage system under the approved plans is now nearing completion.

A flushing system will be necessary in connection with this sewer, for which there is no adequate supply of water provided. Experience has shown that the well recently sunk for the Chamberlin Hotel at Fort Monroe does not yield potable water. The funds appropriated for an artesian well at Fort Monroe are not sufficient to sink a well of materially greater depth than that of the Chamberlin well, and as these funds were appropriated upon estimates submitted to provide a water supply for the fort, it is believed that they are not available for the sinking of a well for the procurement of a supply of water that could be used solely for flushing the sewer.

It will be necessary, therefore, to provide a supply of water, by pumping or from some other source, for the flushing system of the sewer, and it is thought that it will be in the interest of economy that this water supply should be provided by the Government alone, and not jointly with the nonmilitary residents, especially as a flushing arrangement would be necessary for the United States sewers if there were none other.

I have, therefore, the honor to recommend that Congress be asked to authorize at once the use of \$5,000 of the balance of the sum appropriated for the construction of one-half of the sewerage system at Fort Monroe for the completion of the sewerage system and for providing a flushing system for the sewers, the funds to be immediately available and the work to be done by contract or otherwise, as may be most economical and advantageous to the Government.

W. P. CRAIGHILL,
Brigadier-General, Chief of Engineers.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the consideration of the joint resolution?

There was no objection.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, I desire simply to state that this question was up yesterday. There was a question of jurisdiction involved. I still think it should have gone to the Military Committee, but at the request of some members we have turned it over to the Committee on Appropriations, on account of the importance of having it at once passed. I ask that the Military Committee be discharged from the further consideration of the resolution.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. The Committee on Appropriations do not object to the passage of the resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to a third reading; and it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. HAINER of Nebraska, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

Mr. HULL. Now, Mr. Speaker, I move that the Committee on Military Affairs be discharged from the further consideration of the resolution.

The SPEAKER. It is ipso facto discharged, because the bill has passed.

BENJAMIN F. JONES.

Mr. SPENCER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 7161) for the relief of Benjamin F. Jones.

The bill was read.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. LOUD. Mr. Speaker, I should like to have the report read.

Mr. ODELL. Mr. Speaker, I object to the present consideration of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Objection is made.

JOHN S. BURWELL.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7816) for the relief of John S. Burwell, administrator of the estate of A. L. Burwell, deceased.

The bill was read at length.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. ODELL. Mr. Speaker, I object.

SALMON FISHERIES OF ALASKA.

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6403) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the protection of the salmon fisheries of Alaska."

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act approved March 2, 1889, and entitled "An act to provide for the protection of the salmon fisheries of Alaska," is hereby amended and reenacted as follows:

"That the erection of dams, barricades, fish-wheels, fences, traps, pound nets, or any fixed or stationary obstructions in any part of the rivers or streams of Alaska, or to fish for or catch salmon or salmon trout in any manner or by any means with the purpose or result of preventing or impeding the ascent of salmon or salmon trout to their spawning ground, is declared to be unlawful, and the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to remove such obstructions and to establish and enforce such regulations and surveillance as may be necessary to insure that this prohibition and all other provisions of law relating to the salmon fisheries of Alaska are strictly complied with.

"Sec. 2. That it shall be unlawful to fish, catch, or kill any salmon or salmon trout of any variety, except with rod or spear, above the tide waters of any of the creeks or rivers of less than 500 feet wide in the Territory of Alaska,

or to lay or set any drift net, set net, or seine for any purpose, across the tide waters of any river or stream, for a distance of more than one-third of the width of such river, stream, or channel, or lay or set any seine or net within 100 yards of any other net or seine which is being laid or set in said stream or channel, or to take, kill, or fish for salmon in any manner or by any means in any waters of the Territory of Alaska, either in the streams or tide waters, from noon on Saturday of each week until 6 o'clock postmeridian of the Sunday following, or to fish for, or catch, or kill in any manner or by any appliances, except by rod or spear, any salmon or salmon trout in any stream of less than 100 yards in width in the said Territory of Alaska, between the hours of 6 o'clock in the morning and 6 o'clock in the evening of the same day of each and every day of the week.

"Sec. 3. That the Secretary of the Treasury may, at his discretion, set aside certain streams as spawning grounds in which no fishing will be permitted; and when, in his judgment, the results of fishing operations on any stream indicate that the number of salmon taken is larger than the capacity of the stream to produce, he is authorized to establish weekly close seasons, to limit the duration of the fishing season, or to prohibit fishing entirely for one year or more, so as to permit the salmon to increase.

"Sec. 4. That to enforce the provisions of law herein, and such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury may establish in pursuance thereof, he is authorized and directed to appoint one inspector of fisheries at a salary of \$8 per day, and two assistant inspectors at a salary of \$6 each per day, and he will annually submit to Congress estimates to cover the salaries and actual traveling expenses of the officers hereby authorized and for such other expenditures as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of the law herein.

"Sec. 5. That any person violating the provisions of this act, or the regulations established in pursuance thereof, shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine not exceeding \$1,000, or imprisonment at hard labor for a term of ninety days, or both such fine and imprisonment, at the discretion of the court: And provided further, That in case of the violation of any of the provisions of section 1 of this act, and conviction thereof, a further fine of \$250 per diem will be imposed for each day that the obstruction or obstructions therein are maintained after notice to remove the same; said notice may be given by any Government officer or private citizen."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. LOUD. Mr. Speaker, this is a measure of so great importance that I hardly think it ought to pass by unanimous consent.

Mr. KNOX. It has been to the committee and I have here the report of the inspector. It has been carefully gone over by the committee in connection with the Treasury Department. The need for immediate consideration is thus stated: The run of salmon commences on the 1st of June, and unless the bill can be passed and got through the Senate these provisions will not be put into active operation during this season.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks the gentleman's remarks must be addressed to the Chair and through the Chair to the House. If gentlemen would keep their seats and cease conversation it might be possible to hear in this Hall, although, of course, that is a question.

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Speaker, the present bill is a bill which has been reported from the Committee on Territories, and its object is the protection of the salmon fisheries of Alaska. In the Fiftieth Congress, in chapter 415, it was provided:

That the erection of dams, barricades, or other obstructions in any of the rivers of Alaska with the purpose or result of preventing or impeding the ascent of salmon or other anadromous species to their spawning grounds is hereby declared to be unlawful, and the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to establish such regulations and surveillance as may be necessary to insure that this prohibition is strictly enforced and to otherwise protect the salmon fisheries of Alaska; and every person who shall be found guilty of a violation of the provisions of this section shall be fined not less than \$250 for each day of the continuance of such obstruction.

Sec. 2. That the Commissioner of Fish and Fisheries is hereby empowered and directed to institute an investigation into the habits, abundance, and distribution of the salmon of Alaska, as well as the present conditions and methods of the fisheries, with a view of recommending to Congress such additional legislation as may be necessary to prevent the impairment or exhaustion of these valuable fisheries and placing them under regular and permanent conditions of production.

Under the provisions of this law passed by the Fiftieth Congress an inspection has been made carefully of the various streams of Alaska and the various canneries that are established upon those streams, and a careful inquiry made by the inspector, Mr. Murray, upon consultation with those who are interested in the preservation of those fisheries, as to the best method of preserving them, and the report, which is a very careful and voluminous one, compares the provisions of this country with those in Scotland and those in England, which have been tested, and which have preserved for generations the salmon fisheries in Scotland and other countries.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is a danger of the present supply of fish in Alaska being destroyed by the method of taking salmon. The streams of Alaska, with two exceptions, are small, running into the interior to the extent perhaps of 20 miles. The fish that go up there to the spawning grounds are caught by damming the streams and taking them out or scooping them out in hundreds and hundreds of thousands, thus preventing the propagation of the species, until in but a few years the great industry of the salmon fisheries of Alaska will be utterly destroyed and the food supply of the natives gone, and a very great source of supply and profitable industry to the people of the United States exhausted.

Mr. PERKINS. Will the gentleman permit me one moment?

Mr. KNOX. Certainly.

Mr. PERKINS. In addition to what he has stated, in regard to the origin of this bill, I think that it may be stated that the excuse for bringing this matter in this morning to ask for unanimous consent is that this legislation is required immediately to be

effective, as the salmon begin to run about the 1st of June, and unless this legislation can be had in advance of that time it will be ineffective for the purpose intended. I believe the gentleman has stated that this bill emanates from the Treasury Department in pursuance of the section of the statute which he has read. It was carefully prepared in the light of all the facts by the Treasury experts, and it is asked by those who have charge of the preservation of that industry that this legislation be had without delay.

Mr. HERMANN. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. KNOX. I have not yielded the floor. I will answer in a moment. I was about to say that that was precisely what I stated to the gentleman from California [Mr. LOUD] in the duet that I was obliged to maintain with him in order to be understood at all—which was that it is represented by the Treasury Department that the necessity for this immediate action rests upon the ground that the salmon run commences the 1st of June, and in order to get it through both Houses and to get any of this supervision in operation it will be necessary for immediate consideration, if the bill is thought one that is worthy and proper to pass.

Mr. HERMANN. Will the gentleman permit me to ask him whether his committee has heard from the interests that are to be affected by this bill, not only through the Treasury Department but directly from the interests themselves? And, in connection with that question, let me say to him that a great many of our people on the Pacific Coast, in the States of California, Oregon, and Washington, are largely interested not only in the fishing in the streams of Alaska but also in the canning of the salmon, and therefore it strikes me that until he shows the House that those interests have had proper representation before his committee he ought not to ask to have this bill considered under these circumstances.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to hear this bill reported again, if it can be done under the rule.

The SPEAKER. Objection is made to the consideration of the bill.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. I do not object, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair understood the gentleman from Oregon to object.

Mr. HERMANN. No, Mr. Speaker, I did not object.

The SPEAKER. If there is no objection, the Clerk will again report the bill.

Mr. HERMANN. I do not object to the consideration of the bill, but I think we ought to have a little more explanation with reference to it.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of this bill?

Mr. LOUD. I do not think the gentleman can put this bill through in this way.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Mr. Speaker, I understood that, pending objection, an explanation of the bill would be made, and I ask to have it read again.

Mr. LOUD (to Mr. KNOX). It seems to me that you ought to consider those interests—

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman that those interests have been heard before the committee, not only through the Treasury Department, but through the inspector, Mr. Murray.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Is the gentleman unwilling to let the House know what his bill is about?

Mr. KNOX. Certainly not.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Then why do you not let it be read again?

The SPEAKER. Without objection the bill will be again reported to the House, but if any gentleman intends to object to its consideration, it is hardly worth while to repeat the reading. The Clerk will again report the bill.

The bill was again read as above.

Mr. BARHAM. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman to let that bill go over for two or three days, so that we may consider it. It may be just what we want on the Pacific Coast; I do not know. Our people there are very much interested in the subject of the bill.

Mr. KNOX. Well, if the bill may be considered as up for consideration without objection, I will agree to that.

Mr. BARHAM. I must reserve the right to object, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of this bill?

Mr. BARHAM. I object.

JOHN C. HOWE, DECEASED.

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take up the engrossed Senate bill (S. 32) for the relief of the legal representatives of John C. Howe, deceased.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay to the legal representatives of John C. Howe, deceased, \$66,907, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the same being compensation in full for the use by the United States,

to wit, in 66,907.313 cup-anvil cartridges, of the invention secured to John C. Howe and his assigns by letters patent of the United States issued to him August 16, 1864, and numbered 43651, during the entire term of said letters patent, as appears in the findings of law and of fact made by the United States circuit court for the district of Connecticut in the case of Forehand and others vs. Porter, reported in volume 15 of the Federal Reporter, at page 256, and as further appears in the findings of fact made by the Court of Claims, after full testimony and full hearing in Congressional case No. 1, entitled Forehand and others vs. The United States, heard on reference of the matter to said Court of Claims by the Committee on Claims of the Senate under and pursuant to the act of March 3, 1883, commonly known as the Bowman Act, said findings of fact having been certified to the Committee on Claims of the Senate by said court on the 26th day of April, 1889.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of this bill?

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, has this bill been considered in Committee of the Whole?

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. This bill has passed the Senate twice unanimously; it has been reported twice by the Senate committee; it failed in the House on two occasions because it was not allowed to be brought up for consideration; it has been reported unanimously by two committees at this session, the Committee on Claims and the Committee on War Claims, and it was reported by the Committee on War Claims favorably at the last session.

Mr. AVERY. Has it been considered in Committee of the Whole?

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. It has not; but it has been passed twice by the Senate. It is one of the most meritorious bills that has come before the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. AVERY. I object.

GEN. JOHN M. THAYER.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 6644) granting a pension to Gen. John M. Thayer, United States Volunteers. After the reading of the bill and report I shall ask consent to make a brief statement in explanation of the merits of the bill.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of John M. Thayer, late brigadier-general and brevet major-general of volunteers, at a pension of \$100 a month.

The report (by Mr. ANDREWS) was read, as follows:

The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 6644) granting a pension of \$100 per month to John M. Thayer, late brigadier and brevet major-general of volunteers, having carefully considered the same, respectfully report as follows:

In 1855 the Territorial legislature of Nebraska provided for the organization of the militia and for the calling out of volunteers for the defense of the settlers, and elected John M. Thayer brigadier-general to command the troops on the frontier, and subsequently elected him to be major-general. It devolved on General Thayer to defend the people of the frontier settlements against the hostile Indians. He was not only protecting the settlers of the Territory of Nebraska, but was defending what was then the frontier of the United States. This service he performed continuously from 1855 to 1861, and has never received any compensation therefor.

In 1861 he raised the First Regiment Nebraska Infantry, took it to St. Louis, and reported to General Grant at Pilot Knob, Mo. In the battle of Donelson General Thayer commanded a brigade, and at a critical moment, when General McClelland's division had exhausted their ammunition and were compelled to fall back closely pursued by the enemy, General Thayer rushed his brigade forward, got in the rear of the retiring division, formed a line of battle, met General Buckner's army, and drove them back into their works. For this gallant service he was given great credit and honorable mention by General Grant. He commanded a brigade in the battle of Shiloh, at the siege of Vicksburg, led his brigade as a storming column at Chickasaw Bayou, had his horse shot from under him in the battle at Arkansas Post, and participated in other battles.

The records of the War Department show that he was promoted from colonel to brigadier-general of volunteers October 4, 1862, and that he commanded a brigade from that time until the close of the war; that on March 13, 1865, he was made a brevet major-general of volunteers "for gallant and meritorious service during the war."

The evidence in this case shows that General Thayer is now 77 years of age, and that he is wholly without means of support, and a subject of charity for his neighbors and friends.

Dr. W. G. Houtz testifies:

"* * * That for the last four years he has had the said John M. Thayer under his care and medical treatment, and much the greater part of that time he has been wholly unable to do any kind of manual labor, and for many weeks at a time he was confined to his bed. Determination of blood to his head is of such frequent occurrence as to constantly threaten apoplexy. Loss of locomotion (locomotor ataxia) unfits him to be left without some one to be constantly with him and care for him."

N. S. Harwood, president of the First National Bank, of Lincoln, Nebr., testifies as follows:

"For the last four or five years he has been in a helpless condition; the only means of earning a livelihood has been by his pen, and but very little of this period has he been in sufficient health to enable him to do this. He is a very proud and sensitive gentleman; he will not let his poverty and helplessness be known, and it is impossible for friends who would gladly render him assistance to do so. I think he would rather starve or die of neglect than to accept alms. He is now dangerously ill at the home of his comrade in arms, Capt. Adam Bax, who is himself broken in health, and whose family is in no suitable condition to care for him."

There is abundant evidence establishing the fact that the said John M. Thayer is wholly without means of any kind and that he is entirely unable to do anything for his own support, and that his condition is such as to require some one to be with and care for him all the time.

Your committee respectfully recommend that the bill do pass.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of this bill?

Mr. RICHARDSON. I desire to ask the gentleman in charge of the bill what this pensioner is now drawing?

Mr. ANDREWS. He is drawing nothing. He declined to accept any assistance in this direction so long as he was able to care for himself, and he has consented to permit his friends to make this effort on his behalf now only because he is no longer able to care for himself, as the report shows.

It has been the pride of General Thayer's life, so far as I know him, to serve his country from a true spirit of genuine patriotism. In the time of his country's need he gave the best services of his life for its preservation and advancement. After the close of his brilliant military career, briefly sketched in the report, he served with honor and distinction in the United States Senate.

At a later date the people of Nebraska elected him twice to the governorship of their State. In every station he has served the interests of his State and nation with marked fidelity and ability, and now, in the hour of his weakness, the people of Nebraska and all who know him and have learned to love him will greet the passage of this bill with most hearty approval.

The Nebraska delegation upon this floor earnestly request that unanimous consent be granted for the immediate passage of this bill.

But, Mr. Speaker, I must not intrude upon the time of the House, although I would gladly extend the history of this brave patriot, soldier, and statesman. I esteem it one of the privileges of my life to have the honor of requesting the passage of this the first bill placed in my charge on the floor of this House. What we do must be done speedily, as it may be too late to give relief. Let him have at least a token of his nation's gratitude for his loyalty to the flag and the Union. Let him know that we will care for him in the hour of his weakness as faithfully as he cared for the Union in the hour of its need.

Mr. RICHARDSON. And he is in a needy condition?

Mr. ANDREWS. Absolutely so, and also in a very critical condition of health.

Mr. RICHARDSON. And he is 77 years old?

Mr. ANDREWS. Yes, sir; and I hope we can have a vote on the bill. [Cries of "Vote!" "Vote!"]

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

REPRINT OF RIVER AND HARBOR BILL.

Mr. HOOKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for a reprint of the river and harbor bill.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

A MEMBER. Regular order.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is demanded. The regular order is—

Mr. HITT. The conference report on the resolutions in relation to Cuba.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, I ask the gentleman to yield to me for a moment while I present a privileged report.

Mr. HITT. I yield to the gentleman for that purpose.

ELECTION CONTEST—GOODWYN VS. COBB.

Mr. DANIELS. I am directed by the Committee on Elections No. 1 to submit their report on the contested-election case of Goodwyn vs. Cobb, from the Fifth Congressional district of Alabama. The majority of the committee report that Mr. Cobb was not elected and that Mr. Goodwyn is entitled to the seat. The committee have agreed to give to the minority of the committee one week from Monday in which to prepare the statement of their views; and we expect to bring up this case on Monday week for the consideration of the House.

The SPEAKER. The Chair can not hear the statement of the gentleman from New York [Mr. DANIELS]. The House will please be in order.

Mr. DANIELS (after order had been restored). Mr. Speaker, we desire to bring up the case of Goodwyn vs. Cobb on Monday week for final action; in the meantime the minority of the committee will prepare the statement of their views.

The SPEAKER. This report of the Committee on Elections will be ordered to be printed. How much time is desired for the minority to file their views?

Mr. DANIELS. A week from Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to allowing the minority of the committee that time? The Chair hears none.

ELECTION CONTEST—ROBINSON VS. HARRISON.

Mr. LEONARD. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Elections No. 1, I present their report on the contested-election case of Robinson vs. Harrison from the Third Congressional district of Alabama. I ask for the consideration of the report at this time.

The SPEAKER. Is it a unanimous report?

Mr. LEONARD. It is a unanimous report in favor of the contestant.

The SPEAKER. If there be no objection, the House will proceed to the consideration of the report.

There was no objection.

The resolutions appended to the report were read, as follows:

Resolved, That W. C. Robinson was not elected a Representative in the Fifty-fourth Congress for the Third Congressional district of Alabama at the election held in said district on the 6th day of November, 1894, and is not entitled to the seat.

Resolved, That George P. Harrison was elected a Representative in the Fifty-fourth Congress for the Third Congressional district of Alabama at the election held in said district on the 6th day of November, 1894, and is entitled to the seat.

The resolutions were agreed to.

On motion of Mr. LEONARD, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

Mr. DANIELS. I ask that the report in the case just disposed of be printed.

The SPEAKER. In the absence of objection, that order will be made.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I desire to make a motion to reconsider the vote on agreeing to the report of the committee in the election case of Robinson vs. Harrison and to lay that motion on the table.

The SPEAKER. That motion was made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. LEONARD] and was agreed to.

CUBA.

Mr. HITT. I now call up the regular order—the conference report in reference to Cuban belligerency. As the last speaker was opposed to the report, I will ask the Chair to recognize the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ADAMS], a member of the committee.

The SPEAKER. For how much time?

Mr. ADAMS. I desire to speak in my own right.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ADAMS] is recognized.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, it had been my full intention not to address the House again on this subject, because when the question was up before I occupied a short time in endeavoring to state as briefly as possible the reasons which led the subcommittee to the conclusion expressed in the resolutions which were at that time under consideration. But, sir, in view of the extraordinary remarks made yesterday by the gentleman from Maine [Mr. BOUTELLE] embracing statements of which I can only say that I do not know from what source he could possibly have obtained his information, and in view of the fact that the many questions interjected into the remarks of members of the committee have indicated a desire for further information by members of the House on this subject, and in view of the fact, also, that when I last spoke my time was so limited, I desire now to restate briefly the reasons which led the subcommittee to come to their conclusion in favor of the resolutions originally reported here.

In the first place, it has been claimed by the gentleman from Maine, and has been asserted in other quarters, that the sentiment of the American people is not behind these resolutions, and that therefore the House is not justified in adopting them. I should like to ask what better evidence can the representatives of the people have as to the sentiment of the country than the expressions which have come to us in behalf of these resolutions? If members here had seen the numbers of petitions coming to this House from all parts of the country, they would have realized how deeply the people are interested in this question, and how eagerly they have exercised their constitutional right of petition in order to convey to Congress their sentiments in behalf of these resolutions. I have heard some of the members of this House longest in experience here state that never have they known so many petitions to be filed in favor of any proposition pending before Congress as have been filed here in favor of doing something to aid the struggling Cubans in their fight for liberty.

It was my office, as chairman of the subcommittee, to go over these petitions. They numbered hundreds; and the thousands of signatures appended to them represented every class and condition of life in this Republic. There were official petitions from boards of trade and business bodies; there were the individual petitions of men who, moved by a spirit of patriotism which they could not repress, felt it incumbent upon them to appeal to the Congress of their country to do something to assist these lovers of liberty. Some of these petitions had been placed in public places such as drug stores and others, where the passer-by unsolicited might affix his signature to this call upon the representatives of the country to do something for the Cubans.

Under these circumstances, Mr. Speaker, how a Representative of this House can rise here and say that the sentiment of the American people does not demand the passage of these resolutions I am at a loss to understand.

Furthermore, in response to the petitions, these resolutions were passed both by the House and Senate practically unanimously;

and does anyone dare to say at this time and under these circumstances that we, the representatives of the people on this floor, are false to our duties, false to our oaths, that we sat here and cast our votes in diametrical opposition to the wishes of our constituents, and that it was not in obedience to the will of the people of the country that we have acted?

Why, Mr. Speaker, what proof can we ask further than what we have right before us at this time?

Now, the gentleman from Maine claims that this sentiment among the people has changed. He stated that when these resolutions reached the other branch of Congress, after being debated there, the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations of that body found that they could not pass, and therefore had them sent back to the conference, so that it might be taken out of the jurisdiction of the Senate. I do not know where he got that information. The Senators who argued against the adoption of the House resolutions were just the same as those who opposed the adoption of the Senate resolutions. There were no accessions apparently to their ranks. The same arguments were repeated over and over again. It became apparent in the course of the discussion, from the nature of the remarks made, that they were not seeking to amend the resolution, that it was not the subject-matter of the House resolution to which they objected, but that the men who spoke were in opposition to the expression on the part of the American people of any sympathy with the struggling people of Cuba.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. ADAMS. I decline to yield. The gentleman from Maine denied me the courtesy yesterday of an interruption. He must excuse me now for not granting it to him.

The gentleman from Maine may criticize the sentiments embodied in the resolution. This was done during the discussion in the Senate on the part of a few of the members in that body who desired to defeat all expressions of sympathy on the part of the people of this country with Cuba. The Senator from New York said he did not like the resolution because it enunciated the doctrine that this country would protect American property wherever it was situated. He did not like, he claimed, pecuniary motives or considerations to be incorporated in a solemn resolution expressive of sympathy.

Ah, Mr. Speaker, he was at a loss for some criticism in order to sustain the position of opposition that he took to the resolution. And, in another part of my remarks, I will refer to the position taken by several Senators on this point.

Another gentleman objected on the ground that the grammar of one of the sections was not strictly correct, but he took good care not to state what the section or paragraph was or to cite the rule of Murray to which it would not accord. Another had objections on the ground that the Senate should adhere to their own resolutions, and not be coerced, bulldozed, or carried away by the House of Representatives. In other words, it was a claim that Senatorial dignity must be maintained.

When the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations found it was obstruction and not opposition with which he was confronted, he asked leave to withdraw the report and let it go back to the conference committee. I do not wish to disclose in any improper way the proceedings of the conference committee, but, inasmuch as assertions have been made which were entirely inaccurate, I know of no other way to remedy them except by a statement of the facts. No claim was made by the conferees on the part of the Senate that the resolutions of the House could not pass the Senate; but it was stated that a small number of Senators, from 6 to 10, at the outset of the controversy had announced a purpose to filibuster, if necessary, to the end of the session to defeat the express will of the whole American people and not allow the resolutions to go on the records of Congress. When that situation was made known to the conferees on the part of the House, we saw that if we wished to carry out the will of the people, there was but one way, and that was to acquiesce in the Senate resolutions, withdraw them from the consideration of that body, and bring them back to the House of Representatives, which is closer, nearer, and dearer to the people of this country, and where we could see that the wishes and sentiment of the American people might be embodied in the resolution of sympathy and put on the records of Congress, and that this, the mother of Republics, was ready to hold out the hand of relief in any part of this continent to our struggling sisters who were seeking the establishment of self-government. The members of the Senate who were in the majority saw that under the rules of the Senate they could not force a vote to be taken on the resolution; and hence this was the only parliamentary solution of the difficulty. It is for this reason that the conferees, having held out for the adoption of their own resolution, agreed to accept the Senate resolutions and bring them back and recommend their passage by the House of Representatives.

Now, another claim has been set up here that there is no government in the nature of a Republic in Cuba; that these men were bandits; that it was a negro uprising or insurrection, and that we have no information here to warrant us in extending belligerence to those people fighting for liberty on the Island of Cuba.

I wish to state, sir, and I do it on the most accurate information which, after two months of investigation, I have been able to obtain, that that charge is absolutely untrue. There was a congress held at Jimaguayu, a town in the Island of Cuba, at which there were representatives from every province of that island. They adopted a constitution. So careful was their consideration and so well weighed was their action that when it was proposed to establish a military dictatorship it was not allowed. They said they would have a civil form of government, that the military should be subservient to it and under its direction, and a regular civil government was organized then and there. I will give you a list of the men who constituted the president and cabinet of this Republic, because I wish to show their character; that they are not adventurers; that they are people of standing and position; that they are patriots who are striving, as did our forefathers over a century ago, to establish the eternal right of self-government on the Island of Cuba, almost the last vestige of land on this Western Continent of ours that is subject to royal control.

The president is the ex-Marquis Santa Lucia, a man whose love of liberty was so great that he laid down his title and became a plain citizen.

The vice-president is Bartolomè Masso.

The secretary of foreign affairs is Rafael Portuondo, who was an attorney of good standing, and assistant district attorney under Spain.

The secretary of war is General Roloff, a man well known as being always ready to lend his aid to the cause of liberty.

The subsecretary of war is Mario Menocal, an engineer, a name well known in our country, and he is the nephew of the man who has had so much to do with the Nicaragua Canal.

The secretary of the treasury is Sarcio Pina, a man of good family and of high distinction.

The secretary of the interior is Dr. Santiago Canizareo, who was port physician under Spain.

The subsecretary of foreign affairs is Dr. Dominiquez, one of the survivors of the massacre of the students by the volunteers, which cast such a stain on the last war that was waged in Cuba in 1871.

The treasurer is Dr. Joaquin Castillo, who is known probably to every man in this House as having been a member of the *Jeannette* expedition to the polar regions.

Sir, there is not a colored man in the whole list that I have read. There is not a man who holds a high commission in the insurgent army, except Maceo, who is not a white man. When these claims are made in order to deprecate these struggling patriots it is time they should be repudiated on the floor of this House, and that the truth may prevail.

Now, sir, to sustain this position, that even in the ranks there are plenty of native Cubans, I will quote from the official letters of the consuls of the United States. These are not newspaper reports. These are what the subcommittee waited for before they reported these resolutions to the House, in order that they might have official information. Consul Hyatt writes:

During the past week about 100 men have left Santiago to join the insurgent forces. Many of these men belong to the best families of the town, which gives a new phase to the uprising.

Another consul writes:

Men are constantly leaving the large centers of population to join the insurgents, and the public opinion is rapidly going in that direction.

There is another letter here somewhere, of similar import, which I can not at this moment find.

Now, sir, the charge has been made—was dragged into this debate yesterday, and I do not see how it applies—of the great barbarity that has been practiced in Spain. It was held up here, and the method of public execution described. How was it answered? Sir, when the gentleman from Maine rose in his place and in order to palliate the legalized cruelties of other countries cited the illegal acts of his own, and began to put in the official record of Congress the story of lynchings and tortures that had taken place in our country, it shows the weakness of his argument. In the one horrible case which the gentleman cited as having occurred in this country, he did not even give the cause of it. He did not state that the mob was roused to its point of fury in avenging a crime that was so atrocious that I can not name it on the floor of this House.

Sir, it is a bad cause and a weak argument when a man has to derogate his own country in order to mitigate the crimes of other lands when cruelty is charged against them. Sir, I care not whether garroting be cruel or not—the gentleman says it is the legal death penalty in Spain—I only know that in the last case of which I read in the papers it was stated that the public executioner and his assistant fled from their work and could not pursue it. It was even too much for men trained to execute their public function.

Sir, all the cruelties that exist in this case are to be placed at the door of the Spanish as against these insurgents. I ask any man of fair judgment to read the official proclamation of the new governor-general, Weyler, who has taken his place to put down

this rebellion because Campos, who closed the last rebellion, not by force but by compromise, has not succeeded in putting down this one. Campos closed the last rebellion by promising to these people autonomy, representation in the Cortes, and reform in the taxation. These were promised after the vain endeavor for ten long years to put down the rebellion by force. Not one of those promises, practically, has been kept, and that is the reason for this new outburst on the part of the Cubans against Spanish imposition and Spanish cruelty, in order to free themselves from the great burden of taxation which has been imposed upon them.

Now, sir, I come down to the question of belligerency. It has been much discussed on the floor of this House. We are told that these people are not entitled to the rights of belligerents, first, because they have no capital; second, because they do not possess a seaport, and third, because they fly no flag on the high seas. Gentlemen, these are not requisites under international law for the granting of the rights of belligerency. The fact of the existence of a capital permanently located is the best evidence probably of the existence of a permanent government. The possession of a port shows they are able to hold it against the force of the parent government. So far as this cause is concerned, they have got a capital; it is located, I will admit, on the Cubitas Mountains; but it is so strong and so impregnable that, although 6,000 Spanish troops have occupied a position for a space of one year within 6 miles of that place, they dare not attempt to take it. The gentleman from Maine has said that this is one reason why belligerency should not be granted.

I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if when some sturdy delegate to the Continental Congress when he arrived at the city of Philadelphia, to take his place there and represent his district, had found that the capital of the then struggling Republic of the United States had been moved to Lancaster, would he have said, "Our cause is lost; our cause is not just, because our permanent capital has been removed?" Methinks he would have pursued his travel to Lancaster; and when he arrived there, and found that the capital of the Republic had been moved farther on, do you think that the heart of that sturdy old New England delegate to the Continental Congress would have failed him and that he would have said, "The Republic is lost; our cause is a hopeless cause; the capital has moved back to the mountains of Pennsylvania, to York?" No, sir; methinks he would have gone to the mountains of Pennsylvania, where was located the capital of our Republic, and when there he would have voted for new supplies and made arrangement for the raising of new men, and not have said that the cause of the great American people was hopeless or lost because the capital had been moved to the mountains. [Loud applause.] But, sir, the tone of New England was different in those days from what it is now; and we in the Middle States look for inspiration to Plymouth Rock, and not for cold water and arguments against the people who are struggling for liberty.

Now, sir, belligerency means a state of war. Whenever men can establish under international law that a state of war has been maintained for a reasonable time its people are entitled to belligerency. I will ask any rational man if, when the official records of Spain show that 120,000 Spanish troops have been sent to Cuba in the past year, that is not a state of war? I will quote from a Spanish newspaper to show that my sources of information are utterly impartial. It says (I will translate):

We hold in front of our troops 53,000 insurgents. Thirty thousand of them are well mounted [referring to the cavalry] and perfectly armed.

This is from El Pais of the 9th of January of this year.

Can any man maintain that an army of 120,000 troops, reenforced by 40,000 volunteers in Cuba, on the one side, and on the other 53,000 men, who, in spite of the disparity of the numbers to-day, at the end of eighteen months of battle, the Spaniards have not even gained a foot from the Cubans, but have lost, lost until they have gone to the very gates of Habana, the capital of the island; and had they had artillery or had they more arms to equip a sufficient number of men they could have captured the city and swept the Spaniards into the sea.

Now as to the message of General Grant, which was quoted here as a precedent. No man, sir, should stand higher or have more weight with the people of this country and with its representatives, especially on a question of war, than the great captain-general who saved our country. But, sir, one fact must be remembered: General Grant personally always gave his sympathy, and would have recognized the belligerency of the Cubans if it had not been for the advice and influence of his Secretary of State. In a recent interview with the Hon. Hamilton Fish, his son, now living in Albany, he gave out a portion of his father's diary, where General Grant was just about to recognize the Cubans, when the Secretary of State sent for him and persuaded him against it; and General Grant, with that great breadth of mind for which he was so much credited, at the advice of the Secretary of State, did not carry out his purpose. Sir, with all due respect to Hamilton Fish, whom I honor and admire and whose acquaintance I possessed, it

was the same influence upon Secretary Fish—the business interests of New York—that had great weight with him, and the same that makes a Senator of that State stand on the floor of the Senate and oppose it to-day. The business interests and the stock market do not represent the sentiment of 70,000,000 people of our great Republic.

Now, sir, I claim that under international law they are entitled to belligerency, because they have an established government of their own. They have gained possession of almost the entire island, and have an independent government of the island. They have governors in their provinces who control the civil authorities. They have prefectos in every district who administer justice, and who levy supplies and forward them to the army; and while that may not be called taxation, that is what it is to all intents and purposes, for the money is generally used just as if it were raised by taxation.

There is one other point of international law that I wish to refer to before I close. It is a well-admitted principle which has been enforced time and time again, that when the material interests of any country are affected by strife, either internal or foreign, going on in a neighboring state—when the commerce, the manufactures, or the sources of commercial supply of that country are seriously interfered with—its government, under the law of self-preservation, has a right to intervene to put an end to the strife.

Before emphasizing this proposition I wish to advert for a moment to another point. It has been asserted here that the people in the towns in Cuba are not in sympathy with the revolutionary movement and that it is limited entirely to the agricultural districts. I have here a copy of a set of resolutions adopted by the officials of the town of Mantua, one of the towns that the insurgents captured and held for quite a time. The original of these resolutions, attested by the seal of the town, is in possession of Senator SHERMAN, so that there can be no doubt as to its authenticity. In that town when the people were free, under the protection of the insurgents, and had full liberty to express their opinions, they passed these resolutions:

Pedro Saucedo Espinosa, secretary of the municipal council of Mantua, certifies that in the archives under his charge and responsibility exists, which literally says:

Minutes: In the town of Mantua on the 23d day of the month of January, 1896, there assembled in the town hall the most important residents of this place without distinction of political opinions, presided over by the mayor. The following were present at the session: The lieutenant-general and chief of the invading army, Antonio Maceo, accompanied by his chief of staff, Brigadier Jose Maceo, and the chief of the First Brigade of Las Villas, Juan Bruno Zayas. I declare as follows:

First, that the town of Mantua is in the western extremity of the island, in the Province of Pinar del Rio.

Second, that General Maceo with forces under him has occupied the town and municipal districts, having respected lives and all kinds of property, keeping the public order with his troops, and leaving the authorities which were under the Spanish Government in their places, and that seeing the conduct of the army of liberation and of his chief they adhere to its principles and arms, believing that it would be for the benefit not only of this district, impoverished already by the many exactions of which it was the victim, but also for the benefit of the whole country which suffered the same ill treatment.

And the persons assembled, who represent the living forces of the territory in real estate, in cattle raising, in manufactures, in trade, in art, in the professions, in banking, and in agriculture, signed with the foregoing before me, the secretary, as a witness: Jose Tors, A. Maceo, Martin Viladomat, priest; the chief of staff, J. Miro; Brigadier Juan B. Zayas; the governor, Oscar A. Justiniani; the auditor of war, Jose Antonio Caines; first lieutenant major, Jose Fernandez; Simon Docal, alderman; municipal judge, Nicholas Reyes; Dr. S. Carbonell, notary public; D. Tors; substitute municipal judge, Santiago Muguza; Prof. Pedro Lozano, secretary of the municipal court; Rafael Yngles, merchant; Narciso Fontanella, secretary of the marine department; Jose Ruiz, G. Morell, Juan Ocariz, Manuel Rego, Fidel Pedraza, Jose Granda, Branlo V. Blanco, Antonio Menendez, Manuel Quintana, Jaime Vives, Jose H. Pelaez.

The secretary of the council, Pedro Saucedo, and at the request of Brigadier Jose Miro, I give the above copy with the assents of the president, in Mantua, on the 23d of January, 1896.

[SEAL OF THE TOWN.]

PEDRO SAUCHEZ (signed).

The President TORS (signed).

Now, Mr. Speaker, I revert to the principle of international law of which I have just spoken, the right of a country to intervene where its material interests are affected. Our own country is dependent on the Island of Cuba for some of the necessities of life. It is also dependent on that island for some of the materials which go into our great structural buildings. It is also dependent on that island for some of the fruits in most common use. It is also dependent on that island for several of its luxuries. Now, when the condition has arrived in which the material wealth of our country, the necessities of our people, the luxuries of our people, the materials which go into our manufactures, the trade and commerce in which our merchants make their profits—when the condition is reached where those great interests have been materially interfered with for a period of one year, we have the right, under the principle of international law which I have cited, to intervene in this dispute. If the war in Cuba continues, the island will be devastated from one end to the other in such a way and to such a degree that fifty years will not suffice to restore it to a condition which will enable it to supply us with those necessities and luxuries which we have heretofore obtained from there.

The time has come, therefore, when something ought to be done, and if the granting of belligerency tends in the direction of putting an end to this struggle, this House will be fully justified in passing these resolutions.

But, Mr. Speaker, there is another consideration, a higher consideration. I believe, sir, that this Western Hemisphere of ours has been dedicated to the right of self-government. One by one Spain has lost her colonies. Following the example set by this, the mother of republics on our Western Continent, they have separated from the mother country. One by one they have established themselves as republics in North, South, and Central America, until now Cuba and Costa Rica alone remain. Spain can not hold Cuba. That island is bound to follow the inevitable law of nature. Spain will lose Cuba just as she lost her other colonies. For seventy years this warfare has been going on in the Island of Cuba. As I have already stated, the last rebellion was put down only by compromise. It was never conquered. Those people never will be conquered.

Meet them; see the spirit that animates them; look how they fight! The well-trained soldiers of the regular army of Spain can not withstand the onset of those Cuban patriots, armed simply with the machete; they can not withstand the onset of those men fighting for liberty. The Spanish troops dare not go beyond their own fortifications. Whenever they do so they are compelled to retreat. On the other hand, the insurgent forces wander at will from one end of the island to the other. The Spaniards, with all their warlike appliances, their armed railroad cars, their cannon, and their well-trained troops, can not prevent the insurgents from traveling from one province to another. They have had them hemmed in time and time again, but never have been able to hold them there. The continuance of the conflict is inevitable and can have but one result. Why? Because it is a war waged on the part of liberty as against oppression; because it is waged by a people who are fighting for the same cause that sustained our ancestors—the right not to be taxed without representation.

The people of Cuba are overtaxed, and not only that, but the appointments of collectors of taxes are limited entirely to minions of Spain who are sent to Cuba from the mother country. Even the Cuban volunteers, so called, that they claim are fighting for Spain are Spaniards, not Cubans. They dare not arm the Cubans. They raised a regiment of native Cubans and sent them into the field; as soon as they met the insurgent forces the entire regiment deserted, under the command of the lieutenant-colonel, and the colonel of the regiment (Cineros) was so mortified that he committed suicide. The so-called Cubans who are fighting for Spain are not native Cubans; they are Spaniards who have gone to Cuba in times of peace, many of them to escape the five years of military service required in Spain, preferring to serve in Cuba, where the term is but three years. The Spaniards can not get white native Cubans to fight against their country. The native Cubans are with the insurgents in the field, and I believe that if they could get into the towns nearly everywhere would be heard similar expressions to that which I have read you from the city of Mantua.

Sir, the conflict will go on until victory crowns the efforts of those men fighting for freedom. Spain will never conquer Cuba. Cuba will join the list of the great Republics founded in this our Western Hemisphere, and soon from one end of the continent to the other there will be only that form of government which is dedicated to the rights of mankind, where white and black shall have the same civil and religious rights, and where the people shall have that free government which is their right, undictated to and uncontrolled by any power of Continental Europe. [Loud applause.]

Mr. HITT addressed the Chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POWERS). The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLET] is recognized.

Mr. GILLET of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I am aware—

Mr. HITT. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KNOX], who has a letter he desires to read from his colleague [Mr. DRAPER], a member of the committee, would like to be recognized for seven minutes.

Mr. GILLET of Massachusetts. I have no objection to yielding for that purpose.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KNOX] will proceed.

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Speaker, I have intrusted to me a letter from my colleague, General DRAPER, a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. He has sent me this letter that I may read it to the House. I differ with him, much to my regret, in the position he takes. He is opposed to these resolutions, while I am in favor of them. I differ, with similar regret, from others of my colleagues from Massachusetts. It seems to me that the struggle of the patriots of Cuba can not but excite the sympathy of a free people and their earnest solicitude for the success of those who in the love of liberty and the desire for a free government have taken up arms and appealed to the God of battles. This I understand

to be the sentiment of the Republican platform in Massachusetts. That platform expresses not merely sympathy for the Cubans, but desire for their success, and urges the United States (of which we here are the representatives) to take measures to put an end to this cruel and barbarous war. Now, if we fail to express in some practical and efficient manner such sympathy and solicitude for the Cuban patriots we shall incur, I think, not only the loss of our own self-respect, but the contempt of foreign nations.

There are two ways in which this sympathy may be expressed. If it shall be made to appear that this war is carried on with barbarity, cruelty, and atrocity on the part of the Spanish soldiery, is attended with the slaughter of noncombatants and women and children, then it would be the duty of this Government (if such course should be necessary) to interfere in the interest of our common humanity. The locality of this contest is so near that we could not be indifferent. We could not shelter ourselves by saying that we were ignorant of the facts; and if such crimes were permitted by one great power of the Western Hemisphere, we should be held responsible for them in the eyes of the civilized world.

But in the absence of such evidence there are other ways by which we can show our sympathy. One is by the adoption of such resolutions as those now pending, in favor of giving belligerent rights to these struggling Cubans. This course all the undisputed facts clearly point out as correct. It can be said with no extravagance of statement that if there ever was a revolution which was absolutely justified it is that now in progress in Cuba. Long years of misrule, of oppressive taxation wrung from the people with no beneficial returns, the denial of common right and justice to numbers of those people, left no course to the Cubans but an appeal to arms. That appeal has been sustained by an organized army, equipped and officered, which has made marches and fought battles and endured privations and sufferings that challenge the admiration of the world. And somewhere, Mr. Speaker, in the mountains of Cuba, those ancient fastnesses of liberty, there has been a government established, founded on justice and the equality of man.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Cubans may point, as to the permanence of this revolution, not alone to their present achievements, but to their past history. That history is glorified by deeds of valor, by endurance of suffering that always accompany a struggle for freedom wherever it is carried on. They surrendered in 1878; but they were unconquered, although they had met the whole power of Spain for more than ten years in open warfare, unaided and alone. Is there any reason to suppose, Mr. Speaker, that the present war will be less prolonged? Can anybody say with any foundation of fact or reason that this is but a temporary revolution—a mere ebullition of popular discontent? No, sir; it is war, bitter and prolonged war, and can have but one result—the freedom of Cuba or the annihilation of the native population of that island.

If we consider the facts as they exist, and judge the future by the past, we should give to these men the rights of belligerents. If we fail to do it we shall be false to that changeless tradition of our own country, to that love of liberty which has here its highest earthly exemplification, and shall be unfaithful to a duty that is laid upon us and which we have no choice but to discharge.

And now, Mr. Speaker, lest my time should entirely expire, I will discharge the duty imposed upon me of reading this letter of my distinguished colleague, with whom I differ with so much regret.

WASHINGTON, D. C., March 26, 1896.

MY DEAR FRIEND KNOX: I am unfortunate as a Representative in Congress in having a business that makes occasional imperative demands, and these demands sometimes come at unfortunate times. As a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, I have formed some definite ideas on the Cuban question, and though I expressed them fully in committee, I was compelled to be away when the resolutions were brought before the House some weeks ago.

Having no idea that they would be back again in any form, I have made engagements necessitating my leaving for New England to-morrow, and now it seems probable that resolutions in some form according belligerent rights to the insurgents will be reported from the conference committee during my absence.

Under these circumstances, if you will get time during the debate and read this note in the course of your remarks, it will explain my absence to those who feel as I do, and who might expect to hear from me as a member of the committee.

I am opposed to any resolution according belligerent rights to the Cubans under present circumstances for at least two reasons:

First. The facts do not warrant according them, if the writers on international law have any weight in such matters.

Second. These unnecessary disturbances of our foreign relations are having and will have a disastrous effect upon business in our own country.

I should say much more if I had opportunity to speak, but perhaps this is all of your time that I ought to occupy.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM F. DRAPER.

Hon. W. S. KNOX,
House of Representatives.

I read this letter during my own time, and regret that I can not agree with the opinion therein expressed. I am in favor of granting belligerent rights to the Cubans, that they may have their freedom, that their country may be as free as ours. [Applause.]

Mr. HITT. Mr. Speaker, I should be glad if we could agree as to the time at which to take the vote on these resolutions. A number of gentlemen have asked to speak, and I do not think there is any disposition to curtail debate unnecessarily. A great many gentlemen, however, are desirous of voting to-day. If the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. TUCKER], who is aware of the claims upon his side of the question for time, can suggest an hour when we may take a vote, I hope it will meet the assent of the whole House.

Mr. TUCKER. If my friend will postpone his request until after the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLETT] has spoken, I think we can agree upon a time.

Mr. HITT. How much time does the gentleman from Massachusetts desire to occupy?

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. Possibly not more than a few moments myself.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. How much time does the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HITT] yield?

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. The Chair will excuse me. I had the floor and yielded to my colleague [Mr. KNOX.]

Mr. BOUTELLE. There has been no limitation yet upon the time.

Mr. HITT. No; my proposition was to arrange a time for taking the vote. As the gentleman from Massachusetts expects to occupy but a few moments—

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. I desire there should be no misunderstanding. I was recognized and yielded to my colleague [Mr. KNOX]. He spoke in my time. Now, I again have the floor.

Mr. BOUTELLE. There has been no limitation of time. The gentleman from Massachusetts was recognized in his own right.

Mr. TUCKER. We will agree on the division of time hereafter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will ask the gentleman from Illinois if he has yielded time to the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. HITT. There has been no adjustment of time yet, and no one has been designated to control the time. The gentleman from Massachusetts desired to be recognized in his own right.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will then recognize the gentleman in his own right.

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I am aware that it is useless as well as unpopular to oppose these resolutions.

The overwhelming majority by which the resolutions presented before were passed showed the temper of the House, and for myself I am ready to admit that I do not believe that it exaggerated public opinion. But with all due deference I do not think that public opinion ought to guide us in this instance, because I do not believe that public opinion observed the details of this measure but looked at it simply as an expression of a sentiment of good will and friendliness toward the struggling people of Cuba. That, I think, is a sentiment in which we all participate. We all feel and would all be glad to express sympathy with Cuba, but everyone will admit that when the House of Representatives comes to express an opinion, not on a general question of sympathy, but on a very delicate question involving constitutional and international law, it is not for us to be guided entirely by our sympathies or by public sympathies, but it is our duty to analyze the question before us and decide it according to the law and the evidence.

For myself, I sympathize most heartily with the cause of the Cuban insurgents. I do not see how an American citizen, with the historical memory coming down from our own Revolution, can feel otherwise toward an American colony struggling against a European power, though I do not admit that the Cuban insurgents are of the same stuff as were our Revolutionary ancestors. And if my sympathy was not enough, I might point to the fact that self-interest also calls for the absolute independence of Cuba, for Cuba free and independent would present an opening to our market and our industries and for the investments of capital and a reciprocal trade greatly to our advantage.

So, Mr. Speaker, I freely admit at the outset of my remarks that not only motives of sympathy with the cause of struggling Cubans, but motives of self-interest as well, make us desire the success of Cuba.

But that is not the question presented to us to-day. We are not here to-day either to express sympathy or annex territory, and I think it is necessary for us to use special caution lest unwittingly to ourselves we mix the motives of love of humanity with self-interest, and lest when we think we are merely influenced by those feelings the real motive might be mercenary.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ADAMS] said we were not in the habit of hearing from Massachusetts or New England voices against human freedom. That is true; but, Mr. Speaker, it is not simply love of freedom that characterizes Massachusetts. It is love of justice as well. And I think when a question of law is presented to us on which we must pass judgment, a grave ques-

tion of intricate, delicate, constitutional law, she will insist upon her Representatives not deciding from sympathy or sentiment, but she will expect them to hear the evidence, and if the evidence is against their sympathy she will expect them to stand by the dictates of judgment and justice; and although her sympathy, like ours, would naturally be with these resolutions, I think she will not blame us if we are compelled to decide against them, nor will she be ashamed if we are in a small minority, when we are supported by the words of George Washington and Ulysses S. Grant read yesterday.

What is the resolution before us here? We are asked to express an opinion upon the rights of Cuba to belligerency. Now, the fact that this is a mere question of opinion, a question of which we have no jurisdiction, is not to me an insuperable objection. If I sat on the other side of the House, if I had recently argued and voted for the doctrine that the House had no right to express an opinion on the conduct of a foreign ambassador because it was beyond our jurisdiction, I might myself feel constrained to oppose this resolution on that ground. I think, however, this House has a right to express an opinion on any subject. It is a question of expediency; and the question raised now is whether it is wise on the part of Congress to express an opinion on a moot question of international law. To that there is this objection: The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HITT] yesterday admitted that this resolution accomplished nothing. He admitted that by expressing our opinion that they are entitled to belligerent rights we do not give them those rights. Another department of the Government decides that. So we are here arrogating rights which are not given to us. We are here usurping a jurisdiction which is not ours, simply in the hope of impressing the judgment of the Executive, who by the Constitution has that jurisdiction.

Now, it seems to me that on a delicate question of international relations it is not wise for us to express an opinion unless it amounts to something. It is not wise for us to usurp a jurisdiction and to express our opinion when we know and it is admitted that that opinion has no force. It does not bind Cuba. It does not bind Spain. It does not bind the United States. It binds no one but ourselves; and if our decision is right, if it is in accord with constitutional law, it does not help constitutional law any, and it does not help anyone else. If it is wrong, if we are making a mistake, if it is against constitutional law, it does not hurt constitutional law, but it does hurt the House of Representatives. It establishes a bad precedent for no useful purpose. That is one reason why I decline to vote for these resolutions.

And there is another reason still more influential. I think that when we come to assume a jurisdiction that does not belong to us, and express an opinion on a question of fact and of law which is not of right ours to decide, which is intruding upon another department of the Government, I think we ought to have evidence to support it beyond all question. If there is a doubt on the matter, if we can not be sure, if the evidence is conflicting or if it is vague, then I think we ought to abstain from any opinion.

Now, in this case there is no question that the evidence is vague and contradictory and insufficient. What is it that they must prove? I wish to read just one sentence, stating the constitutional law as General Grant understood it. He says in his message to Congress during the former Cuban revolution:

To justify a recognition of belligerency there must be, above all, a de facto political organization of the insurgents sufficient in character and resources to constitute it, if left to itself, a state among nations.

What do we know about the political organization of the Cuban insurgents? Do we know that they are able to take their place as a state among nations? Why, criticism has been passed upon Spain because in our civil war it prematurely recognized the Confederacy. It has been said that was an improper and unfriendly act, and it has been argued upon that ground that we ought to recognize Cuban belligerency. When Spain recognized the Confederacy it held within its own exclusive power all the jurisdiction which it ever aimed to hold. It had driven from its borders the only hostile force. The courts were in session. Municipal government existed. States existed, all recognizing the supreme power of the government which was organized, and there was a unanimity among the people supporting it greater than there was among its opponents. There were also armies formed, recognizing the jurisdiction, not merely prepared for guerrilla skirmishes or for devastation, but armies which, if war came, were sure to make a terrible and prodigious conflict. And there was no cause for them to make an attack. Unless the armies of the United States advanced to attack them, they not only would be recognized as belligerents but as independent. So that at that time they controlled all their territory. Their political organization was in full power, and they had an army ready to resist attack. It seems to me, when compared to that, it is preposterous to say that the present condition equally demands recognition. And yet we then complained that it was an improper, unfriendly act for Spain to recognize belligerency; and it seems to me if that did not

justify recognition, then we can not possibly claim to-day that recognition of the Cuban insurgents is justifiable.

But my main objection, as I said before, is that this is an intrusion upon an executive function which we ought not to undertake unless we are absolutely sure that the evidence warrants it. We are not sure. The evidence is doubtful, unreliable, and conflicting, and upon that ground we ought not to interfere with the executive function.

Then there follows another objection to these resolutions. A recognition of belligerency does not depend simply upon the condition of the belligerents. Even if the facts justify it, there must still be decided the question of expediency. First, the facts must authorize it, and second, it must be expedient.

Is it expedient to grant it? That is not for us to say. A department of the Government has been constituted to decide that question, and if this House intrudes there, again we are usurping an executive prerogative. Now, why is recognition expedient? Does it do Cuba any good? Is it helpful to Cuba? The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HITT] yesterday brought forward as the main advantage to Cuba the fact that it would give her power and freedom upon the sea. I do not know that there are any sailors in Cuba. The insurgents have no ports. They have no ships. Of what advantage will it be to recognize her belligerency and allow her to have her flag and her impossible vessels upon the sea?

But there is another advantage to Cuba which I fear may follow. It will be likely to embroil us in war with Spain, and I believe that is the main reason why the Cubans desire the passage of these resolutions. Their best hope of independence is a war between the United States and Spain, and the passage of these resolutions is one step toward it. I do not believe we have any moral right to enter upon war with Spain for this purpose. However we might think that we do it from love of humanity, certainly the other nations of the world would say we did it for greed of Cuban territory, and it seems to me it is wise for the United States, if it is going to wage war as a champion of humanity, to do it in a cause where we can not be accused of using humanity as a mere cloak for ambition. It is wise for us not to attempt to rescue Cuba in the name of philanthropy and leave it open for other nations to say we are aggrandizing our own territory.

Mr. WATSON of Ohio. Is there any attempt in these resolutions to rescue Cuba?

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. There is no attempt in these resolutions, Mr. Chairman, but the argument that supports these resolutions, the reason that the Cubans desire them—and the only reason they would do Cuba any good—is because it may lead to that.

Mr. WATSON of Ohio. Do not the resolutions declare neutrality on our part.

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. They do.

Mr. FAIRCHILD. Has the gentleman any objection to ambition when ambition is founded on humanity?

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. No, Mr. Speaker; only I think if the basis of our action is ambition we ought to make it known. I do not especially object to ambition for aggrandizement. England has been attacked very much for her ambition; but I think if the United States is going to be actuated by ambition she ought to say so, and not say she is actuated by philanthropy. I think hypocrisy is a vastly worse vice than ambition or greed of territory.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the second resolution, which suggests that our friendly offices should be tendered to Spain, expresses my feelings, and I should be glad to have the United States use any friendly offices and do anything it could in the way of kindness and peaceful intervention in order to effect the independence of Cuba. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HITT] yesterday assured us that this resolution could not give just offense to Spain. I do not see why it could. This same step, as he said, has been taken before. In the seventies the United States Government tried to intervene. She had negotiated a partial arrangement by which we should guarantee the obligations of Cuba and Cuba should be declared free. I should rejoice if such an arrangement could be made to-day. Gladly we might pay \$100,000,000 to secure this.

But, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that this very resolution shows the folly of our present conduct. Does any man think that we can to-day usefully intervene? Does any man think, with the state of public opinion in Spain, any friendly intervention of the United States would be possible? Of course it would not. And why? Because the Congress of the United States has stepped beyond its proper province and has used words which have offended the sensitiveness of Spain, so that no friendly intervention from this country will be allowed, and it seems to me that that very fact illustrates the folly of the House of Representatives engaging, outside of its province, in matters of diplomacy. It seems to me that it is very possible that when intervention was before attempted it may have been acts in the United States that prevented its fulfillment. Suppose our President, our Secretary of State, had at-

tempted within the last year to offer his friendly offices; suppose negotiations have been going on, would not the conduct and the words that have been spoken in another branch of the Congress of these United States have entirely stopped any such negotiations? So, it seems to me, this last resolution, whose spirit I heartily approve, has been rendered impotent by the acts and words of Congress.

Mr. BLACK of Georgia. May I interrupt the gentleman?

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. Certainly.

Mr. BLACK of Georgia. In that connection—and I am in entire sympathy with the argument of the gentleman—on page 2343 of the RECORD, dated March 2, when we had these Senate resolutions under consideration, the distinguished chairman of the committee, for whom we all entertain the highest respect, expressed himself in reference to this second resolution which we are now asked to vote for, and said that it would be an insult to Spain.

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. Well, if the chairman of the committee said that at that time, certainly he said yesterday quite the contrary. I know that Philip was sober in both cases [laughter], but I do not know which to accept, so I will accept the one which is most in accord with my own judgment, and that is the statement made yesterday.

Mr. HITT (to Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts). If you say that I have made two contradictory statements, tell us what they are.

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. I did not say so. The suggestion was made by the gentleman who interrupted me [Mr. BLACK of Georgia].

Mr. BLACK of Georgia. I called attention to the fact that on the 2d of March, when we had these resolutions under consideration the first time, the gentleman from Illinois, the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, said this:

The resolutions of the Senate, for which those of the House committee now offered are a substitute, are two in number; the first substantially the same as that reported by the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, and the second proposing that our Government should offer its friendly offices to Spain for the recognition of the independence of Cuba.

Now, on that second resolution he said:

Every gentleman, on hearing that suggestion made or that proposition presented to him, must think in a moment what would be the response if a proposition were made to our Government, for example, by the British minister, presenting resolutions adopted by the British Parliament asking and desiring us to consent at once to the independence of Texas, of Florida, or of Michigan. How long would he remain in Washington after presenting such a proposition as that—after the self-respect of our Government had been thus insulted?

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. If the gentleman from Illinois desires to say anything in reply to the gentleman from Georgia now, I will of course yield for the purpose, but if he had just as soon wait until I finish—

Mr. HITT. As the gentleman from Massachusetts himself has expressed an opinion about my having made contradictory statements, if he had done me the honor to listen to what I said on yesterday—

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts (interposing). Mr. Speaker, the gentleman must have misunderstood me. I simply said that the gentleman who now stands before me [Mr. BLACK of Georgia] had suggested that there was a contradiction between the two statements of the gentleman from Illinois, and I also said that my own judgment was in accord with the statement made by the gentleman from Illinois on yesterday, which I did him the honor and myself the pleasure to listen to with great attention.

Mr. HITT. Then, if the gentleman did me the honor to listen to what I said, he knows that there is not the slightest contradiction between what I said yesterday and what I said on a former occasion. I explained yesterday that an offer of that kind made by England to our Government in time of peace would be regarded as unfriendly and offensive, and meant to be so, but that such an offer to Spain by our Government as was done by two of our Presidents to Spain when war is actually in progress would be a friendly act, and had been so received twice by Spain.

Mr. BLACK of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I did not say that the gentleman from Illinois had made contradictory statements; I simply called the attention of the gentleman from Massachusetts to what the gentleman from Illinois had said about this second resolution which we are now asked to vote for.

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. I thank the gentleman; and I repeat again, Mr. Speaker, that I entirely agree with and accept the opinion which the gentleman has expressed—

Mr. HITT. Which gentleman? Two gentlemen have had a confidential conversation over there, none of which could be heard here. [Laughter.]

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. I accept implicitly, as I have already said, the statement which the gentleman from Illinois made yesterday and which I listened to with great pleasure and profit, and it is because I do agree with him, because I do not believe that this resolution conveys an insult to Spain, because I believe it is a friendly suggestion on our part—it is for that reason that I approve it and would gladly vote for it. But, as I said

before, I also think it is useless, and our friendly intervention with Spain would now be ineffectual, because in another branch of this Congress words have been spoken which have aroused the sensitiveness of Spain to such a point that no friendly intervention by the United States will be accepted. It seems to me that this case illustrates very well the wisdom of that provision of our Constitution which places the power of dealing with these matters in another branch of the Government and not in Congress, where public excitement, the desire for applause, the desire to be on the popular side, may lead to speeches which are not discreet and which may excite foreign complications in connection with matters that ought to be dealt with in a secret, restrained, reserved manner, in order that finally some friendly intervention may be made effectual. In short, I think the obvious fact that this last resolution would now be ineffectual is a conclusive proof of the folly of introducing and discussing these resolutions here.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not think this House has any occasion to go into such a discussion. It may be different elsewhere. It is an old trick of European sovereigns when the people are restive under their restraints to try to divert their attention from misgovernment at home by directing it to foreign war and conquest. I can imagine something of that sort in this country. It is not, I believe, parliamentary to mention the other branch of Congress, but I can conceive that if there is anywhere on this hemisphere a legislative body which has forfeited public confidence, which is distrusted and discredited, which, when legislation for the good of its constituents has been presented to it, has steadfastly put it to one side, which sees the country in bankruptcy and suffering, trade dull, commerce paralyzed, industry dead, everybody appealing to it for aid, and then which deliberately refuses that aid, I can, I say, conceive that if there were anywhere such a body as that, it might well try to divert public attention from its own misconduct by stirring up an excitement about foreign affairs, a sentiment for war, a fever of martial ambition and military glory, even if thereby they still further disturbed business and shattered public confidence, and might hope, by exciting some such gale of factitious enthusiasm, to turn from itself the reprobation it deserved and fan itself back into popularity and power.

I do not believe this House needs to engage in any such discussion. I believe that its members have vigorously, energetically, wisely tried to improve the deplorable condition of the country and better the welfare of their constituents. If their efforts have not succeeded, the people know where the responsibility rests; and I believe it is not only for the present good of this House, but for our permanent popularity at home and the good of our constituents, to continue devoting ourselves to the legitimate province of Congress and the best interests of this country, letting it be understood that this end of the Capitol is here for business and not for "buncombe." I believe such a course will ultimately tend to the strength of the House as well as to the good of the country.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I suppose I shall undoubtedly be misrepresented outside for the ground I have taken here. I shall be accused at home of being a friend of Spain and an enemy of liberty. But I hope in this House I shall not. I hope it will be explicitly understood that, as I have stated, I am in entire sympathy with the independence of Cuba. I hope there may be established a stable, permanent, and successful republic. I wish it because of my sympathy with Cuba and also because of a sentiment of self-interest on the part of the United States. So wishing, I would gladly vote for any resolutions of sympathy. But I will not vote for this resolution recognizing belligerency, which calls upon us to decide on doubtful evidence a question of fact and of law on an important international issue which is beyond our province, binds nobody but ourselves, and accomplishes nothing except to establish a precedent which may come back to plague us. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. HITT. The gentleman can not reserve the remainder of his time, if the arrangement which I am about to suggest should be made.

Mr. GILLET of Massachusetts. I do not desire to reserve the time for myself.

Mr. HITT. The gentleman can not reserve it for anybody else. If an arrangement for taking the vote should now be made, as I trust it may be, I should be glad if the House would assent to the proposition to have the vote to-day—at 4 o'clock or 5 o'clock. [Cries of "Now!" "Now!"]

Mr. TUCKER. There are gentlemen on this side of the House who desire to be heard on this question, and I think there would be desired on this side about an hour and thirty minutes—perhaps an hour and forty-five minutes.

Mr. QUIGG. Then we could not vote to-night.

Mr. HITT. I suggest, then, Mr. Speaker, as there is a desire on the part of many members to address the House, that it be agreed by unanimous consent that the remainder of this day's session, prolonged to whatever hour the House may see fit, be devoted to the discussion of this conference report, and that the vote be taken

on Monday morning, without further debate, immediately after the reading of the Journal.

Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky. I suggest to the chairman of our committee [Mr. HITT], and also to my colleague on the committee, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. TUCKER], that we have a vote this afternoon. Let the question be discussed from now until half past 4 o'clock or 5 o'clock, and then let the vote be taken. [Applause.]

Several MEMBERS. Let us vote now.

Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky. Next Monday is suspension day, and other matters of importance will come up then. I think we might have a vote this afternoon at 5 o'clock. [Cries of "All right."]

Mr. HITT. I ask unanimous consent, then, that the vote be taken at 5 o'clock this afternoon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HITT] asks unanimous consent that the vote be taken on the pending question at 5 o'clock this afternoon.

Mr. MAHON. I object.

Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky. Then I suggest 4 o'clock.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Illinois modify his request by substituting 4 o'clock?

Mr. HITT. As objection has been made, my request is now at an end.

Mr. TUCKER. I hope the suggestion of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MCCREARY] will not be adopted. There are gentlemen here who want to be heard on this question and who have a right to be heard.

Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky. I withdraw the suggestion for a vote at 4 o'clock.

Mr. TUCKER. I am perfectly willing that we should have a vote this evening; but these gentlemen have the right to be heard.

Mr. HITT. There has been objection raised by so many gentlemen to any proposition to close debate this afternoon that it would seem impossible to secure consent for any proposition of that kind. I therefore make the motion—I do not ask unanimous consent—that the time for debate on this conference report be limited to this day and that the vote be taken on Monday after the reading of the Journal without further debate.

Mr. RICHARDSON. It is not in order, I will suggest to the gentleman, to make the motion. I think we can agree by unanimous consent on a time.

Mr. HITT. Objection is made to the request. I make the motion, Mr. Speaker, if in order; and on that demand the previous question.

Mr. CANNON. I will make no objection to the motion; although it seems to me that the gentleman can get unanimous consent if he asks again. I know of no way of closing debate except by moving the previous question.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I suggest that the gentleman make the request again.

Mr. HITT. Then I will make the request again, Mr. Speaker; the same request.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that the debate close to-day, and that the vote be taken on Monday morning immediately after the reading of the Journal, without further discussion. Is there objection?

Mr. MAHON. I will object to that if the gentleman will not include also a night session to be held for debate.

Mr. QUIGG. Why do you want a night session?

Mr. MAHON. There are men here, let me say to the gentleman, who wish to be heard. Why not have a session to-night and give them a chance? This is a very important question.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. MAHON. I object unless we can agree to have a night session.

Mr. HITT. Then I will put it as a part of my request that the House at 5 o'clock take a recess until 8 o'clock, to continue in session, say until 10 o'clock, for debate only on this question, and that the vote be taken on Monday immediately after the reading of the Journal without further debate.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will submit the gentleman's request to the House. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that the House, at 5 o'clock, take a recess until 8 o'clock, the evening session to close at 10 o'clock, for debate only on the conference report, and that a vote be taken on Monday morning immediately after the reading of the Journal, without further debate. Is there objection?

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

Mr. HITT. Now, Mr. Speaker, if the Chair will recognize some one on either side to control the time we can make some arrangement or adjustment of it.

Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky. If it requires a motion, I would move that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HITT] have the control of the affirmative and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. TUCKER] the negative.

The SPEAKER. That would require unanimous consent. If there be no objection, the Chair will recognize the gentlemen named to control the time.

There was no objection.

Mr. HITT. I yield ten minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COCKRELL].

Mr. COCKRELL. Mr. Speaker, I have listened with a great deal of interest to this debate from its inception to this time, and have felt no disposition at all to enter into any discussion of the question as presented by the resolution before the House. But as there has been no one from my part of the country who has seen fit to express any views on the subject at all, at the solicitation of some of my friends I agreed to make a few remarks.

I have no disposition to go into an extended or elaborate argument on the question; but I do desire to answer some arguments that have been presented by gentlemen on the other side of the question. Now, it has been said by my friend from Pennsylvania, who sits before me [Mr. ADAMS], that those who oppose these resolutions declare that there is no one supporting the resolution except the people of the country. That may be so to some extent, but I have long since learned that the country people as a rule are generally on the right side of all questions. I have also learned, and have learned since the discussion of these resolutions commenced, within the last two or three weeks, that there is a certain class of men who live on the continent of America (and who ought to have more patriotism) who have been covering every member's desk for the last two or three weeks with cries that the commercial interests of the country will be ruined, that the money interests were all involved in this question, and "for God's sake stop this hue and cry about Cuba." I received some of these circulars this morning, and after reading them came to the conclusion that there was a great number—no; I will not say a great number; I will take that back—but that there is a small number of people who claim to be American citizens, and if their combined patriotism was all condensed into a small space it would not exceed the size of a copper cent. [Laughter and applause.]

They have forgotten the duties and obligations, it seems to me, that they owe to a struggling people—Cuba; and when I read the history of the struggles of this nation in its infancy, when that gallant General Washington was being driven from post to pillar by overwhelming forces, how any man on this floor can say that the Cubans are not entitled to belligerent rights because they failed to face the Spanish army and fight some great battle—that they are always on the retreat—I can not understand why they should be condemned for this method of warfare, for this has always been the policy of a wise general in command of an army, to adapt himself to the conditions surrounding him and make, if necessary, a skillful and successful retreat in the face of an overwhelming enemy; and the general who can do that is a greater general than he who fights and has his men slaughtered that he may hold the battlefield.

It is the policy of a wise general to husband his resources, to husband the lives of his soldiers, to husband the lives of his men, through which alone he can expect to succeed against overwhelming numbers. And I say to-day that Maceo and Gomez have exhibited a degree of generalship that has never been excelled in the history of this or any other nation. On an island not larger than my district, not containing as much territory as there is in my Congressional district, Spain has landed 125,000 troops to put down what it says is a mere faction in that island, who are mere bandits. In addition to that, the gentleman from Maine [Mr. BOUELLE] yesterday said that large numbers of Cubans had entered the field on the side of Spain. He said about 40,000 had done so. These, with 125,000 sent by Spain to Cuba, make 165,000. So 165,000 men who have been upon the trail of these patriots for more than a year have never been enabled to hold any of the territory of Cuba out of the reach of the cannon of the Spanish gunboats.

These Cubans are struggling for liberty, and it will be a blot upon the American name if we do not raise our voices in defense of these people; and not only that, but take whatever steps are necessary to uphold the hands of these struggling patriots while they wrestle against an overwhelming force.

Now, if these people are not entitled to belligerent rights, what was our condition during our struggle for independence? We never had in the American Army more than 38,000 soldiers at any one time. The British never exceeded over 68,000, and for seven long years we struggled with might and main. Never have a people struggled harder than we did. Our rights were recognized. While we were driven from our capital, while we held none of the coast, while we had no navy, yet the nations of the earth said to us, "You are entitled to belligerent rights." And yet Americans in this day and time tell us that these struggling Cubans are not entitled to belligerent rights. If I had my way I should go further than this resolution goes; but as the committee in its wisdom has seen fit to accept these resolutions as they come from the Senate, I am willing to accept them, not as an antidote

for all the crimes that have been perpetrated, but I say to-day that we owe it to these struggling patriots upon our border to acknowledge their independence. That is what they deserve. [Applause.] They have won the right to that recognition, and are entitled to it. If I had my way I should take this old wolf Spain, which has had all of its colonies by the throat for the last hundred years, and has sucked the life blood out of them until they could stand it no longer and have revolted, and as my friend to-day said, Spain has lost the last colony which she has upon our border—I tell you it is an act that we owe to these people to take this old wolf by the throat and tell her that she must take her Weyler and her murderers off the Island of Cuba and give its people their independence. [Applause.]

Mr. HITT. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. WOODMAN].

Mr. WOODMAN. Mr. Speaker, it seems time that the matter of recognition of the Cubans was disposed of. It has been dragging along week after week, while some of the honorable gentlemen at the other end of the Capitol have been talking eloquently against it and against time.

Now, I submit that it is time to act. The butchery and outrage of the Spanish commander in that island is daily going on, and the brutality of it is recorded in the morning papers every day. Only a day or two ago was the record published of five men, captured as prisoners of war, who were garroted as murderers, violators, and incendiaries.

Mr. Speaker, this nation should enter a protest against such inhumanity and such arrant cowardice as is involved in the butchery of prisoners of war. The granting of belligerent rights to Cuba will do more than to enable the government of that island to purchase arms, ammunition, and supplies in the United States; it will place upon Spain the necessity of conducting its warfare according to the recognized rules of war. It is considered in international law that any nation has a right to interfere in any conflict if such interference be on the grounds of ordinary humanity. And the rules of war do not encourage, under any circumstances, the massacre of defenseless prisoners who may have been captured. There is one pertinent fact in this connection. All the prisoners taken by the Spanish army are executed, while the Spanish troops, when taken by the patriots of Cuba, either join the Cuban army or are confined till Cuba shall be free.

Much has been said of the incendiarism of the patriots. That is simple. The orders of the Republic of Cuba were that no cane should be ground, as the product of the cane fields produce a large revenue for Spain. It is probable that the fields of such planters as disobeyed the order may have been burned, just as any army would destroy supplies to prevent their falling into the hands of the enemy. On the other hand, Spain insists on treating Cuban patriots, the men who possess and maintain control of almost the whole island, except a few seaports, as murderers and incendiaries, and executes them forthwith. It is a violation of humanity; it is a violation of the rules of warfare; it is a violation of all the principles that men hold most dear. Consequently, I say that it is true that Congress should put its seal of condemnation on the practices of Spain in Cuba, and give to those who are struggling for freedom the rights which nature and nature's God demand. [Applause.]

Mr. TUCKER. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to my colleague [Mr. ELLETT of Virginia].

Mr. ELLETT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the House is now considering a question of great moment and importance, and the result of its deliberations will affect most gravely not only our own country, but Spain and her struggling dependency—Cuba, "the Gem of the Antilles." As an individual, as a simple American citizen, I, from the bottom of my heart, would rejoice to see Cuba free. My warmest sympathies go out to every people struggling for the blessings of liberty, to every man who, following the example of our patriots of the Revolution, is seeking those blessings which we have enjoyed for over one hundred years.

Addressing this body, however, and in this presence, I have what I consider a higher duty to perform. We are not here to express our individual sympathies, preferences, or prejudices, as seems to have been the case with many. We are here as the direct representatives of 173,000 people of our respective districts, but over and above that we are here as the representatives of this great Union, and in that capacity our responsibility becomes those of judges in this matter.

Therefore we should approach and discuss this question with deliberation and not with passion and prejudice. We should not endeavor to inflame the passions of this House by such terms as "the wolf of Spain," "the tyrant Weyler," and by introducing pictures from illustrated papers with long citations from prejudiced journals, but should approach the subject with that calm deliberation worthy of the dignity of this great Republic. We should consider the international laws relating to belligerency and be guided thereby, and this country should act as becomes one of the friendly family of nations.

Mr. Speaker, belligerency is a pure question of fact. The definition of the word belligerent is "actually at war." And the question of recognition of belligerent rights is not one inherent in the country which is seeking recognition, but it is one entirely at the will and pleasure of the country granting that recognition, and they must take the responsibility therefor. I should certainly be inclined to defer to the great will of the majority as so numerously expressed here, were I not well fortified by the past history and precedents of my own country and sustained by no less a soldier than General Grant, who, when President of the United States, and acting under identically the same circumstances, laid down this as the rule that should govern the Congress of the United States at that time.

Before I read it, however, permit me to state that, while I was not here, I have been authoritatively informed, that the same passions and prejudices were rushing through both branches of Congress at that time as seem now to prevail. This message not only allayed that feeling, but caused the question to pass from discussion by both bodies of the Congress and by the people of the whole country.

The question of belligerency is one of fact, not to be decided by sympathies for or prejudices against either party. The relations between the parent State and the insurgents must amount in fact, to war in the sense of international law. Fighting, though fierce and protracted, does not alone constitute war; there must be military forces acting in accordance with the rules and customs of war, flags of truce, cartels, exchange of prisoners, etc., and to justify a recognition of belligerency there must be above all a de facto political organization of the insurgents sufficient in character and resources to constitute it, if left to itself, a State among nations capable of discharging the duties of a State and of meeting the just responsibilities it may incur as such toward other powers in the discharge of its national duties.

Applying the best information which I have been enabled to gather, whether from official or unofficial sources, including the very exaggerated statements which each party gives to all that may prejudice the opposite or give credit to its own side of the question, I am unable to see, in the present condition of the contest in Cuba, those elements which are requisite to constitute war in the sense of international law.

The insurgents hold no town or city; have no established seat of government; they have no prize courts; no organization for the receiving and collecting of revenue; no seaport to which a prize may be carried or through which access can be had by a foreign power to the limited interior territory and mountain fastnesses which they occupy. The existence of the legislature representing any popular constituency is more than doubtful.

In the uncertainty that hangs around the entire insurrection there is no palpable evidence of an election, of any delegated authority, or of any government outside the limits of the camps occupied from day to day by the roving companies of insurgent troops. There is no commerce, no trade, either internal or foreign; no manufactures.

Mr. Speaker, that was written by the President of the United States, Gen. Ulysses S. Grant in 1870, and I, without fear of contradiction, claim that it applies to the present situation, and that the present situation is identical, so far as the facts are concerned, with that which existed at the time when this message was written.

Why, it is claimed that they have a small capital in the mountains of Cuba protected by about 1,500 men in an impregnable fastness. This capital is situated on an elevated plateau containing about 15 square miles, the valley being surrounded by mountains. Is that a ground for the recognition of a government? Why, in Tazewell County, Va., we have Burke's Garden, containing 30 square miles of beautiful blue-grass country, with only one outlet in the mountain defiles, which could be protected by 1,500 men. If the Southern Confederacy had permanently held that one place only, with small bodies of troops scouring the rest of the country, recklessly and wantonly destroying the property of their own people, do you suppose that Spain, France, or England would have accorded to her belligerent rights? Why, of course not!

Another thing. Where is the insurgent seaport, where is organized war? Where is the great battle that has been fought, such as Bull Run or Gettysburg? None. All the news that comes to us comes under a cloud and shadow; and then again, the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PATTERSON] said yesterday that he would favor independence of these people provided they were unanimous in this rebellion; but the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ADAMS] and all others whom I have heard speak in favor of the resolutions, concede that there are 53,000 insurgents on the one side and 43,000 Cubans enlisted on the other or Spanish side.

Again, Mr. Speaker, here is what Mr. Fish, Secretary of State, addressed to Mr. Motley, then at the Court of St. James:

The President does not deny, on the contrary he maintains, that every sovereign power decides for itself, on its responsibility, the question whether or not it will, at a given time, accord the status of belligerency to the insurgent subjects of another power, as also the larger question of the independence of such subjects and their accession to the family of sovereign states.

But the rightfulness of such an act depends on the occasion and the circumstances, and it is an act, like the sovereign act of war, which the morality of the public law and practice requires should be deliberate, reasonable, and just, in reference to surrounding facts.

Deliberate! How can men saturated with the war spirit which seems to pervade this House be deliberate?

National belligerency, indeed, like national independence, being but an existing fact, officially recognized as such, without which such a declaration is only the indirect manifestation of a particular line of policy.

But circumstances might arise to call for it. A ship of the insurgents might appear in the port of the neutral, or a collision might occur at sea, imposing

on the neutral the necessity to act. Or actual hostility might have continued to rage in the theater of insurgent war; combat after combat might have been fought for such a period of time; a mass of men may have engaged in actual war until they should have acquired the consistency of military power, to repeat the idea of Mr. Canning, so as evidently to constitute the fact of belligerency, and to justify the recognition by the neutral. Or the fearness of the seat of hostilities to the neutral may compel the latter to act; it might be his sovereign duty to act, however inconvenient such action should be to the legitimate Government.

Mr. Fish says:

The question of according or withholding rights of belligerency must be judged, in every case, in view of the particular attending facts. * * * This conflict must be one which will be recognized in the sense of international law as war. Belligerency, too, is a fact. The mere existence of contending armed bodies and their occasional conflicts do not constitute war in the sense referred to.

Now let us see what President Woolsey, one of the highest modern authorities on international law, has to say on this subject:

There may be a difficulty in ascertaining when the fact of war begins, and this difficulty is the greater in cases of insurrection or revolt, where many of the antecedents and premonitory tokens of war are wanting, where an insurrection may be of little account and easily suppressed, and where war bursts out full-blown, it may be, at once. Our Government has more than once professed to govern its action by the following criteria expressed in Mr. Monroe's words relating to the Spanish South American revolts: "As soon as the movement assumes such a steady and consistent form as to make the success of the provinces probable, the rights to which they were entitled by the law of nations, as equal parties to a civil war, have been extended to them." But this rule breaks down in several places. The probability is a creature of the mind, something merely subjective, and ought not to enter into a definition of what a nation ought to do. Again, the success does not depend on steadiness and consistency of form only, but on relative strength of the parties. If you make probability of success the criterion of right in the case, you have to weigh other circumstances before being able to judge which is most probable, success or defeat. Would you, if you conceded, belligerent rights, withdraw the concession whenever success ceased to be probable? And, still further, such provinces in revolt are not entitled by the law of nations to rights as equal parties to a civil war. They have properly no rights, and the concession of belligerency is not made on their account, but on account of considerations of policy on the part of the state itself which declares them such, or on grounds of humanity.

And last but not least I will request the Clerk to read in full the note of Richard Dana to Wheaton's International Law, which is admitted to be the clearest and ablest presentation of this doctrine of belligerency, and I submit it fully sustains the position I have taken.

The Clerk read as follows:

The occasion for the accordance of belligerent rights arises when a civil conflict exists within a foreign state. The reason which requires and can alone justify this step by the Government of another country is that its own rights and interests are so far affected as to require a definition of its own relations to the parties. Where a parent Government is seeking to subdue an insurrection by municipal force, and the insurgents claim a political nationality and belligerent rights which the parent Government does not concede, a recognition by a foreign state of full belligerent rights, if not justified by necessity, is a gratuitous demonstration of moral support to the rebellion and of course upon the parent Government. But the situation of a foreign state with reference to the contests, and the condition of affairs between the contending parties, may be such as to justify this act. It is important, therefore, to determine what state of affairs, and what relations of the foreign state, justify the recognition.

It is certain that the state of things between the parent state and insurgents must amount, in fact, to a war, in the sense of international law—that is, powers and rights of war must be in actual exercise; otherwise the recognition is falsified for the recognition is of a fact. The tests to determine the question are various and far more decisive where there is maritime war and commercial relations with foreigners. Among the tests are the existence of a de facto political organization of the insurgents sufficient in character, population, and resources to constitute it, if left to itself, a state among the nations, reasonably capable of discharging the duties of a state; the actual employment of military forces on each side, acting in accordance with the rules and customs of war, such as the use of flags of truce, cartels, exchange of prisoners, and the treatment of captured insurgents by the parent state as prisoners of war; and, at sea, employment by the insurgents of commissioned cruisers, and the exercise by the parent Government of the rights of blockade of insurgent ports against neutral commerce, and of stopping and searching neutral vessels at sea. If all these elements exist, the condition of things is undoubtedly war; and it may be war before they are all ripened into activity.

As to the relation of the foreign state to the contest, if it is solely on land and the foreign state is not contiguous, it is difficult to imagine a call for the recognition. If, for instance, the United States should formally recognize belligerent rights in an insurgent community at the center of Europe, with no seaports, it would require a hardly supposable necessity to make it else than a mere demonstration of moral support. But a case may arise where a foreign state must decide whether to hold the parent state responsible for acts done by the insurgents or to deal with the insurgents as a de facto government.

Mr. Canning to Lord Granville on the Greek war, June 22, 1826. If the foreign state recognizes belligerency in the insurgents, it releases the parent state from responsibility for whatever may be done by the insurgents, or not done by the parent state where the insurgent power extends. (Mr. Adams to Mr. Seward, June 11, 1861, Dip. Corr., 105.) In a contest wholly upon land, a contiguous state may be obliged to make the decision whether or not to regard it as a war; but, in practice, this has not been done by a general and prospective declaration, but by actual treatment of cases as they arise. Where the insurgents and the parent state are maritime, and the foreign nation has extensive commercial relations and trade at the ports of both, and the foreign nation and either or both of the contending parties have considerable naval force, and the domestic contest must extend itself over the sea, then the relations of the foreign state to this contest are far different.

In such a state of things the liability to political complications and the questions of right and duty to be decided at once, usually away from home, by private citizens or naval officers, seem to require an authoritative and general decision as to the status of the three parties involved. If the contest is a war, all foreign citizens and officers, whether executive or judicial, are to follow one line of conduct; if it is not a war, they are to follow a totally different line. If it is a war the commissioned cruisers of both sides may stop, search, and capture the foreign merchant vessel, and that vessel must make no resistance and must submit to adjudication by a prize court; if it is

not a war, the cruisers of neither party can stop or search the foreign merchant vessel; and that vessel may resist all attempts in that direction, and the ships of war of the foreign state may attack and capture any cruiser persisting in the attempt. If it is war, foreign nations must await the adjudication of prize tribunals; if it is not war, no such tribunal can be opened. If it is war, the parent state may institute a blockade jure gentium of the insurgent ports, which foreigners must respect; but if it is not a war, foreign nations having large commercial intercourse with the country will not respect a closing of insurgent ports by paper decrees only. If it is a war, the insurgent cruisers are to be treated by foreign citizens and officials, at sea and in port, as lawful belligerents; if it is not a war, those cruisers are pirates, and may be treated as such. If it is a war, the rules and risks respecting carrying contraband, or dispatches, or military persons come into play; if it is not war, they do not. Within foreign jurisdiction, if it is a war, acts of the insurgents in the way of preparation and equipments for hostility may be breaches of neutrality laws; while, if it is not war, they do not come into that category, but under the category of piracy or of crimes by municipal law.

Now, all citizens of a foreign state, and all its executive officers and judicial magistrates, look to the political department of their government to prescribe the rule of their conduct in all their possible relations with the parties to the contest. This rule is prescribed in the best and most intelligible manner for all possible contingencies by the simple declaration that the contest is or is not to be treated as war. If the state of things requires the decision, it must be made by the political department of the government. It is not fit that cases should be left to be decided as they may arise, by private citizens, or naval or judicial officers, at home or abroad, by sea or land. It is, therefore, the custom of nations for the political department of a foreign state to make the decision. It owes it to its own citizens, to the contending parties, and to the peace of the world, to make that decision seasonably. If it issues a formal declaration of belligerent rights prematurely, or in a contest with which it has no complexity, it is a gratuitous and unfriendly act. If the parent government complains of it, the complaint must be made upon one of these grounds. To decide whether the recognition was uncalled for and premature requires something more than a consideration of proximate facts and the overt and formal acts of the contending parties. The foreign state is bound and entitled to consider the preceding history of the parties, the magnitude and completeness of the political and military organizations and preparations on each side, the probable extent of the conflict by sea and land, the probable extent and rapidity of its development, and, above all, the probability that its own merchant vessels, naval officers, and consuls may be precipitated into sudden and difficult complications abroad. The best that can be said is that the foreign State may protect itself by a seasonable decision, either upon a test case that arises or by a general prospective decision; while, on the other hand, if it makes the recognition prematurely, it is liable to the suspicion of an unfriendly purpose to the parent state. The recognition of belligerent rights is not solely to the advantage of the insurgents. They gain the great advantage of a recognized status, and the opportunity to employ commissioned cruisers at sea, and to exert all the powers known to maritime warfare, with the sanction of foreign nations. They can obtain abroad loans, military and naval materials, and enlist men, as against everything but neutrality laws; their flag and commissions are acknowledged, their revenue laws are respected, and they acquire a quasi-political recognition. On the other hand, the parent government is relieved from responsibility for acts done in the insurgent territory; its blockade of its own ports is respected; and it acquires a right to exert, against neutral commerce, all the powers of a party to a maritime war.

Mr. ELLETT of Virginia. Third. Now, Mr. Speaker, let us look into the character of this war. It is alleged that the Spaniards, and especially General Weyler, are guilty of butchery and cruelty. I am not here to accuse or defend them. We have such vague and exaggerated reports that it is almost impossible to form a satisfactory opinion except on one point, and that is that both insurgents and Spaniards are engaged much more in marauding, murdering, burning, and devastating than they are in carrying on war, and in the eyes of civilized nations this is not belligerency, but atrocious barbarism.

I again quote President Grant's message, describing the state of affairs in Cuba when it was written, and it can but be admitted that this accurately portrays the present situation:

During the six months which have passed since the date of that message the condition of the insurgents has not improved, and the insurrection itself, although not subdued, exhibits no signs of advance, but seems to be confined to an irregular system of hostilities carried on by small and ill-armed bands of men, roaming, without concentration, through the woods and the sparsely populated regions of the island, attacking from ambush convoys and small bands of troops, burning plantations and the estates of those not sympathizing with their cause.

But if the insurrection had not gained ground, it is equally true that Spain has not suppressed it. Climate, disease, and the occasional bullet have worked destruction among the soldiers of Spain; and although the Spanish authorities have possession of every seaport and every town on the island, they have not been able to subdue the hostile feeling which has driven a considerable number of the native inhabitants of the island to armed resistance against Spain and still leads them to endure the dangers and the privations of a roaming life of guerrilla warfare.

On either side a contest has been conducted and is still carried on with a lamentable disregard of human life and of the rules and practices which modern civilization has prescribed in mitigation of the necessary horrors of war. The torch of Spaniard and of Cuban is alike busy in carrying devastation over fertile regions; murderous and revengeful decrees are issued and executed by both parties. Count Valmaseda and Colonel Boet, on the part of Spain, have each startled humanity and aroused the indignation of the civilized world by the execution, each, of a score of prisoners at a time, while General Quesada, the Cuban chief, coolly and with apparent unconsciousness of aught else than a proper act, has admitted the slaughter, by his own deliberate order, in one day, of upward of 650 prisoners of war.

It is but human nature for either side in civil strife to charge the other with brutality, whether with or without just cause. The English to-day claim that we were guilty of brutality in the execution of André, and Americans make a like charge against Benedict Arnold and Tarleton.

But the facts must rule in these matters. Why this picture which has been so vividly drawn this morning by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ADAMS] of five men who were garroted in Moro Castle, Habana? I, like the gentleman, had read the harrowing description of these executions in the New York

World of Sunday. My blood boiled to think that patriots should be executed as felons. I do not believe in quoting mere newspaper statements, but as the gentleman from Pennsylvania makes his charge on the basis of the World's report, it is fair to answer him in kind. Who were these five men, the subjects of this bungling execution? Patriots? No! but felons of the deepest die. Here is what the Post of yesterday says of them:

HABANA, April 2.

The following is the story of the crime committed by the five negroes who were the victims of the bungling execution by the garrote on Monday. Their names were Sacarias Santa Cruz, Isidro Calderon, Juan Bautista Gutierrez, alias Lucumi, Rufino Ordenez, and Marcelino Gonzalez.

The scene of the bloody crime was a lonely house on the road from San Jose to Tijiragua. On the evening of July 12 José Castillo, the owner of the house, had just left it, his wife, four daughters, and three friends remaining there, when the galloping of several horses approaching the house on the highway aroused the inmates as if by a presentiment of the wretched fate they were to meet. Soon afterwards five negroes dismounted before the house, brandishing their glittering machetes, and ordered everyone in it not to move. They then demanded of Castillo's wife that she should give them all the money there was in the house. She gave them two gold pieces, asserting that that was all they had.

But some of the wretches, in ransacking the house, found 36 more gold pieces, which brought the men up to a state of fury over the deception played upon them. One of them struck the poor woman with the keen edge of his machete, decapitating her with a blow.

The negroes, seeing the blood of their first victim, became transported with rage, and put to death all but one of the inmates, the exception being one of the visitors, who was left so badly wounded that he died soon after giving testimony of the affair.

Gentlemen, I do not know anything about the garrote. I am not here to defend it, but I hear that it is a very quick and sharp chisel that cuts the spinal cord, and death is caused more quickly than by hanging. I say if these men were guilty of these crimes they most richly deserved the punishment inflicted upon them in Moro Castle.

But that is going a little away from the subject. This war, in its character, is one of pillage, devastation, fire, and ruin upon the part of the insurgents.

Here is what the recognized Cuban organ in this country boastfully says of the methods and actions of the insurgents:

Maceo's Great Raid—The Insurgent General has Devastated the Whole of Pinar del Rio.

That is the name of a province. The next heading is:

Thirteen Towns Burned—All the Tobacco Crops Destroyed and People Wandering About Without Clothing.

What is the next heading?

Spain Beaten Everywhere.

That is the method, Mr. Speaker, that the insurgents are taking to beat Spain everywhere—"thirteen towns burned; all the tobacco crop destroyed"—"people wandering about without clothing." Here is the report in full, with further heading:

The true story of the result of the raid made by Antonio Maceo into Pinar del Rio is beginning to crop out. So effectual was the work of the insurgent general that 13 towns held by the Spaniards have been destroyed and the rich tobacco lands throughout the province have been laid waste. Practically all of the island west of Habana is a wilderness. This news has heretofore been suppressed by the Spanish censors, and it is believed that matters are much worse than the news depicts.

HABANA, March 5.

The reopening of telegraphic communication with the region of Pinar del Rio brings the first detailed information of affairs in that province for several weeks.

This is where the insurgents had been with their bands in possession of this territory for several weeks, and were at last driven out, when the Spanish troops occupied the territory, and then, as this Cuban organ says, for the first time light was let in on the situation. Now, let us see how these patriots in their struggle for freedom dealt with this province:

The condition of affairs disclosed is little less than appalling. The rich Vuelto Abajo tobacco district seems to have been put to the torch and is apparently reduced to a wilderness.

Whole towns have been obliterated or reduced to a heap of ashes, and their inhabitants are wandering helpless over the face of the country, without a place to lay their heads or wherewithal to be clothed, and many of them starving.

TOWNS DESTROYED.

The villages and towns of Cabanas, Bahia Honda, San Diego de Nunez, Santa Cruz de los Pinos, Los Palacios, Pinar Real de San Diego, and San Diego de los Baños are known to be reduced to ashes, and reports of others will bring the number destroyed up to thirteen. All of these were important and thriving centers of population and business.

The last town which has succumbed to the insurgents' torch is San Juan y Martinez. The tobacco from this town is famous the world over to all connoisseurs for its matchless flavor. Its cultivation brought great wealth to the people of the district and gave material for a large commerce in the town and support to over 1,000 families.

San Juan de Martinez is, however, not more.

WAITING FOR HELP.

When the first column of Spanish troops arrived on the site of the town they found only debris and smoking ashes, and all around a seemingly limitless sea of fire. A hundred desolate families had taken refuge in poor huts outside of what was once the town and were waiting helplessly for any assistance that would save them from starvation. They were without clothes and without food and saw no prospect ahead in their despair of securing either.

San Juan y Martinez is erased from the map. The adjoining town of San Luis had a narrow escape from the same fate, but escaped almost by a miracle. The inhabitants had already fled outside, seeking a refuge from the flames

which the torch was ready to apply, when General Cornell, at the head of a detachment of troops, made his appearance on the scene, and the insurgents evacuated the town.

Such is the result of Maceo's raid. A committee representing the Chamber of Commerce and the Spanish Casino called upon Captain-General Weyler to-day and assured him of their patriotic adhesion to him in his policy.

WEYLER'S PROCLAMATION.

In consequence of the distribution of a circular containing General Weyler's proclamation requiring the concentration of all country people within the limits of the towns for protection, there have been many delegations of farmers coming to Santiago de Cuba to inquire of the military authorities how far the requirement applies to them and for an interpretation of its provisions. The consuls of foreign governments are seeking the same information.

Generals Bernal and Vicuna have arrived here for a conference with Captain-General Weyler.

Mr. Speaker, after the above description, can it be claimed that that is civilized war? Freedom is not secured nor the blessings of liberty acquired by such methods. Neither fight their battles that way. Should such people drive out the Spaniards I doubt their capacity for self-government.

Do you call the burning of dwellings, the destruction of plantations, and the devastation of the whole country war? Is that public war? Do you call the taking of 650 prisoners and slaughtering them in cold blood war? General Quesada did that in the prior rebellion, and his example has been followed on a smaller scale in this one. We learn from information as authentic and accurate as any that has been produced on the other side that the insurgents, as well as the Spaniards, are carrying on this fight not in accord with civilized warfare. I had intended to make further quotations setting forth the horrors of this war; but, gentlemen, it is not to my taste, and I hope that your ears do not desire to hear them. I will spare your feelings and not harrow them by such blood-curdling recitals.

Now, Mr. Speaker, permit me to say this: I represent, in part, upon this floor a grand old State whose history is familiar to you all. Some may be surprised that I speak here as a man of peace, but I believe that the sentiment of that State is behind me in opposing this measure. The people of this land have weighed in the balance the Fifty-third Congress and found them wanting. The people of this land will soon weigh in the same balance the Fifty-fourth Congress, and, if we are not careful, we too shall be found wanting. We have done nothing for the public interest, and while all through this land the pockets of the people are empty—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TUCKER. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes more to my colleague.

Mr. ELLETT of Virginia. All through this land the business interests, the farming interests, the laboring interests, all interests, are clamoring for the Congress of the United States to give them a remedy for the financial distress which prevails, but instead of that we fritter away our time by trying in the most offensive manner to intermeddle in the affairs of other nations and in making attacks on one of America's purest and most conscientious statesmen; and for what? Because of two speeches that he made in England. I may not approve in full those utterances, but I say to you that you might as well censure General Sherman because, in a moment of excitement, he happened to strike one of his troops on the back with his sword, as attempt to censure a man who has given a lifetime of pure, efficient, and able service to his country. Thomas F. Bayard, I am proud to say, is not injured thereby, but other countries are amazed at the lengths to which we will permit the petty politics preceding a Presidential election to carry us, and Congress loses in dignity and the esteem of the people.

Mr. WATSON of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. ELLETT of Virginia. Certainly.

Mr. WATSON of Ohio. Do you approve of the language which Ambassador Bayard used?

Mr. ELLETT of Virginia. I will be perfectly candid, sir; I think it was slightly indiscreet, but I say it was beneath the dignity of the Congress of the United States to take notice of so small a matter.

Mr. WATSON of Ohio. That was not my question. My question was whether you approved of the language that Ambassador Bayard used.

Mr. ELLETT of Virginia. I have replied to that, sir. Turn your attention, gentlemen, to our own internal affairs and let the business of other people alone for a while. Do not keep the markets of your country jumping up and down, the business of your country stagnant, while you waste the people's time and money in this Congress. As I remarked a while ago, I represent in part the State of Virginia, and I believe my people are against the expensive amusement of frittering away the time and attention of Congress upon measures in which they have no direct or immediate interest and which tend to war. If the honor of this country

should be in any way involved, the people of Virginia would be among the most ready to respond; but their history has been this. They have, as a State, always taken the position that Laertes was advised to take by Polonius:

Beware of entrance to a quarrel, but being in,
Bear it that the opposed may beware of thee.

At the time of the Revolution Virginia was not the first to sound the tocsin of war; but when America was struck she marched to the North to assist her Northern brethren. Subsequent to that her voice, through John Randolph and others, was always raised in the councils of this nation on the conservative side, against war, unless it became a dire necessity. Coming down to the war of the rebellion, as you term it on the Republican side of this Chamber, but to the war between the States, as it should be properly styled, Virginia had the honor to originate the Peace Commission, the purpose of which was to prevent, if possible, war between the States. Virginians are ready to-day, as they have been always, to take up arms to preserve and defend the honor of their country. In my district there are 25,000 ex-Confederates, men who know what war is. In defense of their country they are willing to contribute millions of men and money, but they will never, without a protest, give one man or one stiver for the purpose of intermeddling with the affairs of other peoples. [Applause.]

Mr. HITT. I yield ten minutes to the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. NEWLANDS].

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. Speaker, the Senate resolutions are substantially the same as those which were passed recently by the House, though they are not, perhaps, couched in language so diplomatic and courteous. Two objections are urged against these resolutions. One is that there is not a state of public war in Cuba. The able and convincing speech of the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs [Mr. HITT] has fully established that there is a state of public war in Cuba. One hundred and twenty-five thousand soldiers have been employed for a long period of time in attempting to suppress the rebellion, and, notwithstanding the great strength employed in that effort, three-fourths of the island is now in the hands of the insurgents.

It is true that the insurgents have not been able to meet the army of the oppressor with the force and vigor with which equal armies meet. They have been obliged to resort to the tactics always employed by insurgents against a strong and despotic power. They have been obliged to resort to guerrilla warfare—the war of attack and retreat and reattack, as the chairman of the committee so aptly stated yesterday. They have been guerrillas, not banditti. The latter attack only for plunder, but the Cuban insurgents have had a high and noble purpose—the liberation of their country, and though their destruction of property has been great, it has its justification in the fact that only by destroying the sugar crops and thus impairing the revenue of the Spanish Government can its efficiency in suppressing the rebellion be impaired. But the war so conducted has been effective. An organized government has been created which now wields its power in three-fourths of that island; and the captain-general of the Spanish forces has declared that he will require at least two years more to suppress the rebellion. I take it, then, that there is existing in Cuba a condition of affairs which justifies us in asserting that there is a state of public war and that the insurgents are entitled to belligerent rights.

The next objection urged is that Spain is a friendly nation and friendship requires that we should not intervene in a difficulty between a friendly nation and her colonies. International law is appealed to. But that law is not a rule of action which can be enforced by any tribunal. It is a code of etiquette between nations. And what does that code of etiquette require? Why, simply that nations should bear toward each other the general friendliness and courtesy which individuals in organized society entertain, but whenever a nation, like an individual, puts itself in a position where it is chargeable with the repudiation of the obligations of honor and with acts of perfidy and cruelty, then the friendship may well cease in the case of a nation, just as in the case of an individual.

Nations are not really friendly to each other. They are simply either at peace or at war with each other. War necessarily implies enmity. Peace does not necessarily involve friendship. And I take it that a great and powerful nation like the United States, the greatest and most powerful nation in this part of the world, has a certain duty to perform to other nations, just as every individual in our social organization has a duty to perform to other individuals, and this duty is the higher and the stronger in proportion to the power and the strength of the individual or the nation. I take it, then, that just as the powerful nations of Europe have felt that they had the right again and again to interfere in the affairs of Turkey for the purpose of securing to a people cruelly oppressed and downtrodden a certain protection, a protection which we have demanded in behalf of those people in certain resolutions recently passed, an equal obligation is imposed upon

the most powerful nation on this side of the world to protect a country that lies at our very doors against perfidy, cruelty, and oppression, for it should be remembered that the ten years' rebellion, from 1868 to 1878, was only ended upon certain guarantees of autonomy and representative government made by the Spanish Government—guarantees which were repudiated when peace was restored—and that Spain's perfidy lit the fires of a new rebellion.

In these resolutions what do we do? We simply express the opinion of the two Houses of Congress that Cuba is entitled to belligerent rights and that the friendly offices of this Government should be used to insure the recognition of free Cuba. We have extended the hand clothed in velvet, but it should be understood that under the glove of velvet is concealed the hand of iron which will ultimately by vigorous action break the bonds which hold an outraged colony to a perfidious, cruel, and despotic Government.

I think this country has some duty to perform besides a duty to its own people. We have not the right to pursue the policy of selfish exclusion any more than an individual has in organized society. I think we have a duty to perform to all the Republics of this continent that now, with the exception of Mexico, cast disgrace upon the very name of republicanism. Instead of maintaining the policy of selfish exclusion which we have maintained for years, saying to the great powers of Europe, and particularly to England, "Hands off! we will not permit you to extend to these countries the government of law and order," we have a certain duty to discharge to humanity and to civilization in seeing that those countries are no longer dedicated to disorder and violence. There is a certain duty as protector that devolves upon the people of this country with reference to the nations on this continent. It should be exercised through the Pan-American Congress—through treaty relations for mutual cooperation and support—by all the moral influence which a great nation can exercise in its communion with weaker powers, and, if necessary, when civil war, anarchy, and mutual destruction blot the fair name of republicanism and substitute military despotism, by an armed intervention, commanding order and good government.

Now, of course, we all understand that the people of the Latin race are not so well fitted as those of the Anglo-Saxon race for free government. We through generations and through centuries have had a training for freedom—in our trial by jury, in our legislative system, and by all the machinery of our forms of government—so that it may be said that the Republic of America was the very evolution of the education of ages. The Latin race has not been prepared for such an evolution. Yet must we say that the colony of this European despotism must be kept always under the heel of the oppressor because its people are not fitted for self-government? Shall we keep people in darkness in order to train them for the light? I apprehend that the very fact that disorder and violence exist in the Central American and South American Republics, that the Latin race is illy fitted for free government, is no objection to a bold and decided stand on the part of this country in favor of the independence of Cuba, for I claim that the very first step in the evolution of liberty is to break the shackles that bind a dependent colony to a despotic country.

So from every point of view my judgment is that we should take a firm, self-reliant, and powerful position with reference to this entire continent—with reference to the Central American and the South American Republics and with reference to dependent colonies suffering under oppression and cruelty. In that view, regardless of the talk about the friendship which should exist between nations and the etiquette that should control friendly nations in their dealings with each other, I say that some duty devolves upon us toward civilization and humanity and human liberty, and this duty is best discharged by prompt and vigorous action with reference to this struggling country at our very doors.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. HITT. I yield three minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. STEWART].

Mr. STEWART of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I was astounded and surprised at the stand and argument of the brilliant, persistent, but inconsistent man from Maine. His argument, forsooth, was because our Treasury was depleted by the unwisdom and maladministration of the Democracy that therefore we should close our hearts to charity and close our mouths to words of pity and sympathy. He charges that we should not, on this account, because our Treasury is empty, protest against the bloody hand of Spain and the cruel proceedings of that bloodthirsty, cruel, and vindictive nation that has looked on in all the years of history with bloodshot eyes on all the nations of the earth.

Why, Mr. Speaker, it is an inherent right in all nations to exercise a just, proper, and reasonable discretion in recognizing the belligerency of other nations or peoples struggling for liberty. It is not an act of war, and does not necessarily place us under the perils of war.

More than a month before the battle of Bull Run, Spain had

recognized the belligerency of the Southern States of the Confederacy, when that government simply existed on paper, and before it had shown itself able to resist in any degree the armies of the United States. What sympathy, then, does America owe to Spain? But, on the other hand, do we not owe every consideration of compassion to our downtrodden and persecuted neighbor, Cuba? How like our case in the dark and lonely days of the Revolution is hers! She now is experiencing her "Valley Forge," and her sufferings—how like ours in the dreary and hopeless swamps of the Carolinas!

I appeal to this House in the name of humanity, in the name of all that is just and right and pure, in the name of human sympathy and pity, to recognize poor, struggling Cuba, and give her the rights to which she is justly entitled in order that she may have a better standing before the world. [Applause.]

[Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia addressed the House. See Appendix.]

Mr. HITT. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WALSH].

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I will merely occupy the time of the House for the purpose of putting myself on record in favor of the resolutions offered here, and for the purpose of correcting an impression which might have been gathered from the remarks of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ADAMS] who spoke here this morning. In the course of the eloquent speech that he made in favor of the resolutions, in nearly all of which I heartily and sincerely concur, he attributed to the Senator from the State of New York a motive which is as foreign to him as it can be to any man in public life who enjoys his enviable record. The gentleman from Pennsylvania suggested that Senator DAVID B. HILL, in his attitude toward this resolution, reflected the sentiment of Wall street.

Now, Senator HILL has his strong points and, I suppose, his weaknesses, like most men. He has his friends and his enemies. There are those who praise him and those who censure him; but all must admit that if there is one lesson we can gather from his career it is that throughout the whole of that career he has been in touch, in sympathy with, in harmony with the plain people of the State he represents and of the United States. He has not advanced a single step in favor of the money power except so far as its welfare was incidental to the general good. His personal integrity can not be questioned. His alliance with that power can not be shown in a single sentence he has uttered. In fact, he has been opposed to those who have made alliances with Wall street; that is, with exponents of inordinate speculation, and has made that opposition emphatic in every act of his on the floor of the Senate and long before he came to the Senate. So when Senator HILL says he is in favor of these resolutions for humanitarian reasons, I say we should attribute to him the full credit that such an utterance from such a man invites. I am for the resolutions for the same reasons. The Cubans are struggling as our fathers struggled, and they are entitled to encouragement from us. If another reason were necessary for favoring these resolutions, it is that while America has proclaimed her belief, whether sentimental or real, in the Monroe doctrine, what can we expect from that great power England if in our present situation we back down from that weak power Spain?

We have a right, gentlemen, to interfere for Cuba. She is our neighbor. She is contending for all that is right and true and beautiful in human character and in the character of nations.

I trust that these resolutions will pass with an almost unanimous vote in this House, and that we shall give emphasis to anything we do here by showing that the Congress of the United States is behind the department of this Government which has the power to declare for belligerency in any reasonable length to which that department may go for the relief of these struggling people. [Applause.]

Mr. TURNER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, before making my statement I should like to ask of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HITT] if any reason exists why we might not have a brief debate on Monday on this proposition, when gentlemen will all be in their seats—say half an hour on Monday, to be equally divided between the two sides? I call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that the House is not now full, and that gentlemen seem to be weary of the week's work. I would suggest that we take a recess earlier and take half an hour on Monday in order to conclude this debate.

Mr. WHEELER. It would be better to have two hours on Monday, an hour on each side.

Mr. HITT. I am obliged to ask the House to act as soon as possible. I made several requests to-day, to all of which there was objection, until I yielded so far as to allow the vote to go over until Monday. I do not think gentlemen ought to press me to go further. A number of members of the House told me they would object to anything which should carry this matter further into Monday than the mere taking of the vote.

Mr. TURNER of Georgia. I was not in the Hall at the time to which the gentleman refers. I hope he will not feel that I am pressing him. I withdraw my request.

Mr. HITT. I understand the gentleman's position very well. I was simply endeavoring to say that a number of gentlemen told me they would object to making any encroachment upon Monday, for anything other than the mere vote. Those gentlemen have now left the Hall, and I must keep faith with them.

Mr. TURNER of Georgia. I withdraw my request.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The request is withdrawn.

Mr. TURNER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, repeating what I said on a former occasion, I regret that in so grave a matter, involving delicate foreign affairs, we have so little information on which to predicate our action.

I yield to no man in my sympathy for a people who may be struggling for freedom; but this is not a question of sympathy. It is a question which affects our own interests and which relates to our duty as a member of the family of nations. The step we propose to take to-day also concerns our duty under treaty stipulations.

In the Island of Cuba, Mr. Speaker, there are peculiarities of topography, population, and social conditions which are very little known to the rest of the world. The white population live chiefly on the coast and surround the island. The interior is still a wilderness. It consists of mountain fastnesses and swamps, without highways. These insurgents, so called, are said to occupy these fastnesses and swamps and contiguous territory, while the people loyal to Spain occupy the coast towns and fortifications and their vicinity.

No safe access, as a general rule, exists from one side to the other pending hostilities, and no actual, reliable information has reached us as to the condition of this struggle so far as the insurgents are concerned. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HITT] read yesterday a statement which undertook to give the military force of the insurgents. It was an anonymous statement; its author's name was suppressed. But even taking that statement as printed to-day in the RECORD, it is apparent there are only 16,000 men engaged in active operations on the side of General Gomez and General Maceo, and nothing is said of the character of their arms; the rest of the 60,000 thus loosely reported is said to form an army of occupation. What that means the statement does not disclose.

Mr. PATTERSON. Will my friend yield to me, in that connection, just one moment?

Mr. TURNER of Georgia. I will.

Mr. PATTERSON. I desire to state, before I answer the question, that the matter that influences—

Mr. TURNER of Georgia. I asked my friend no question. [Laughter.]

Mr. PATTERSON. I understand that; but I was going to ask you a question. It is this: Is it not impossible for the Cubans to carry on the character of campaign which they have carried on, are now conducting, and have conducted, without practical unanimity upon the part of the Cubans in the support of their cause? The question is this: From your knowledge of military operations, would it not be impracticable to carry on and conduct the character of a campaign which they are conducting unless the Cubans were practically unanimously their friends? If they were surrounded by an unfriendly population it would simply be impossible, in my judgment, for them to do it.

Mr. TURNER of Georgia. The gentleman has answered his own question, then. [Laughter.]

Mr. PATTERSON. I think so.

Mr. TURNER of Georgia. The gentleman has interjected into my brief space the argument to which he desired to address himself on this question.

Mr. PATTERSON. Well, perhaps so.

Mr. TURNER of Georgia. He has relieved me of a very considerable embarrassment, no doubt. [Renewed laughter.]

We know, Mr. Speaker, that in very recent history, within a day's ride of this city, when a country having the greatest armies and the greatest resources of modern times was engaged in a great war, Mosby, with a few guerrillas, was able to carry on hostile operations in the sight of the Dome of this Capitol for months and years.

Mr. PATTERSON. And simply because he was operating in the midst of a friendly population.

Mr. TURNER of Georgia. Admitting that the army of General Lee occupied largely the attention of Mosby's foes, still he operated successfully against great odds, because he was sheltered by mountains and could concentrate or disperse his small force at pleasure. The country he occupied was practically depopulated. The Cubans have a still better field, which they seem to have improved for military operations with the torch.

I do not deny, Mr. Speaker, that these people may be engaged in a just cause. I do not wish to prejudice their character; far from it; but what I insist upon is that we ought to know something about them before we commit our people to an attitude which may

involve us in the most serious consequences. War is a serious business. The most of us have had some experience of its hardships; and I know that if the people of this great commercial and agricultural country should become engaged in a foreign war its consequences may bring unutterable woe to millions of our countrymen. At this time we are entering manfully upon a struggle for our old dominance on the ocean; war would drive our commerce from the sea except in neutral bottoms. The flag of England, our great rival, would float above our trade, while our own, except on our ships of war, would disappear from the seas. The price of cotton, already low, would go still lower. The section of the country already desolated by war would be still further impoverished.

I should have no fear of Spain or any other country in the world in a physical conflict with our country so far as military success is concerned; but the waste and woes of even a successful war are irreparable. "There is nothing so melancholy as a victory won, except a victory lost," said Wellington. Just at this time, when we have not yet recovered from the horrors of civil war and their fearful consequences, I am not willing to take the risk of another war.

But, sir, I had wandered somewhat from the question which I had intended to discuss. I recur to it. A month has elapsed since I challenged my honorable friend from Illinois [Mr. HITT] to give us reasons for this proposed action. A long debate has taken place elsewhere, and the newspaper press of the country has been engaged in sifting this matter from day to day and week to week, and yet it has nowhere and in no way appeared that the conditions prescribed by all the authorities for recognizing a new power as a belligerent have been fulfilled by these Cuban insurgents. Plantations have been burned and villages destroyed, but where have they made any real achievement in public war?

I ask again, after the interesting and learned argument of my friend from Illinois, what at last did he give us as the basis for our action here except the statement of an unknown author?

If these resolutions be postponed for thirty days I would be willing if at the end of that time we should not have more definite information as to the condition of the struggle in Cuba, to favor an official inquiry.

It must be noted, Mr. Speaker, that during the interval which has elapsed between the former debate in this House and the present time some discussion of this question has taken place at the other end of the Capitol, and it is now said that the House resolutions could not be passed in that body. I undertake to say, sir, that the Senate resolutions we are now considering would encounter indefinite obstruction in that body. The second sober thought has ensued, and the only way in which the gentlemen interested in this measure could bring it to a direct result was to take it away from the deliberative body at the other end of the Capitol and force it to a vote in the House of Representatives. In my opinion nothing on this subject would now pass the other House of Congress; and I believe that when the vote is taken it will be shown that many gentlemen here have reconsidered their views of this subject.

Allow me now to refer to the effect of a recognition of belligerent rights which has to some extent been defined by the gentleman from Illinois. When a force is recognized as a belligerent power, certain results ensue; but it must be remembered that in this particular case we are governed also by a treaty existing between this country and Spain, ratified and approved in 1795. That treaty contains a provision that if war ensues between Spain and any other power, she shall have a right to stop our merchantmen on the high seas and search them for articles contraband of war.

According to all the authorities that treaty would operate if we should recognize the force in Cuba as a belligerent power. At the present time it does not operate. On the authority of our courts, notably in the *Itata* case, originating in the late Chilean war, each party to a civil war has the right of access to our markets for the munitions of war. The Cuban people have that right at this time. They can buy all the munitions of war that they desire in our ports and there is no authority which can say them nay; and when those goods are shipped in accordance with law as merchandise, in a regular way, there is no power on earth, in the present state of things, that dare go on the decks covering those munitions of war and assert the right of search, or that dare look into that vessel's hold to see if she contains articles contraband of war.

The Cubans are buying munitions of war already in this country. According to reports in the papers they get their supplies from this country and from no other. Now, if we should recognize them as a belligerent power, while it might have the effect of giving them access to our ports with prizes captured on the high seas and the advantage of coming in and having their prizes condemned, a further effect would be to confer on the Spanish King and the Spanish Government the power to search every merchantman that might go from our ports in that direction.

In my opinion, the present condition of things is more advantageous to the people engaged in the struggle against the Spaniards in Cuba than would be their condition if we should actually give them recognition of belligerent rights. I need not pause to cite the authorities on which this conclusion is reached. I take it for granted that they are familiar to all lawyers and to all gentlemen who have studied this subject, so that I need not dwell upon the point. I have them here.

Mr. Speaker, I approach now a subject involving some delicacy, but I trust that I shall not be suspected of sectional bias or improper feeling when I refer to events of recent occurrence in our own history. Perhaps the matter is too recent to admit of the impartiality with which history will hereafter record the events following our great civil war. However, having had experience in this matter after the war was over amid the most trying circumstances of which I have ever read, I want to remind gentlemen that in the Island of Cuba there is a condition of things even worse than that which prevailed in the Southern States after the civil war.

Mr. Speaker, the race to which we belong is one which has the instinct of self-government. You may put a thousand or ten thousand of this race in a country where no flag floats—in some corner known as "no man's land"—and they will meet together and make government; they will establish order, they will pass laws, they will create courts. It is the proudest boast of our race that they have this great and glorious endowment. [Applause.] But, sir, there is no other race on earth that has it in so high a degree. There is the Spanish race, with whose descendants we sympathized in their struggle for freedom in the colonies to the south of us, and we gave them recognition.

And how have they prospered since their freedom has been established, in comparison with the country in which we live? Revolutions and anarchy have been their portion.

But my friend from Illinois said yesterday that the pure race settled in largest degree in Chile and in Cuba. But, Mr. Speaker, I answer that the example of Chile is not particularly inspiring, yet I presume that there are in that country very few persons of African descent. Mexico is the most progressive, perhaps, of all the Spanish-American Republics, but her most distinguished statesmen were not the descendants of the Spaniards; they were of the natives. Juarez and Diaz were of pure Indian blood.

A MEMBER. How about the Argentine Republic?

Mr. TURNER of Georgia. My friend suggests the Argentine Republic as a successful Government. Mr. Speaker, I will not undertake to state anything with which I am not entirely familiar; but if I have not been misled and misinformed as to that country the best hopes of the Argentine Republic to-day consist in the development of that country by the sturdy Scotchmen and Germans who have gone there and taken possession of the wild plains. [Applause.]

But, sir, if the Spanish people, once so imperial in the world and having the noblest and fairest portions of the American continent, have lapsed from their proud position, it is not for us to reproach them in their decline. How is it with the other race which constitutes nearly half of the population of Cuba? We know that the African race, while perhaps it has admitted of larger growth and progress than many of us anticipated, has never yet manifested that genius for liberty and good government and free institutions which has characterized other races of the earth, but the misfortune is that in Cuba both of these races are trying to govern, each of which has never been eminent in the business of governing. According to information published in the papers, the struggle there pending is largely a race conflict. You have them there contending with each other for the mastery.

Now, my friend from Tennessee, who is doing me the honor to hear me, will see the serious situation in which those people in the Island of Cuba would at once be placed if we could go to the utmost hopes of some of our people and set them free from Spain. I for one, Mr. Speaker, have had enough of reconstruction; and I would not be willing to be a party to such an experiment under the conditions which are said to exist in that island. I confess that I have no definite information on the subject. I wish I knew more about it. I can respect a black patriot, or a Cuban patriot, or a mulatto patriot, or a patriot anywhere in the world if he has the capacity, the courage, and the disposition to organize and maintain good government rather than anarchy, revolution, spoliation, and barbarism. Let us not forget Haiti and San Domingo.

Mr. Speaker, I have rapidly gone over considerations which appeal to my judgment in this grave contingency. At this late hour I will not further detain the House. [Loud applause.]

Mr. QUIGG. Much has been said, Mr. Speaker, concerning the obligations that we owe to a friendly nation. I want to remind gentlemen that if there is any quality that has especially distinguished the attitude and conduct of the United States toward foreign countries it is respect for their rights and consideration of their susceptibilities. This has been due not entirely to the ab-

sence on our part of a selfish concern in their affairs, nor entirely to our preoccupation with our own, but a sincere desire in the American people, always and faithfully reflected by their Government, to do unto others as they would have others do unto them.

No nation can in fairness find less fault with us than Spain. For, with no interests in common, with many opportunities of controversy, and with our sympathies naturally attracted in directions antagonistic to her purposes, we have well and faithfully performed to the Government of Spain every obligation which from her own point of view is implied in the existence of friendly relations.

Spanish control in Cuba, Mr. Speaker, has been exercised at our sufferance for more than fifty years; and in the light of human nature, and in view of our commercial and other relations to that island, it is not too much to say that nowhere in history is there an example of such forbearance as we have shown to Spain. For we have been the life and breath of Cuba for all of half a century. We have opened her mines, builded her railroads, cultivated her plantations. We have taken into our markets substantially the whole of her surplus product; and although perfectly conscious that every dollar of the enormous sum annually wrung by Spain from the Cuban people is a tax on American capital and American enterprise, we have assumed and in good faith performed the part of a stranger to Cuba and a fair friend to Spain.

We have shut our eyes to public abuses and private wrongs compared with which the grievances that drove our fathers into revolution were an amiable caress. The evils against which the Cuban people have risen are not new. They began, sir, with the Spanish conquest. They result from the Spanish character. They follow from the Spanish point of view. They are inseparable from the colonial rule of Spain, and for the reason that the chance to perpetrate them have supplied the motive of Spanish control wherever it has been exercised on the soil of these continents. It is a government of the sword for plunder, and not of the head and heart for the high purposes of civilization.

We have known this, Mr. Speaker. Even while our officials were inditing proclamations forbidding us to manifest our sentiments about it, we have known it well. I mean that we shall have the credit, if in it credit can be found, for the fair and generous course our Government has pursued toward the Government of Spain. We have known that its treatment of its "Ever faithful isle" was that of a selfish oppressor; that by the denial of such political rights as are elementary in our system, by forms of taxation that would be to us utterly unendurable, it has earned the enmity of the people whose interests it should have dearly cherished. We have known that its continued exercise of sovereign power in Cuba was at conflict not only with Cuba's interest, but our own; that it exposed our trade to unfair exactions and our properties to the risk of ever-recurring political agitation, and that it interfered with the possibility of friendly and neighborly arrangements that would be highly beneficial to our commerce and our national position.

And above and beyond all of this, sir, we have known that the cause of the Cuban insurgents is the cause of human liberty; that they are applying the doctrines we have taught, acting on the motives we have inspired, and venturing their lives for principles we have declared to be the common birthright of mankind.

When we have read in the newspapers Presidential proclamations warning us against giving aid and comfort to the Cuban insurgents, we have known in our hearts that they deserved both. We have watched our cruisers chasing their little privateers on the high seas, profoundly desiring a fruitless result. And we have seen the powers of our judicial department bent to the undoing of the plans of their little bands of patriotic adventurers with less pride at the way in which the obligations of friendship work being met than mortification and regret at the prostitution to our Government to the office of a tyrant's policeman.

It may be possible to confuse the American people about the requirements of international customs and public law, but they know their own history, Mr. Speaker; they know the lesson it teaches and the duty it enforces. There is one obligation of a king to a king; there is another of a people to a people. The royalty that frowns at his royal cousin's rebels frowns to anticipate his own. Our function, we may well remember, is another and a nobler one. On our faith in free government, on our allegiance to the creed it proves, we are bound to listen when above the din of revolution the voice of an injured people cries out that they are, as of right they ought to be, a free and independent state. [Applause.]

I think it may be fairly claimed, Mr. Speaker, that in so far as any obligation to Spain exists, under the rules that govern the intercourse of nations, from the mere fact that we have no direct cause of quarrel with that country, it has been well and faithfully performed. The time has now come when we may fairly consider whether, in the situation that exists in Cuba, there is not an obligation to ourselves and to the Cuban insurgents. And I am frank to admit that I for one approach the consideration of that question

from the point of view of one who fails to discover any reason whatever why any American community should longer be held in subjection to a European crown. [Applause.]

The progress of the human race is the one high purpose of government, and no political relation between two communities that has become injurious to either or that is not affirmatively beneficial to both is entitled to be perpetuated. To the maintenance of this doctrine and to its firm application within the limits of our natural and proper influence we are invited both by its propriety and by our interests. A new gospel has taken the place of the gospel of royal prerogative. The reign of the common people has come to all the earth, and with it an end to the fancy that a great and beautiful country, capable of maintaining millions of inhabitants in happiness and plenty, can forever remain the unchallenged property of a foreign prince, hundreds of leagues distant, merely because certain adventurers, owing allegiance to one of his ancestors, happened to discover it three or four centuries ago. It is not right; it is not reasonable. [Applause.] The day has dawned when things are, not because they have been, but because they should be. The sovereignty of Cuba resides, in justice, as it shall in fact, wherever the welfare of the Cuban people places it.

Mr. Speaker, I hardly think it worth while to discuss the moot question of whether the conditions that exist in Cuba are or are not a state of war; and even of less importance is the quaint contention of the gentleman from Maine [Mr. BOUTELLE] and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TURNER], that belligerent rights should be denied the Cuban people because they are not fighting according to the rules of warfare laid down by the professors of international law! [Laughter.]

How are they fighting? Why, sir, they are fighting in a way that has enabled them within a single year to extend their authority from a single spot in a single province all over the island, until only three or four seaport cities remain to the Spanish Crown. They are fighting in a way that has increased their armies from a little band of 500 rebels into a magnificent force of 60,000 victorious, well-disciplined, and well-equipped soldiers. They are fighting in a way which has exhausted the resources of Spain to maintain an ineffectual and hopeless resistance. They are fighting in a way that has enabled one Cuban to contend successfully against three Spaniards; and not their bravery, nor their patriotism, nor the brilliant leadership of their generals, nor their unqualified success can be impeached by calling them brigands or by alleging that their methods are not the methods of civilized warfare.

The way to fight, I take it, is to fight to win. [Applause.] And that art, sir, the Cuban soldiery has learned in a degree that commands the admiration of all the world. Army after army has been sent into Cuba only to encounter defeat and humiliation. One general has displaced another, and yet, even with the assistance of a very resolute and very indefatigable press censor, who has converted defeat into victory upon innumerable occasions, who has captured Gomez and shot Maceo half a hundred times, who has exterminated more bands of Cuban rebels than there are palms in the Cuban forest, who has converted a maddened population into a loyal and contented colony, who has changed acts of infinite cruelty into acts of compassion and gentle mercy—even with his aid it has not been possible to conceal the fact that Cuba is forever lost to Spain. [Applause.] "This may not be war, sir; but I give you that it is no summer's holiday." [Laughter.]

Mr. Speaker, I believe it is the duty of the Government of the United States to bring the war in Cuba to a close. Nor do I urge this view solely for the sake of the Cuban people. We must bear in mind the fact when we come to vote upon these resolutions that the expense of this war is being paid, and must be paid hereafter, not by Spain, but by the American people. When Spain has lost Cuba, what has she lost? Simply an annuity. The invested capital engaged in developing the resources of the island is ours. Already our losses have been prodigious. Our mines have been closed. Our plantations have been burned. Our mills and railroads destroyed.

And even this measures only a fraction of the loss to us of what has already occurred in Cuba. Our principal sugar and tobacco supplies are obtained from this island. We must look elsewhere for them now and get them at a greater expense. And when the war is over it is from our reinvested capital and our recovered trade that the revenues must be drawn wherewith to pay an enormous accumulation of war debt. We have lost already more than we can afford, and more than we should endure. The ground upon which we can intervene is the just, firm, sensible ground of self-interest.

Gentlemen say that the intervention contemplated in these resolutions is a dangerous thing and may actually involve us as a principal in the conflict. That, of course, is mere speculation, as would be any reply that I might make. But, sir, I apprehend that a war with the United States is not an enterprise upon which any European nation, even the most sufficient, will lightly wish to engage. This is not a consideration, obviously, that entitles us to do an unfair or an ungenerous thing. On the contrary, it warns us, as

the greatest force among the nations of the earth for progress and civilization, to act the part of an enlightened and honorable Government.

Our country is at peace to-day, and it is the duty of every citizen here or at home to strive to keep it so. We seek no quarrel. We make no causes of quarrel. Our time and energies are consumed in efforts to make the earth better and happier for our existence as a nation. For the European war lords, strutting about in their anxiety for combat, our sentiment, if not wholly respectful, is thoroughly charitable. But we have small interest in their ambitions, and only commiseration for the unfortunate people whose blood and treasure must soon become the price of their royal vanities.

The land we live in is a land of peace, of liberty, of progress, and of Christian civilization. But, sir, it must not become a land of pusillanimity. It must not forget its place in the family of nations, nor the duty which that place imposes, of commanding the respect and the influence of a power no less competent than it is benignant. The ends of peace are not promoted by cultivating among the people a sentiment of dull disregard for events in which are involved their commercial welfare and their national authority. The policy that would have us shut our eyes and ears to what is going on around us, that would have us allow our neighbors without protest or intervention to be subjected to humiliation and injury, to be despoiled of their territory, to be embarrassed in the exercise of their sovereign rights, to be confronted with a foreign fortification flying a European flag, is not possible to a nation of our responsibilities and our destiny. The United States are no longer a little string of Commonwealths along a little strip of coast. From the blue of their starry banner blaze not thirteen brilliants, but forty-five. They stretch across a continent and launch their fleets in either ocean. We must accept our part in the affairs of mankind, faithfully performing its duties and bravely accepting its consequences.

Although a war with the United States is not within the imagination, much less the purpose, of any responsible Spanish statesman, the consideration that should constrain us in the adoption of these resolutions is far remote from that. The end we seek to attain is peace, and not war; peace for a desperate and distracted people who have made the only choice that men can make when confronted with the alternative of abject slavery or revolution. They come to us with a petition for fair play. They do not seek to involve us in their quarrel. They ask no favor. They ask simply—and this is the significance of our resolutions—that we shall hold the scales even between them and their enemy. If we refuse this reasonable request; if we deny to them the position that their cause justifies and their valor has won; if we declare them to be wanton rebels, nay, plundering disturbers of the public peace, I say we shall be false to our history, false to the genius of our people, and false to the mission that it is ours to serve in the development of mankind. [Loud applause.]

Gentlemen say, do nothing. But we can not do nothing. We are not on earth to do nothing. [Applause.] And by doing nothing what they mean is to do something that is very bad indeed. By doing nothing they mean that we shall take the part of Spain as against this struggling colony, our neighbor and our friend. By doing nothing they mean that we shall take the part of despotism as against liberty. To do nothing is to accept the Spanish view—that the insurgents are not entitled to belligerent rights, that their armies are brigands, their ships pirates, and their flag not an emblem of national life, but of anarchy and of crime.

I am very frank to admit to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. BOUTELLE] and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TURNER] that it is a matter of regret that the necessity to do something has been imposed upon the Congress of the United States. It would have been much better if the action contemplated in these resolutions had been taken by the Executive long ago, and not left to Congress [loud applause]; but his failure, which I submit to my Democratic friends is chronic and characteristic [laughter], properly to represent the views of the American people, does not excuse us from so doing. On the contrary, it renders our duty all the more imperative.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. QUIGG. I will yield to myself five minutes more time. I have charge of the time on our side. [Laughter.]

There are only one or two other points that I desire to notice. It has been said that the Cuban forces fight in disorder. So did the farmer lads at Bunker Hill. They say that the Cuban Government frequently moves. So did the Continental Congress. They say that the Cuban armies are little bands of guerrillas. So were Marion's men. So was Sumter's brigade. So, indeed, were all the armies of the Revolution, the total number of whom were not half the force that is now engaged for Cuba free? I say to gentlemen that it is not for us, the sons of the ragged and forlorn miserables who froze at Valley Forge and starved in the swamps

of the Carolinas, but out of whose glorious aspiration and noble daring free government was born, to sneer at the distresses through which the men of Cuba, brave with the same hope, fierce with the same passion, are fighting their hard way to freedom! [Great applause.]

Cuba ought to be free, Mr. Speaker; Cuba must be free. [Renewed applause.] Aye, and by the favor of a just God, to whom serfdom is hateful and all is good that tends to the advancement and improvement of His creatures, Cuba shall be free! [Loud applause.]

Mr. HITT. I yield thirteen minutes to the gentleman from Alabama.

[Mr. WHEELER addressed the House. See Appendix.]

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. I rise to a question of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on the 19th of March last a debate occurred in this House in which a circular issued by the gentleman from Tennessee, Mr. GIBSON, was used by the gentleman from New York, Mr. SULZER. The matter was the subject of newspaper comment and subsequently of a prosecution. All that I desire at this time is to call attention to a statement made by the gentleman from Tennessee, Mr. GIBSON, contained in the papers of yesterday afternoon and of this morning, and to make a statement of my own. It is proper to say that had I been present this morning and not detained by my work in the committee room, I would not at this hour interrupt the House. It is stated in the newspapers that on the trial it was developed by the testimony of the gentleman from Tennessee, Mr. GIBSON, that Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia, and not Mr. BARTLETT of New York, was the man who had obtained and furnished the circular in question.

Mr. Speaker, it is true that circular was given to me by a printer to whose office I went for the purpose of having some business transacted. It is true that without any purpose or intention of having the same used in debate, but as a mere matter of curiosity, I brought that circular to the House, and that it passed from my hands to the hands of other gentlemen and reached the hands of the gentleman from New York [Mr. SULZER]. I had no concern or connection with his using it.

All I desire now to say is that I hold in my hand a statement—which it is not necessary to read, unless called for—from the printer, which shows that I came by this circular legitimately; that upon my going to his business place for the purpose of procuring some printing done for myself, he called my attention to these circulars and showed them to me. My recollection is—the printer's recollection is not positive about it—that he handed me one of them, and I simply said: "Can I have it?" and he said that I could. I brought it to the House in my pocket. Upon taking it out, as I said, it was passed from hand to hand.

Now, I want to say that this statement of the printer which I hold in my hand shows that I got that circular legitimately, with his knowledge and consent. The use made of it afterwards I am not responsible for. I desire further to say that I made no statement to anyone that the gentleman from Tennessee was sending these circulars to his constituents under his frank.

This is all I desire to say now, Mr. Speaker. I simply desired to call the attention of the House to the matter as it stands and to the statement which I hold in my hand signed by the printer who furnished the circular to me in order to show that my possession of it was legitimate and proper. Having said this, I have nothing further to say unless it should become necessary.

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Speaker, all I wish to say is that I am satisfied from an investigation of the facts of the case that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARTLETT] obtained that circular with the consent of the printer; and any implication to the contrary in the remarks I heretofore made I am glad to withdraw. I am also glad to learn from the gentleman from Georgia that he did not state to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SULZER] that I was sending that circular out under my Congressional frank. I wish only to add that hereafter, when the gentleman from Georgia has a paper of that character, he be a little more careful of it when he is within reach of the gentleman from New York. [Laughter.]

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. Pardon me a moment. I did not distinctly hear the remarks just made by the gentleman; but I understand him to withdraw any statement that he has made to the House or elsewhere reflecting upon me or implying that I got that circular improperly.

Mr. GIBSON. I withdraw everything whatever that reflects upon the gentleman; I am glad to do so.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. That is perfectly satisfactory.

CUBA.

Mr. TUCKER. I yield eight minutes of my time to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MAHANY].

Mr. MAHANY. Mr. Speaker, it is an easy and a gracious thing to speak upon the popular side of any public question; but it is also at times wise and expedient to give some attention to the considerations involved in the opposite contention. I desire to say at the outset of my remarks that I intend to vote for these resolutions, but I vote for them under protest at the manner in which they have been brought before this House.

When these propositions, involving an important international question affecting the relations of comity between two Governments, were first brought before the House of Representatives, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs [Mr. HITT] proposed to "railroad" them through on a debate limited to twenty minutes on each side. Now, I am a new member and a young one, and far be it from me to seem even remotely to criticize the methods of procedure that obtain in this House. But I have seen this legislative assemblage spend hours and hours in what appeared to me idle and fruitless disputation on subjects infinitely less important than this. Were I to cite an example, I might refer to discussions on such questions as whether eight or ten more pages should be employed in the service of this House, or whether the compensation for ten or twelve more charwomen should be included in a general appropriation bill. It would seem to me, therefore, that the way in which the Cuban question has been brought before the House of Representatives is neither in accord with the sentiment of the American people nor consistent with the dignity of this body.

I for one decline to believe that the applause of the galleries is the voice of the American people. I have an impression that the great body of thoughtful citizens in this Republic deprecate the war talk of this House and of the other legislative branch of the Government; and I am convinced that the conservative sense of this nation is against idle and officious intermeddling affecting relations of friendship between this Government and foreign powers.

I desire to say in addition that it has occurred to me that the House Committee on Foreign Affairs was established to prevent exactly the condition of things which that same committee has brought about on the floor of this House. By any proper conception of their duties they should have acted as a brake upon the war talk and war clamor which have disturbed and are disturbing the business interests of this Republic. As one of the majority loyal to that committee I must enter a protest against the manner in which, on the contrary, they have seemed to lead the procession of jingo enthusiasm.

I say I am going to vote for these resolutions, and why? Because, Mr. Speaker, I yield to no man in my devotion to human liberty or in my feelings of sympathy for the struggling patriots of Cuba. [Applause.] But, sir, between sympathy and international procedure, between impulse and government, there is a wide dissociation. What sort of a government are we asked to recognize? A government whose seat is a saddle, whose capital is a burro, whose chief of state is a general in the field. But let no gentleman understand me as casting any reflection on these conditions, because in that saddle may ride human liberty and on that burro may depend the hope of a nation's success.

But, my friends, by all the established rules of international law we recognize only such governments as those with which we may actually treat. The gentleman from New York [Mr. QUIGG] who spoke next before the last said we should brush aside all considerations of international law. In that expression he appears to voice exactly the methods and procedure of the committee of which he is a member, because, to judge from their attitude toward the international questions that have come before this session of the House, they are of the belief that we should dispense with the State Department altogether and carry on our foreign affairs by legislative precipitation!

We have here, Mr. Speaker, unquestionably a great duty to perform. But if we desired to place the sentiment of this country on record in behalf of the Cuban insurgents we could have done it in a manlier way by adopting straight and aboveboard resolutions of sympathy with that struggling people. But it was the duty of the Foreign Affairs Committee not to place us in the false position that if we voted against these resolutions of possible intervention we might thereby seem to exhibit indifference or hostility to the efforts of those gallantly struggling for national freedom. As the case now stands we are given no choice in the matter. We are forced to vote for the resolutions lest by proceeding along the established lines of international law and voting against them we should strike down a people that for over a year have won the admiration of the entire world by their heroic efforts to gain their independence, a consummation which it is the fervent hope of every patriotic American the Cubans may in the fullness of time secure. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HITT. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the gentleman

conducting the negative proposition promised me an opportunity to yield time on our side, I yield seven minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BUCK].

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, as both an explanation and perhaps apology for taking the floor at this late hour, not only of the day, but in the discussion of this question, I ask to have read to the House a telegram which was received yesterday within an hour after the pending measure had been taken under consideration by the House.

The Clerk read as follows:

Hon. CHARLES F. BUCK:

We indorse and approve Cuban resolutions, and urge Louisiana Representatives to support them. Please communicate to Louisiana delegation.

NEW ORLEANS, LA., April 3, 1896.
THE DAILY PICAYUNE,
Per THOS. G. RAPIER,
THE TIMES-DEMOCRAT,
Per PAGE M. BAKER,
THE DAILY STATES,
Per H. J. HEARSY,
THE DAILY ITEM,
Per D. C. OMILLY.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, the papers represented by those who signed that telegram are all the important and influential daily papers in the great city of New Orleans, published in the language of the land. I had it read, among other things, for the reason that it has been said upon this floor by the gentleman from Maine [Mr. BOUTELLE] that a change had come over the spirit of the American people since barely four weeks ago, when resolutions more vigorous, more comprehensive, than these we are now considering went through this House upon a wave of just sympathy with struggling humanity by an almost unanimous vote. If there has been a change of sentiment, that message testifies that the change—at least so far as the constituency from which it comes is concerned—is one of emphasis in favor of speedy and effective action by this House. The people which I have the honor in part to represent have always been in sympathy with the people of Cuba; but they have been thoughtful and conservative, and if to-day they send us this message, it is because I think they feel that the time has come when inaction ceases to be virtue and silence is no longer honorable.

As we are lying there at the very gateway to that island, close to the scenes of conflict, it may be that the cries of its despair and the wails of its uncertain hope strike the more deeply into our hearts, and the daily stories of outrage and atrocity begin to sound in the ears of American freemen like reproaches to our common humanity. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, no one upon this floor has a higher admiration for the genius, the eloquence, or the judgment of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TURNER] than myself, since it has been my fortune and my pleasure to sit on this floor and take instructions from him; and no one realizes or feels more comprehensively than I do the magnificence of Anglo-Saxon civilization. But the Anglo-Saxon people are not the only nations of this world whose hearts are inspired by the instincts of freedom. The Greeks were not Anglo-Saxons; the Gauls were not Anglo-Saxons, when a century ago, following in the spirit our philosophy, which declared the equality of man, they overturned the dynasties of centuries and put forever a check upon the power of kings and the traditions of feudal and Middle Age despotism. The instincts of liberty belong to the human heart, as a portion of its divine being and its immortal aspirations.

Mr. Speaker, I will not weary the patience of this House by repeating a word or a thought that has been expressed. We are told that we should hesitate, because we know not the condition of the Cubans. We do know that they fight, we do know that they lay down their lives upon their blood-drunk soil. Is not this war?

Nature's primeval state returns again
When man stands hostile to his fellow-men.

And we also know that if we have not all the knowledge we should have of their affairs it is because the power of Spain has surrounded that island, which lies in God's expanse of waters, with a wall of night which keeps the light of day and humanity from the struggle which its people are waging. [Applause.]

Some one has said, "Give us a month to deliberate; give us that time to study the situation further." What assurance have we that access will be given; that information will be true; that history will be correct? Accord to these people belligerent rights, yield to them the dignity, for the time being, of an equal nation upon the earth, and light will come from them and go to them, and then it will be demonstrated whether they are right or whether they are wrong. If we are to be wrong, let us err on the side of humanity; let us err in pursuit of the principles which we advocate and teach. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, it is seriously contended that this House is dealing with a matter not within its jurisdiction. It seems, rather than take their share of responsibility, gentlemen would prefer to shift the question and consign it to the lazy-footed dignity of diplomatic donthingness or the calculating selfishness of politic statecraft. The contention seems supremely farfetched. The highest

power of the Government, which controls all others, subject only to express constitutional limitation, the very branch which exclusively holds the power to declare war, should not have the power to declare the policy and shape the action of the nation when international complications confront us. The House has settled this question, not only in this case but by a hundred precedents. Argument would be the very idleness of declamation.

But, Mr. Speaker, the gist of all opposition to these resolutions is the contention that neither the magnitude nor the manner of the warlike operations are such as indicate the existence of a national autonomy entitled under the law of nations to be accorded "belligerent rights" by neutral powers. I have already conceded that possibly we do not know the whole truth; and I have shown the reason of it and expressed the belief that we know enough to bind us, in the interest of freedom and humanity, to give to the weak and the oppressed the benefit of the doubt.

As to the magnitude of the operations, I am content to rest the question on the information submitted to the House by the honorable the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations. As to "the manner" of them, it may be true that no great battles have been fought, that no quarter is given or taken, and that no prisoners are exchanged; that no instances of magnanimity or forbearance on either side have come to light to soften somewhat the gruesome picture of a wholly savage warfare; that atrocious acts of outrage and cruelty are common incidents. Who is responsible? Spain is the master power of the two, and she claims to be the sole power. She dictates and determines the conditions of the conflict. On her and her alone civilization and humanity will place the responsibility for the consequences. Spanish methods in warfare against her colonies or foreign possessions are matter of history. If the Cubans practice "barbaric cruelty," it is not far to look for the masters whose "instructions" they but "better." The romantic and eloquent Castelar says: "Spain's Government is free, liberal, progressive." Granted; but, if so, only "at home."

Heaven forbid I or any Representative on the floor of this House should utter a word to offend the dignity, prejudice the interests, or question the honor of any nation with which this country is in peaceful and harmonious relations; but the facts of history are the property of mankind, and truth is the only thing that is permanent.

Spain is proverbially proud; but her pride is rigid with cruelty and her cruelty has reddened in the blood of fanaticism. Great, and perhaps free, at home, she has ever been unjust to her colonies; and in consequence has lost them all but one, and that one is irrevocably fixed in its determination to follow the others to freedom and independence.

She is ever the mistress, they the slaves; she rules to oppress and conquers to destroy. Somewhat over two centuries back a Duke of Alva gaveto Brabant and Flanders the peace of the churchyard and the charnel house; and in our enlightened days a General Weyler will accomplish the same fate for Cuba if she gets no encouragement from the "outer world" until she places grand armies in the field, establishes custom-houses, and sends ambassadors to the nations of the earth.

It is said Spain will declare war against this country if these resolutions are adopted. That might be a great calamity, but Spain would have no just cause for war. Under the principles of both international comity and law the United States of America as a nation have the right to determine the fact of "belligerency," and to declare it, whether in the pursuit or protection of material interests or in the assertion of a principle of human liberty and justice.

Mr. Speaker, if that which we are about to do is right, it is right that we should do it even at the hazard of war. Life and property are not the best of earth's possessions; to nations, as to individuals, all is lost when honor is not maintained.

It would be idle to reason on the possible effects or foretell the probable consequences of a war between this country and Spain; it might be deemed vain boasting and perhaps convey the sting of offense, which is not intended; but every American schoolboy can play the prophet and predict its results.

In the nature of things, from the virtue of necessity, if you will, we know that if ever the flag of this great country is borne aloft against a foreign foe, it will never turn back to be furled in the gloom of defeat; it will wave high on the ramparts, even amid ruin and disaster, until at last, resplendent in victory and refulgent with the very blaze of glory, it shall plant itself on the achievement of an honorable peace.

The SPEAKER. According to the unanimous consent heretofore given, the House will now be in recess until 8 o'clock this evening, when the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. McCALL, will please discharge the duties of the Chair.

EVENING SESSION.

The recess having expired, the House, at 8 o'clock p. m., resumed its session, with Mr. McCALL of Massachusetts in the chair as Speaker pro tempore.

Mr. QUIGG. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DOCKERY] five minutes.

Mr. DOCKERY. Mr. Speaker, to the student of history it is not a matter of surprise that the people of Cuba should now be engaged in a struggle for independence. A little more than one hundred years ago our fathers declared the great fundamental doctrine that governments derive their powers from the consent of the governed, and that before the law all men stand upon the plane of absolute equality. This cardinal tenet of republican institutions was not then, as I now recall, believed in or recognized by any government of the world. It was born on this continent, and grew into strength and power here, its champions being the descendants of the rugged pioneers who settled the New World. Around this doctrine their hopes and aspirations twined and clustered. To them it was the language of freedom, and it seemed as though the air, the mighty seas, and the rivers proclaimed it.

Mr. Speaker, it is unnecessary to recite the familiar history of the wondrous struggle which resulted in American independence. The doctrines of freedom and self-government have made marvellous progress since that period and have exercised a beneficent influence upon all the governments of the world. They have leaped the barriers of the Atlantic and substituted written constitutions for the despotic will of absolute monarchs. It should not, therefore, Mr. Speaker, be the occasion for comment or criticism when the people of Cuba, so closely allied to and identified with us in commercial relations, aspire to independence and self-government.

Sir, I am not familiar with international law, and do not claim to be advised as to its technicalities and intricate proprieties. It may be that under the strict terms of this code a state of war does not exist on the Island of Cuba which justifies the United States in according to the Cuban patriots belligerent rights. To the untutored layman, however, seeking only to know the truth and to deal justly, it would seem that the warfare now devastating that island rises far above the level of mere guerrilla strife. If not, Mr. Speaker, why is it that the armies of Spain, so repeatedly reinforced by veteran battalions, have thus far been unable to repress the people of Cuba in their efforts to achieve national independence? The spirit of American freedom seems to have been wafted to Cuba across the Gulf of Mexico, and I bid the Cubans godspeed in their efforts to establish a free and independent nation. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, possibly the situation may not be unvexed with doubt, but if doubts there be, I shall resolve them here and now in favor of the struggling patriots of Cuba, and cast my vote in favor of the Senate resolutions. [Applause.]

Mr. TUCKER. Mr. Speaker, I yield ten minutes or more to the gentleman from New York [Mr. DANIELS].

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, I design to do no more than simply to vindicate the vote which I shall give when these resolutions come before the House for adoption. I have considered this to be somewhat important upon my part, for the reason that when the resolutions that the House passed were up for a vote I voted for those resolutions. I voted for them, not because I approved the second and third resolutions by any means, but I was heartily in accord with the first of the resolutions, providing for neutrality between the two belligerents on the part of the United States. The first of the resolutions we have now proposed to the House for adoption is substantially the same as the resolution which was then adopted, and seems to be free from all substantial doubt as to its propriety.

This resolution provides for the neutrality of the United States between these two contending forces upon the Isle of Cuba. It is not the purpose of the United States by this resolution to intervene in any respect between these two contending parties, but to allow the struggle to go on with the understanding, nationally, in this country, and of course in others, that the United States is a neutral power, standing between these persons and acknowledging the belligerency of the forces engaged in the insurrection upon this island. So far I see no impropriety whatever in the resolution; but it (the second resolution) goes a step further than that; and the next step, to my judgment, is fraught with danger to the peace, the stability, the quietude, and the responsibility of the United States as a nation. It has been the policy of the United States at all times since the Government was formed to abstain from all entangling relations with European powers and not to permit European powers to acquire any standing or to exert any national policy or influence that is adverse to the institutions created by the people of the United States.

That was the declaration of policy of the first President of the United States. It has been observed faithfully from that time down to the present time; and the United States upon all occasions has abstained from interference with the domestic affairs of European Governments. Besides that, when the South American Republics had acquired what the United States believed to be their independence and the Holy Alliance was set on foot in Europe to reconquer those States and to aid or assist Spain in doing so, and to reestablish its government, the United States took decisive

ground at that time, declaring substantially that the same policy which had prevailed in reference to foreign interference should also be applied to this newly existing state of things, and that the United States would not permit any European country to plant its institutions in this country or maintain them by force of arms, regarding that as a solemn menace to the stability and safety of our own institutions; and a counterpart or equivalent of this doctrine was also asserted, that the United States would not interfere adversely in the affairs of European people; and that has been a part of the policy of the Government, maintained from that time down to the present hour. And it is only a few weeks since that a solemn asseveration by this House and the body at the other end of the Capitol asserted that we should not interfere with the affairs of other nations, but we should not permit their interference with the affairs of the American nations to their detriment, or to an encroachment upon their soil.

Now, what has this second resolution provided for? Simply for intervention on the part of the United States in this struggle that is proceeding between the insurrectionists in Cuba and the Government of Spain. It is true that the resolution has been couched in very measured terms:

That the friendly offices of the United States should be offered by the President to the Spanish Government for the recognition of the independence of Cuba.

That is perhaps not of itself, abstractly considered, any dangerous exercise of authority; but when we look back at the history of nations we see that slight causes, slight disagreements, have often precipitated the most remarkable and the most dangerous consequences between them. We see that it is a delicate subject for one nation to attempt to interfere in any manner in the internal affairs of another nation. And no one nation of a civilized character and standing can interfere with the affairs of another of equal standing, although of inferior authority, without exciting resentment on the part of the nation whose affairs are interfered with. And if the United States should undertake to exercise this authority, as the second resolution proposes, in the future, we can see at once that it is not going to result in the independence of Cuba or the success of the insurrectionists, but it is going to result in a feeling of exasperation on the part of the Spanish Government against the Government and people of the United States. They are already excited very much, and an interference of this character might exasperate that excitement beyond a point of all reasonable restraint and precipitate upon our country a series of consequences that every member of the community would deplore.

We can not for ourselves portray with certainty what would be the effect of such interference by the President of the United States. It would be the exercise of a new and undefined authority. It never has been recommended or acted upon under similar circumstances, and it is not to be expected that it can be exercised now without exciting animosity and resentment on the part of the Spanish people. It is true that that people are inferior in power, vastly so, to the people of the United States; that their resources have been seriously drained in the contest that has been going on for over a year upon the Island of Cuba; but it is to be remembered that in controversies of this character other nations may come in to sustain the hostilities that Spain may enter upon toward this country and produce a series of disasters that we can not now either anticipate or measure.

It is necessary in matters of this kind for every nation to take counsel of its own prudence and not to allow itself to transcend the bounds of propriety in reference to the affairs of other nations—certainly not to place itself in an equivocal position whereby its intentions and its influence may be misunderstood, provoking national resentments by which war may be brought precipitately upon the country interfering in this manner without any suspicion of the danger lurking beneath the efforts attempted to be made. It is because of the danger that may lurk in the exercise of this authority, that may accompany it or follow it, that it strikes me that these resolutions as they are now combined together ought not to receive the vote of this House.

If the first resolution could be presented to the House separately and distinctly, simply acknowledging the belligerency of Cuba and asserting the neutrality of the United States between the insurrectionists and the Government of Spain, I should see no objection to that, because it could not be regarded, in any possible view, as an effort on the part of the people of the United States or their Government to interfere in the deplorable condition of affairs existing on the Island of Cuba at the present time. It would be nothing more than a declaration that the United States generously desired to see the insurrectionists upon that island enjoying the rights of belligerents, so that they might be protected against the allegation that they are criminals or traitors to the Government of Spain because they have arisen and endeavor to overthrow the government of the island.

There would be no harm, apparently, nor any danger in declaring that to be the position of the people and the Government of the United States. There would be in that no reason for Spain's

taking offense. But when it comes to the question of intervention, even possible intervention, we can see at once that this is the first step, which may result later in forcible intervention and bring about a warlike condition of things between the two Governments, and we can not be too cautious in the exercise of authority of such a character. It is because of the danger that may follow the attempt on the part of the United States to interfere to secure the independence of Cuba even by the aid of our moral influence that it strikes me that this second resolution is improper in its character.

When I found on consultation with the gentleman who introduced the resolutions that no vote was to be had upon them separately, but that they were to come before the House and be either accepted or rejected as a whole, I was astonished; for while the doctrine embodied in the first resolution is unobjectionable and might be entirely acceptable, the other, as qualifying the first resolution and this exercise of neutrality on the part of the United States, is such as to indicate certainly a possibility, and indeed a probability, that, by our attempting to interfere through the action of the President in the existing situation between the insurrectionary forces and the Government of Spain, there may be precipitated a war that would be dangerous, lasting, and destructive to many of the interests of our country.

And, Mr. Speaker, we should receive no equivalent, no recompense, for that state of things brought about by our intervention in the dispute that is now existing between Spain and its subjects upon the Island of Cuba. In case of war it would become an independent assault against our Government, against our people, against our seacoast cities, and no person can measure in advance the extent to which the injury might be carried resulting from hostilities carried on against us by Spain and very likely to be joined in by other European powers.

Such might be the result, and where would be the recompense, where would be the equivalent, coming to this country as the result of such an intervention, if it should by any possibility produce such consequences as I have indicated? It is true we may exercise a moral influence without offense. It is true we place ourselves thereby in a position of hostility to Spain; but if that action on our part should lead to another and to still another and finally to a state of war, certainly there would be no equivalent that the people of the United States could receive, no recompense that would in any considerable degree counterbalance the resulting disadvantage and the injury. It is for these reasons, Mr. Speaker, that I desired to present my views to the House as justifying, and not only as justifying, but as requiring that, as these resolutions that the House, when they are presented for adoption or rejection, must be presented together, they shall be voted down, and I hope will reject the resolutions.

Mr. QUIGG. I yield ten minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. BAKER].

Mr. BAKER of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, the resolutions which this House in its wisdom adopted a few weeks since were much more in accord with my individual views than those which I presume will be adopted on Monday next—the resolutions which have come to us from the Senate. There seems to be a diversity of opinion among the members of this House in regard to what the sentiment of the country is. More than that, there appears to be a diversity of opinion in regard to our duty as a nation in regard to this subject. I believe, sir, that if the 175,000 citizens of my district were appealed to to say whether, on this question, I should cast my vote in the interest of human freedom by voting for these resolutions and thereby expressing my sympathy with the cause of humanity, 174,999 of those citizens would say, "Vote for those resolutions."

But, Mr. Chairman, I go a little further in my sentiments than the resolutions now before us. I have no disposition to criticize the committee for what they have seen fit to report to us. They are doubtless better informed on this question than we can possibly be. But, sir, we know not only that there is existing to-day in the Island of Cuba a state of war, but there is existing a very inhuman war. We know that Spain has been using her great power for the last twelve or fifteen months to subdue those people, and that at this particular time she is not in actual possession and control of more than one-fifth of that island. It is impossible for us to know just what the present condition is there. But, sir, I believe for myself in the declaration that was adopted by our forefathers. I believe in a government of the people. I believe in the formation of those laws and the recognition of those rights which will guarantee to a people that they shall be at least treated in a humane way.

If Cuba had in the past been treated as citizens of any government should have been, our duty at the present time would perhaps be different. But we know that they have been terribly oppressed. We know that people of the Anglo-Saxon or English race would not have tolerated what they have been compelled to submit to for years past. We know that history proclaims to the world that they have been debased; that they have been taxed beyond all reasonable power of endurance; that they have been

denied the right of trial by jury; that they and their families have been deprived of the essential rights of freemen. In consequence of being thus treated they have seen fit to rise up in rebellion.

Sir, on this question there is a law as broad as humanity, as deep as human affection, that appeals to the American people to-day in such a way that we dare not do otherwise than express for the people of Cuba our sympathy. I can not conceive how it is possible for any American citizen to allow his imagination to be so worked upon as to induce him to believe that we shall give Spain any cause of offense if we should try to use our good offices in bringing to a peaceful termination the struggle now being carried on in Cuba. If two men are engaged in deadly conflict and a third person tries to interfere in order to separate the combatants, it is barely possible that they will not appreciate his efforts; but if he steps in with power enough to command the peace, not only will they honor him, but every other man must do the same.

That is the condition, as I understand it, existing in Cuba to-day. The people now struggling there are not those that have had the advantages of education and other improving influences such as we have had. In their struggle to-day they are acting with the best light that they have been able to enjoy. They see a great nation on the north of them that is enjoying the blessings of civil and religious liberty, the blessings of national prosperity. They see themselves, on the other hand, in a condition of abject slavery. They have risen in rebellion; they have appealed to the God of battles; they have gone forth to make the sacrifices that only true, brave, and courageous men dare make in order that the cause of liberty and humanity may move onward and upward. [Applause.] Sir, I would dare to say to those people—and I do not believe that I am the only member of this House ready to say so—"In God's name we wish you success in your undertaking; we give you all the words of encouragement that it is in our power to give." [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, I had hoped that we should have had presented to the two Houses of Congress resolutions recognizing Cuban independence. I would be only too glad to vote for such resolutions. I have no idea that there would be any danger of our being obliged to back up that act by force of arms. But, sir, he whose cause is founded in righteousness and truth is doubly armed; and if it should be necessary in the onward march of the nineteenth century that this great Government of ours should take a stand in the cause of humanity, let us bid those who are struggling in that cause Godspeed; let us give them the assurance of our cordial sympathy, our moral support, in the struggle.

How far we should go in extending our sympathy and aid to people struggling as the Cubans now are I know not. Possibly I am too radical in my views on this question. But I say this, that in adopting these resolutions we take a step which I have no doubt future generations will approve. More than that, I believe that the cause of humanity, by reason of our action in behalf of Cuba, will take new vigor; the cause of education and of civil and religious liberty will receive an impetus that will help forward the progress and elevation of the human family. Let us, then, take this step. Let us give Spain the means of knowing just how we do stand on this question. That is exactly my feeling in regard to this subject.

Let us meet the issue like men; and I will take that issue, so far as my people in Kansas, and particularly my district, are concerned, and have not a doubt that every member of the House will be more than satisfied with the result that attends the passage of these resolutions, because we have assurances from the chairman of the committee, assurances that ought to be fully satisfactory to the members of the House, that the resolutions will accomplish the happy result we all so much desire. [Prolonged applause.]

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, perhaps I ought to have kept quiet during this discussion, but some things that have been said against the passage of the resolution induce me to occupy the floor for a short time, and I do not think it would be out of place for me to give the reasons that actuate me in voting for the passage of the resolution.

The gentleman from Maine [Mr. BOUTELLE] on yesterday said that a picture was presented to the members of this House, a horrid picture of a man suffering death by a garrote, which was sent out for the purpose of trying to create a false sentiment of sympathy. I saw that picture. It is the execution of a man in a Spanish prison in the Island of Cuba; not that he had committed murder or a foul crime of any kind, but simply a human being brought to death in that barbarous fashion because he had—after his people for over three hundred years had been struggling to gain their liberty—saw fit to join the Cuban patriots and had been captured as a prisoner of war and was taken to prison and was put to death as there exhibited. That is the reason that that picture was sent throughout the country; not to show how they put to death men guilty of heinous crimes, but to show how they deal with men who desire to secure their liberty. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, there is no nation on the face of this globe which will countenance putting political prisoners to death with that horrible

instrument that deserves any consideration at the hands of any civilized or any Christian government. [Loud applause.] During the war of the great rebellion, at a time we classed our brethren across Mason and Dixon's Line as rebels and recognized them only as insurgents, and while they were captured at the first fight—Bull Run—in a war that continued for four long years in this country, a war in which 600,000 men went down into untimely graves, no man in that strife who had lifted his arm against this Government, no insurgent or rebel, lost his life except in battle. Not a solitary man during that long war was executed, either with the garrote, or by a rope around his neck, or by any other means. We recognized during that struggle that they were blood of our blood and flesh of our flesh, and, remembering the teachings of Him who came into the world eighteen hundred years ago to teach men and point the way of eternal life and how to live in this world as citizens and as men, remembering His teachings, recognizing the principles taught by Him, I say that no man in that great struggle was put to death in this barbarous manner. That is one reason why, Mr. Speaker, I shall vote for the resolution.

Now, there is another reason. I claim that this Government, as a government, has a right to recognize any people in any part of the world who are struggling for their liberty where a state of war exists. I do not propose as a member of the American Congress to ask Spain, that superannuated old giant, that bronze corpse, a cipher among the alphabet of the nations, whether she likes it or not. The only question to me is, is it right? I believe we ought to recognize the Cuban patriots who are struggling against the Spanish Government with every prospect of success, and I propose to vote for these resolutions, be the consequences what they may. [Prolonged applause.]

I was surprised to hear in this American Congress in the past few days that this great Government of ours had no right to give to the Cubans belligerent rights, and to do so was an insult to Spain—a declaration of war. Why, sir, during the late war, as we have been told in the debate here, before a battle was fought on land, the Government of Spain, 8,000 miles away from us, knowing but little about us, knowing nothing about our domestic troubles, with indecent haste poked her nose into our affairs and gave to the Confederate States belligerent rights. Did this Government recognize that act as a cause for war? Did we declare war against Spain? No. And why? Because this Government recognized that all the Governments of Europe, if they saw proper, had a right, if they believed that a state of war existed, to recognize the Confederate Government as belligerents; and I propose that this Government of ours, so far as my vote and influence are concerned, shall give to the Cubans all the rights of belligerents, with the hope that they may gain their independence in the near future. [Applause.]

Now, I want to make a reply, in the very brief time allotted to me, to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. BOUTELLE], and I will read a short extract from a speech of his delivered in the Fifty-third Congress, and as I read this extract from his speech I want you simply, in your own mind, to insert the word "Cuba" in place of "Hawaii," and see where he stood in the Fifty-third Congress, when he was ready to involve our Government in a war if necessary for the purpose of giving these Hawaiian people their freedom. I agreed with him in that fight, and I was ready to vote for his resolution if an opportunity was given, and I am with him on that controversy. The reason that he then set forth in support of his action on the Hawaiian question, Mr. Speaker, influences me in giving my support to the resolutions now pending, and I shall vote for the report of the conference committee.

Mr. TUCKER. Will not my friend allow a man time for repentence?

Mr. PICKLER. We hate to see him fall from grace. [Laughter.]

Mr. MAHON. Now, Mr. Speaker, you will find in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the Fifty-third Congress, second session, volume 144, page 8003, the following:

Mr. BOUTELLE. * * * I understand further, Mr. Speaker, that it has been the uniform policy of the United States to be prompt and earnest in encouraging and recognizing all movements tending toward the establishment of free republican governments, in whatever parts of the world they may be. I understand this to have been the settled policy of the United States from the foundation of this Republic. I need not enforce upon the mind of the House the fact, it seems to me, that the establishment of a republic in the Hawaiian Islands is an event that, under all the circumstances, appeals to the sympathy of the people of the United States with the most peculiar and extraordinary strength.

And a few days afterwards he offered a joint resolution (see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, second session Fifty-third Congress, volume 144, page 8010) "congratulating the people of the Hawaiian Islands on their peaceable assumption of the powers of self-government and recognizing that Republic as free, sovereign, and independent." That was the gentleman from Maine [Mr. BOUTELLE] in the Fifty-third Congress. He has departed from that. I say that the doctrine laid down by the gentleman in that speech is sound American doctrine, and I am willing to vote for the

resolutions on the speech he made in the Fifty-third Congress, a part of which I have just read. [Applause.]

Mr. MAHANY. Will the gentleman allow me a question?

Mr. MAHON. Yes.

Mr. MAHANY. Do you not recognize the difference between a government which has only a general in command of an army in the field and a government established and able to maintain law and to preserve order?

Mr. MAHON. Well, Mr. Speaker, these people fifteen months ago commenced with three or four thousand struggling patriots, without arms or munitions of war. They have grown until to-day they have a magnificent army of from fifty to sixty thousand men. They have fought their way from one end of that island to the other, and have hovered around the capital of Cuba. They have whipped one of the great generals of Spain and sent him home under a cloud, and, mark my word for it, they will whip the man who is in command of the Spanish armies on the Island of Cuba to-day. [Applause.] They have kept the field against an army of 120,000 well-trained Spanish troops. They have never had a dissension in their ranks, they have never had a deserter from their ranks, and for fifteen long months they have contended successfully against this well drilled and disciplined army of Spain. Yet you state to me to-day that they are not entitled to the same recognition that those people were in Hawaii.

Mr. Speaker, we are told that the Cuban army is composed largely of mulattoes, men not fit to govern themselves. I assert that as a class of men they stand much higher in intelligence and morality than the majority of the people of the Hawaiian Islands, and are at least as well fitted for self-government. I suppose if the Hawaiian Islands had belonged to Spain, a great deal of the patriotism and fighting spirit that almost submerged the Fifty-third Congress would never have been heard of. Mr. Speaker, this great Republic is the foster parent of all republics in the Western Hemisphere, and we must, in the language of the gentleman from Maine [Mr. BOUTELLE], "be prompt and earnest in encouraging and recognizing all movements tending toward the establishment of free republican governments." The passage of these resolutions is not a declaration of war. As a great nation we have a perfect right to give to Cubans belligerent rights. If Spain sees fit to declare war, she must take the responsibility and the consequences. The conflict will be short and decisive. Cuba will belong to the United States and Spain will have learned a lesson she will never forget. One more victory will be won over despotism and inhumanity. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MAHON. If there is no objection, I should like to extend my remarks in the RECORD. I could have completed them in about five minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman asks leave to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

Mr. TUCKER. Mr. Speaker, I think general leave to print has been extended.

Mr. QUIGG. Oh, no; I do not think so.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. TUCKER. Mr. Speaker, I yield ten minutes to my colleague [Mr. OTEY].

Mr. OTEY. Mr. Speaker, it has been said that doctors practice on their own patients, but that members of Congress, especially when they are on the Cuban resolutions, practice on the patience of others. I propose to take advantage of that prerogative for the few minutes allowed me.

There is a story told of a man and his wife who quarreled as to what they should have for dinner. The one wanted terrapin stew and sherry, and the other wanted canvasback ducks and champagne. They wrangled and quarreled, and finally compromised on cabbage. [Laughter.] We have had the terrapin stew of the Senate and the canvasback duck of the House, and now we have come in and compromised on cabbage, in the form of this resolution.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. If the gentleman will permit me, I should like to ask him a question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. OTEY. Yes, sir; with pleasure.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I should like to ask you if you have not misstated the facts? Do you not mean that they have had the canvasback ducks at the White House? [Laughter.]

Mr. OTEY. Mr. Speaker, I can only answer that question in this way. It is said that Chief Justice Chase was talking to a nigger one day. I mean no disrespect to the colored people by saying "nigger." It is a word most appropriately derived from "niger," meaning black. He said to this coon—negro, I mean [laughter]—"I have always thought that it was very strange that a coon wore his fur on the outside. When I have a coat with fur on it, I generally put the fur on the inside. I find that it is warmer

to wear it that way, and I do not see why a coon should not wear it in that way. Why is it?" "Well," said the negro, "you'd know if you was de coon." [Laughter.] "Why?" asked the Chief Justice. "Because," said the negro, "you would have more sense." Without reflecting on your intelligence, sir, and with the utmost of pleasantry, you have a complete answer. [Laughter.]

I never visit the White House. I am a spring chicken of this House and do not go there unless sent for to be consulted about great matters of state, and I do not suppose the gentleman from Michigan does. I do not know anything about what they have there to eat. But a spring chicken had better stay away. I have only been there once or twice, and I do not know that I will ever go there again. [Laughter.]

Now, Mr. Speaker, we hear a great deal of talk about war. I am opposed to war. Thirty-five years ago I talked about war, and I was red hot for it. [Laughter.] But, sir, in the language of that great man—I do not know whether I pronounce it right or not—veni, vidi, vici; I came. Yes, sir; I "came" to the front, and for four years I stayed there. I remained there. No surgeon's certificate, sir, ever sent me home; and in the language of a great judge in Virginia, a friend of my friend Mr. TUCKER, no one sent me there to have "the perpetual enjoyment of the rascally immunity of bombproof security." [Laughter.] "I was not to be heterogeneously bamboozled by the unsophisticated audacity of any man," as an old soldier said. [Great laughter.] No, sir; I was not; but veni, vidi, vici. Then vidi, I saw. Yes; I saw rebels there in thousands, with belligerent rights. I know, gentlemen, that you do not know yet which side of this question I am on [laughter], although you can guess which I was on then. I will get to that presently. The trouble about it is that I have not been able to tell which side a great many now are on, because they have been talking about national law, and international law, what General Grant, Henry Clay, Madison, and Monroe said, and all that sort of thing, of which the average Congressman knows but little.

Yes, sir; I saw the rebels in thousands and thousands, with belligerent rights, marching toward a gallant foe. I saw them charge, I saw them stand, I heard them yell, I heard the thunder of their cannon, maintaining belligerent rights. It is not out of place, therefore, for me to say lastly that, after veni and vidi, vici, I conquered. But, sir; not until the big guns at Fort Delaware, where I had been invited to stay a few days by Uncle Sam [laughter], just one month before the surrender—not until these big guns thundered there and informed me that the name of Appomattox had been made immortal, and that the great Army of Northern Virginia had surrendered, making the name of Ulysses S. Grant immortal, not until then did I conquer; and then I conquered what? My insatiable desire for renown as a belligerent! [Great laughter.] That time came and I bowed to the inevitable. I confess, sir, that ever since then I have had no more thirst for gore. [Renewed laughter.]

Now, Mr. Speaker, why all this talk about war, and all this talk about rights and principle, international law and justice, and all such things? Mr. Speaker, just let us see what would be the application of principle, right, and international law under certain circumstances. Let us suppose a case—you all would not suppose it was a supposable case—but just suppose a case [laughter], and that is, suppose that the Northern States had seceded and that the Southern States had undertaken to maintain the Union. What would have been the result? Exactly the same as it was. [Great laughter and applause.] Secession would have succeeded then. No doubt about that. You all had too heavy guns for us and too many people, and it mattered not which was abstractly right, the same causes would have produced the same effects. Therefore, if the cause of the Union had been the whale represented by the Southern States, then it would have been the whale that the fish swallowed, instead of the fish that the whale swallowed. See? There is no question about that. Now, sir, nobody doubts this proposition of international law; but the pertinent inquiry now is, what has this to do with Cuba? [Great laughter.] About as much as the speeches against these resolutions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TUCKER. I yield five minutes more to my colleague.

Mr. OTEY. Thanks. I am much more pleased than I make out I am. Well, sir, I was going on about the question of right and international law when I was hammered out, etc. These things of right and justice in international affairs are settled by the arbitrament of arms. That settles the question, as a general thing. Of course secession was wrong, because the arbitrament of arms settled it. I am not going to discuss secession, gentlemen, not only because I know that has nothing to do with Cuba, but because it is, as we know, a new question. In dealing with Cuba we should remember that the United States does not follow the example of other nations in starting anything. We do not need to follow the example of other nations; and we do not want to wait to see what England is going to do, thank the Lord. [Laughter.] We ought not to wait to see, and I hope we will not wait

to see, what England is going to do about finances or any other thing. I hope we will make precedents instead of waiting for them. I do not believe with some of my friends on the other side of this Chamber that the people of the United States can whip the whole world, but I do not believe that the whole world can whip the United States [great applause and laughter], and hence we should act independently and courageously.

Now, sir, I am not like that gentleman who delivered a Fourth of July oration on one occasion, when he said that the American eagle had plumed her wings and soared aloft and had scanned the whole world and then "lif" in America, with one foot in the Atlantic Ocean, the other foot in the Pacific Ocean, with her tail flopping in the Gulf of Mexico, and picking grass in Canada. [Great laughter.] No, sir; I do not believe that. But I do believe, sir, that the United States is big enough to take care of herself in maintaining any opinion which it may express through us in this House—I being one of "us"—and capable of giving belligerent rights to Cuba [great applause], even though they be rebels.

My time is so limited that I will have to skip a great deal of my speech. [Laughter.] I was somewhat inclined to the other side when this question was first before us, and had prepared a great speech on that occasion. I lost it coming down here [laughter], and I think Mr. TUCKER or Judge TURNER found it, and I believe you will probably hear part of that speech to-night from my colleague, Mr. TUCKER. [Laughter.] However, after hearing the arguments of the gentlemen against the resolutions, I was by them persuaded to go for them and for the belligerent rights of Cuba.

Now, to come down to the point, everybody that has spoken on the other side has suggested something about war. Mr. Speaker, I sympathize with people that are struggling for their independence. I sympathize with rebels. I was a rebel once myself. [Laughter.] In fact, I do not see how any of us on this side can help sympathizing with rebels. [Laughter.] The people of the United States being a free people, the freest in the world, ought to want to see everyone else free, and our neighbor, Cuba, as we know, is not free. I do not believe that the United States ought to go to war about Cuba, and I have not the slightest idea that they are going to do so. However, I am beyond the military age myself, so it would not make so much difference to me personally if they did. [Laughter.] It might increase my sugar bounty. But we shall not go to war. I do not believe we ought to meddle with other people's business. Of course we should not. But no one has suggested that we should interfere with other people's business. Our opinion is our business.

It is true something has been said about intervention, but that was in a pickwickian sense. The real question here is whether there is war in Cuba; not whether we are going to war. Is there war in Cuba? If so, these resolutions are right. If not, they are wrong. That is all there is in the whole matter. Cuba began this attempted revolution in 1849, and she failed. She took it up again in 1854, and she failed again. She made another attempt in 1873, and she failed. If she fails again this time, some of these wise gentlemen, like my friend Mr. TUCKER and others who have spoken here, will say, "I told you so." [Laughter.] Well, if she does fail, we shall not be in any worse fix than Spain and all the nations of Europe were in when we of the South failed, because they all recognized us—everyone of them. [Great laughter.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TUCKER. Mr. Speaker, as I do not expect to deliver the speech that my friend has referred to [laughter], I will yield him five minutes more of my time.

Mr. OTEY. I am much obliged to my colleague. As I said before, gentlemen, I expected to practice upon your patience on this occasion, but I have never done it before except once, and then there was nobody in the House. I beg pardon; I ought to have said *Hows*. [Laughter.] We are not inviting war by these resolutions. What are we doing? We are simply expressing our opinion. Well, has not the House of Representatives of the United States a right to express its opinion? Do not we do that out here in the cloakrooms, and everywhere else? [Laughter.] Did not we express our opinion the other day about Mr. Bayard? Of course we did. And has Mr. Bayard got mad about it and resigned? [Laughter.] You recognized him as a belligerent then. It was harmless. Did it hurt anybody? No, sir; not at all. Cuba is not going to get mad about this. Is Spain going to get mad about it? What if she does? What are we doing? As I said before, only expressing our opinion, which is an inalienable right. [Laughter.] We are not inviting war, as I said before.

What do these resolutions say? In all this war talk and this talk about international law gentlemen have lost sight of these resolutions. A friend with whom I talked a few minutes ago did not know which were the resolutions. He thought the ones that were struck out were the resolutions we were considering, and that the ones that we are considering were those that were struck out. [Laughter.] I do not believe he is the only man here who

was in that state of mind. I did not know which were the resolutions myself until I picked up this copy. [Laughter.] We say in these resolutions that in our opinion a condition of public war exists in Cuba. Let us consider that for a moment. Can anybody deny that war exists in Cuba? Does anybody deny that war exists there—I do not say public war, but war? What is the meaning of war? War, as they tell me in the dictionary, is an old English word which originated in the laws of Canute—you all know who Canute is. You remember Canute. [Laughter.] It originated from the word “w-e-r-r-e” in old French, and in modern French *guerre*, and it means vexation, strife, confusion, broil. The verb means to embroil, to bring into confusion, to entangle.

Do not all of these conditions exist in Cuba? They certainly do. Well, if they do exist it is clearly war, and if war at all, it must be public, not private war. Now, that is what this resolution says, that in our opinion a condition of public war exists there. If war does exist in Cuba, and if it is public war, you ought not to be afraid or ashamed to say so. [Laughter.] You ought to say so if you really think so. The question is, Does it exist? It certainly does exist. I have demonstrated that so conclusively that even my colleague, Mr. TUCKER, can not gainsay it. [Laughter.] My argument has been complete in this respect, and the authorities I have given can not be questioned. [Laughter.] Again, if public war does exist in Cuba, between whom does it exist? It exists between Spain and her subjects (so called) in Cuba, who are supposed to be rebels. Now, if war exists between Spain and those people, then that is just what this resolution says. It says that war exists between the Government of Spain and the Cubans, and has been for some time maintained by force of arms by the people of Cuba. The question now arises, Has it been maintained? Well, it looks very much that way. [Laughter.] This is a war carried on as other wars, for either the purpose of advantage, revenge, for lust of gain, territorial possession, race and sentiment, civil liberty, or some kindred cause. Those are the objects for which wars are generally carried on, and when a war is so carried on it is a public war, and such a war clearly exists between the Government of Spain and the people of Cuba.

The fact that 100,000 men are under arms, all regular soldiers of Spain, with a powerful navy, experienced generals, all the munitions of war at its beck and call, and still held in Cuba, when there is no war there, is astonishing if not absurd. Who can assert under such circumstances that war does not exist in Cuba, and public war at that?

When this resolution says this, it could not have uttered or proclaimed a more potent truism than if it had said that a state of public war does not exist in the United States of America.

How should we act, then? The resolution says we should maintain a strict neutrality. Anything wrong about that; if so, what?

Now, as to the second resolution I shall have very little to say. It is true that some are in favor of the first and yet object to the second resolution. Why, this is putting the cart before the horse. The objectionable part, if any, is in getting ourselves in trouble by maintaining perfect neutrality, thus according to both contending parties belligerent rights. The second is so very inoffensive that I would as soon have it stricken out as not, but not for the same reasons as those expressed by others on this floor. It is so harmless that I would not object to its being stricken out. But I suppose there is something in the mist surrounding international law which hides the great affront which such a resolution gives to a friendly power.

Why, I would vote for just such a resolution to be addressed to England in regard to Ireland. What does it say? Only that our friendly offices should be offered to Spain for the recognition of the independence of Cuba. Why, I would vote for a constitutional amendment that the friendly offices of the United States should be offered by the President to every Government for the recognition of any of their people who were struggling to become free and independent, if such struggle develop to such proportions as to keep an army of 100,000 men a year or more trying to quell the disorder. Strip these resolutions of all war talk, of the dark mantle of legal lore and international erudition which has been thrown over them and turn on the search light of common sense, and we find them unadorned but in all their beauty, a great nation telling struggling humanity everywhere that it sympathizes with them, that they have a right to fight for liberty, that it will ever espouse the cause of freedom, and dare to tell their oppressors that our hearts are with the oppressed, and we tender our good offices to secure them just such rights as those for which we suffered and fought and which we secured.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. OTEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the Hows and you all for allowing me to practice upon your patience so long. I am not half through. I could have demonstrated my position beyond a doubt and could have secured a unanimous vote in favor of these resolutions if I had had a little more time. I could see the work of conversion manifesting itself. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. QUIGG. Mr. Speaker, I will ask my friend from Virginia [Mr. TUCKER] whether he desires now to occupy further time on his side?

Mr. TUCKER. There is no one on this side of the House who desires to speak now.

Mr. QUIGG. Then I yield ten minutes to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. MILLIKEN].

Mr. MILLIKEN. Mr. Speaker, I had not hitherto expected to say a word on this question, although my convictions upon this subject have from the beginning been settled. It is a question upon which, fortunately for myself (differing in this respect from some others), I have never had any doubt in my own mind.

Sir, we approach these resolutions to-night in a somewhat different attitude from what we would occupy if this were absolutely a new question, or if the question were whether we should recognize the rebels in Cuba as belligerents or should do nothing. Now, sir, the Senate has adopted, by a large majority, resolutions in favor of recognizing the Cuban patriots as belligerents. When those resolutions came up for consideration in this House we passed a somewhat different and stronger proposition, substantially, however, the same. We have had a committee of conference; and the question to-night is whether we shall adopt the resolutions as agreed on by that committee or repudiate the action that has been taken and defeat the committee's report.

We are now so placed that we must speak either for or against the patriots in Cuba. We must give to the Cubans struggling for independence our moral influence, our encouragement, our indorsement, or we must give countenance and encouragement to Spain in her effort to crush this struggling people. In adopting these resolutions, as I have no doubt we shall do next Monday, this great Government, with all its influence, will voice, as I believe, almost the universal sentiment of our people and indorse the efforts of a people battling for freedom on a neighboring island, bravely striving to throw off the yoke of perhaps as grinding a tyranny as has cursed mankind in modern times. If, on the contrary, we should vote these resolutions down, what would be the effect? Who would be encouraged by our action? What kind of word should we send forth to the world? How would our action be looked upon by the Cubans? How would it be looked upon by the Spaniards? How would it be looked upon by the great nations of the earth?

Why, gentlemen, this Government ever since it has been established has been the great fortress and home of freedom upon the face of the globe. It has been the only great, well-organized, well-established Republic on the earth. Everywhere, in every country where men and women were hoping and struggling and praying for freedom, for better government, for equal laws, for independence from tyranny, they have looked to this great Republic as the mariner looks to the north star for guidance. This Republic has been their hope and their encouragement. And, sir, I believe that if this Republic in its struggle against the rebellion had been destroyed, the loss of our influence in the earth would be calamitous to mankind. If we had not maintained the integrity of the Union, France would not be a Republic to-day; Brazil would not have put off the panoply of monarchy and put on the habiliments of a democratic government; England and Germany and the other Governments of the Old World would not have been liberalized as much as they have been. The success and the benign influence of this great Republic gave an impetus to liberty and the equal rights of man such as they have received from no other great human achievement.

Now the question recurs, whether our influence shall continue in the same direction in which it has heretofore gone forth—whether we shall continue to be the beacon light for every people struggling for free government, for independence, for the liberty of the individual and the masses, or whether we shall take a backward course and throw the influence of this great nation in favor of oppression.

My colleague [Mr. BOUTELLE], from whom I dislike to differ, talked yesterday about the sentiment of the people of this country being stirred up by pictorial representations in the newspapers. Ah, I think if he could feel the pulsations of the great heart of the people of this country he would find that no pictorial illustrations are necessary to stir up a sentiment in favor of a people struggling for liberty. [Applause.] That sentiment is a living one with Americans, and needs only a just cause to kindle it. Our people have not forgotten the history of their own country. They have not forgotten the seven years of war for independence, when the patriots of the Revolution showed perhaps as much fortitude, as much courage, as much persistence, as much of a spirit of self-sacrifice, as much readiness to suffer uncomplainingly for the cause in which they were engaged, as any people on the face of the globe have done since the dawn of history. And I ask my friends on the other side, have these Cuban patriots shown any less a spirit of self-sacrifice, any less determination to achieve their independence than our forefathers did? Have they not done quite as well?

Why, sir, I was rather amused when my colleague said that 40,000 Cubans are now fighting in the ranks of the Spanish army in Cuba. The prime minister of Spain says that Spain has sent 125,000 soldiers there. There were about 21,000 on the island before, making 186,000 well-trained, well-organized, well-equipped Spanish soldiers upon the Island of Cuba, according to their reckoning. Yet this band of insurgents, as they are called, these scattered freebooters, who, as somebody—I do not remember who—said in this House, number only 16,000, have, in the face and against the resistance of those 186,000 of Spanish soldiery, marched over the Island of Cuba and to-day occupy and control and tax and administer justice in more than three-fourths of it.

Ah, gentlemen, either our friends are mistaken as to the number of men fighting upon the Spanish side in Cuba or else these Cuban patriots are showing a strategy, a courage, a skill in arms which the armies of Hannibal never showed upon the battlefields of Rome. I say that a people who can thus maintain their struggle so long against such an enemy, who can continue to extend their jurisdiction over that country, can continue to achieve victory after victory, can not only maintain themselves but drive so great an army as gentlemen say the Spanish have into the fortresses and the cities of Cuba, so that they hardly dare come out except once in a while to send a detachment to meet the Cuban patriots when they taunt and defy them close to the walls of their strongholds—a people who are doing this and are to-day in control of almost the whole of the Island of Cuba have earned their independence and are entitled to recognition as belligerents at the hands of this great, liberty-loving, democratic Republic. [Loud applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Maine has expired.

Mr. MILLIKEN. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that I am entitled to more time from the predecessor of my friend from New York, and I prefer not to accept the curtailment that he has made on the time yielded me by his predecessor. I hope he will see his way clear in allowing me to continue for the time to which I am entitled.

Mr. QUIGG. After so graceful a request, Mr. Speaker, I could not, of course, deny the gentleman.

Mr. MILLIKEN. I am always graceful to the gentleman who is so graceful himself. I can not help being graceful to my friend, and I thank him for his courtesy.

Now, our friends on the other side proclaim that they have an immense amount of sympathy for the insurgents in Cuba. Their hearts are on fire with love for them and their eyes are filled with tears on account of their sufferings, but they can not see their way to help them or to offer them any encouragement in their hours of trial and tribulation. They can not vote for the recognition of their belligerency. This is the kind of friendship which sounds well, but the fellow befriended does not care for it. Why can not they believe that the Cubans are entitled to recognition? Oh, because they say the Cubans have no government. Is that true? Of course they have not as stable a government as we have, but they have about as stable a government as our forefathers had when they had been fighting for eighteen months for their independence. Has Spain any right to complain of us if in the interest of humanity or of common justice we recognize the Cuban patriots to-day as entitled to belligerent rights?

Why, Mr. Speaker, if I recollect right, it was hardly forty days after the first gun was fired by the rebels upon Fort Sumter before they were recognized by Spain. Were they more entitled to recognition than Cuba is to-day? It is true that they had a government. They had a form of government. They had a place for their capital, as indeed the Cubans have to-day; but had they made more progress, according to the numbers fighting, than the Cubans have made? Had they, in forty days after the first gun fired upon Sumter, invaded any part of our territory, driven us into our fortifications, captured any large body of Federal troops, or in any other manner established the fact that they were able to cope with the powers of the General Government? Why, I think not. Even the disaster of Bull Run, which was the first victory of any consequence achieved by the rebels and the first serious disaster to the Union arms, had not occurred when Spain recognized the belligerency of the Confederates. Indeed, there had then been no battle fought between the Confederates and ourselves, unless you call the bombardment of Fort Sumter a battle, when Spain recognized them. The rebels had merely declared their intention and were getting ready.

Now, after eighteen months, when the Cubans have taken control of three-fourths of the Island of Cuba, when the only places almost which they do not occupy are the fortified cities that the insurgents can not take because they have not artillery to batter down walls and fortifications, when they are not retreating but are advancing, daily, continually, tirelessly fighting and whipping the Spaniards, further and further gaining accretions to their forces, showing a skill in the movement of armed forces that perhaps has never been excelled, when we find that they are acting together with perfect harmony, with no breach in their ranks, no squabbles

among their leaders, no division among them, but a uniform, steady purpose to achieve their independence, when we find them banded together by the strongest ties that can bind humanity, by all the ties of patriotism in the heart of each and every man, when we find them pushing forward for the one great object of their struggle, the independence of their country, I ask if, under these circumstances, if sustaining themselves as they have sustained themselves during all this time against the power of Spain, they are not quite as much entitled to recognition at our hands as the Confederates in our war for the suppression of the rebellion—in forty days after the first gun was fired and before the battle of Bull Run had been fought—were at the hands of Spain?

Why, my friends are talking as if war was right upon us if we give to the Cuban patriots this recognition. They seem to assume so much. Mr. Speaker, some of the statements that have been made here remind me of the story of the old maid, away up in the seventies, who was standing before a burning furnace, and the poor old woman began to cry, when someone standing near her asked what was the matter, why she was crying? "Why," she said, "I was just thinking that if I should ever get married, and should have a child and it should fall into the furnace, what a fearful thing it would be!" [Laughter and applause.] And so our friends on the other side are asserting here what a fearful thing it would be if we should have war with Spain on account of recognizing as belligerents the Cuban patriots a year and a half after they have begun the struggle and have been making their marvelously successful fight for independence, when we know that Spain recognized the Confederacy so soon after the beginning of hostilities; and yet, notwithstanding that action, no threat of war was ever made in this whole broad land on account of that action of the Spanish Government. [Applause.] And be it remembered, too, that Spain recognized the Southern rebels when the stake was not the retention of an island 3,000 miles away, but the life of our Government, the existence of our National Union. Indeed, had the rebels a better cause to fight for thirty-five years ago than the Cuban patriots have now? They were contending to destroy the grandest, justest, and most beneficent Government ever instituted among men. The Cuban patriots are fighting to overthrow a despotism which has robbed them of their substance, dwarfed the development of their resources, hindered progress, repressed improvements, ground them with taxation too burdensome to bear, violated all promises, and practiced the brutalities of the Middle Ages.

Gentlemen on the other side say, Who knows all these things? Why, they are as notorious as is the existence of Cuba itself, and the best evidence of any fact, next to an ocular demonstration, is its universal and indisputable notoriety.

Spain, by her cruelties and barbarities in Cuba, has richly earned the title of the Turkey of America. We have formally expressed our sympathy for the outraged Armenians, and have condemned the great Christian nations of Europe. We have called them selfish and cowardly because, controlled by their fear of each other and their own interests, they have raised no hand to arrest the butchery of Armenians by the thousands. And shall we have another Armenia, with all its inhuman cruelties, in this hemisphere, and close to our own doors, and hear the crying appeals of the oppressed, without so much as a formal protest, washing our hands, like Pontius Pilate, of responsibility? We can not escape responsibility by saying, like Cain, as do gentlemen upon the other side, "I am not my brother's keeper." [Applause.]

Thomas Jefferson said, "I tremble for my country when I remember that God is just." He referred to the responsibility of his countrymen for maintaining human slavery. His solicitude was well founded. Four years of civil war, the death by slaughter and disease of 300,000 brave, devoted Americans, and the destruction of billions of dollars' worth of property were a part of the penalty which we have paid for that national crime.

I believe in God's justice. I believe that Europe will pay dearly for her cold indifference to the bloody butchery of the Armenians. And if we shall show equal indifference to the barbarities committed upon the Cuban patriots, struggling as our forefathers struggled for liberty and independence, if we shall give them no friendly recognition, but by defeating these resolutions send word to them, to Spain, and to the world that great, free, republican America casts her weight into the scale of the oppressor, then I believe we shall have another crime to answer for, the penalty of which we can not measure and can not escape. [Great applause.]

Do we prize liberty only for ourselves? Shall men lose their souls when they aggregate into a nation?

Let us do right; right in the eyes of God and humanity; right in the eyes of men who have freedom and know what it costs, who can understand the longings and aspirations of patriotic hearts, and who believe that every oppressed people struggling for freedom is entitled to the sympathy and help, so far as it can be extended, of every nation that is free. In this direction lie safety and honor. In any other direction lie dishonor and danger.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. QUIGG. I now yield five minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. AVERY].

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, I am not in a general way disposed to be belligerent. I have seen something of war and do not care to see any more of it. It does not produce a pleasant sensation to stand up and be shot at. It has a peculiar effect upon the knees that renders a man a little unsteady in his gait and gives him an awkward appearance. I do not think anyone really enjoys such a position. But no man likes to be called a coward, and no nation can afford to acquire such a reputation. A man standing by to see a brute pound a helpless woman would be branded a coward. If he should witness a murder which he had power to prevent, and made no effort to prevent it, he would be regarded as a party to the crime.

The civilized world has stood aghast at the spectacle of the great powers of Europe eyeing each other while the Turks, in full view, have been butchering the helpless Christians of Armenia. These barbarities have even aroused the indignation and called forth a vigorous protest from our friends in Massachusetts and other New England States. Here upon our very shores lies the fairest island of the Atlantic Ocean. For three hundred years it has been under the iron heel of a cruel and merciless despot, whose only effort has been to extort the last farthing of revenue from its hapless people. This despot first enslaved and then, in less than one hundred years, exterminated the native population, and then he supplied their place with slaves stolen from Africa and overseers brought from Spain. And from that day until this the whole conduct of Spain toward this island has been "marked by every act which may define a tyrant."

No chapter in the history of the last three hundred years is so crowded with acts of oppression, cruelty, barbarities, and suffering and with such heroic efforts to throw off the oppressor as that which relates to the conduct of Spain toward her fairest colony. And now this long-suffering and heroic people are engaged in a life and death struggle for the God-given right to govern themselves—"a right inestimable to them and formidable to tyrants only." These people, in sight of our shore, are engaged in actual war for liberty and the right of self-government. They stretch out their hands across the narrow waters which separate them from us and ask the poor boon of being recognized as belligerents. For one, I know that my constituents expect and desire me to vote to accord them all the rights of war which belong to a brave people engaged in actual war for liberty; and I would be glad indeed to vote to acknowledge them as a free and independent nation, and, if need be, to vote money to aid them in maintaining their independence. By her long course of tyranny over Cuba Spain has forfeited every right to its ownership; and the same law which would deprive a cruel parent of the control of his child should be invoked to deprive Spain of any further control over Cuba. I say this with a full appreciation of the effect words spoken in this Hall may have upon the relations of this Government with other nations.

Cuba lies at the entrance of the great gulf that washes our Southern shore. She commands the entrance to that gulf, to the mouth of the Mississippi River, and the Nicaragua Canal, whenever it is built. In the possession of a strong naval power she would be a constant menace to our commerce and a vantage ground from which to threaten our whole Atlantic Seaboard. Spain has a treasury as empty as our own and a credit not quite so good. She needs money. England has money to loan, and she is constantly on the lookout for good investments and for strategic positions. Where can she find a stronger naval position than the harbors of that island or better security for investments?

Possibly the shadow of the Monroe doctrine may deter her for a time, but let trouble arise between this Government and England and the harbor at Habana will be the point from which demonstrations will be made along our eastern and southern coast. Cuba belongs to this continent; she has a right to be free. Self-interest, self-defense, humanity, and duty alike demand that the United States should aid her to attain this right; and all liberty-loving people everywhere will rejoice to welcome free Cuba into the great family of Western Republics. [Applause.]

Mr. QUIGG. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. TALBERT].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will state to the gentleman from New York [Mr. QUIGG] that his time is exhausted.

Mr. QUIGG. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. TUCKER] has courteously agreed to yield to me some time.

Mr. TUCKER. I yield fifteen minutes to the gentleman.

Mr. QUIGG. Then, Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes of that time to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. TALBERT].

Mr. TALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in the short time allotted to me I shall not be able to go into the details of this question, but it seems to me that if talking and speech making would do the Cubans any good, they would have been relieved sometime ago.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that the time for talking has ceased and the time for action has come. I for one stand here ready and

willing to do anything that is honorable and upright in the way of action that will relieve these Cuban patriots from the distresses and burdens under which they are laboring. [Applause.] What are they fighting for? Are they fighting for the blood of their brethren? No! Are they fighting for conquest? No! They are fighting for a word. It is that word that led downtrodden Israel through the bowels of the Red Sea; it is that word that rendered Marathon and Salamis and Thermopylæ immortal ideas; it is that word which sanctified even the blood upon the blade of Brutus; it is but a word, and that word is "liberty." [Applause.] They should have it; and if they need anything at the hands of this great, grand nation, the greatest upon the face of the earth, we should not withhold it, but give it to them in sympathy and in help, not only in words but in deeds.

I, sir, shall not only vote for these resolutions, but I stand ready to go further and to vote for a joint resolution calling upon the President to take decisive action, and if necessary to go down there and see that they do have an independent government set up for themselves. [Applause.] While they are fighting for that word "liberty," that word which will go sounding down the ages until the Jordan be dried up at its fountain and the Ægean rolls no more upon its shores, why should we, this great and powerful nation, stand here fearing to help our little neighbor when we can do it? Talk about the power of the United States. A distinguished Fourth of July orator has said, and I believe it is almost the truth, that the great United States could whip the world; that she had on two occasions whipped Great Britain; that she had whipped Mexico several times; that every time she got at leisure she would go out and whip the Indians, and finally the top and bottom of the map fell out and she turned in and flogged herself, and that is what the last war meant. [Laughter.] Bounded as she is on the east by the turbulent Atlantic, on the west by the smooth Pacific, on the north by the Aurora Borealis, and on the south by the Day of Judgment, why can she not take care of that little baby down there, if necessary, and annex her and have her as her own, having her own sugar in her coffee and plenty of molasses to lick. [Laughter.]

Talk about the Cubans being guerrillas! Let me call your attention to those brave South Carolinians—Marion, the swamp fox, and Sumter, the gamecock. Did they have any particular place to fight? Did they go out and meet the enemy? No; they hung upon the flanks of the enemy and baffled them. They are the men who repulsed the bloody Tarleton at Kings Mountain, when the spirit of freedom and independence was slowly ebbing. They turned the tide and gave us this great, grand, glorious Government of ours—the land of the free and the home of the brave—where every man can worship under his own vine and fig tree, or not worship at all, if he likes.

Then let us recognize that these Cuban patriots are striving for freedom, are striving for liberty, and let them have that help which they need at the hands of this nation. The spirit which imbues them, the spirit which pushes them on, is that same spirit of freedom which actuated our forefathers when the flag of revolt was flying to the breeze against the black-hearted despotism of Great Britain when our independence was achieved. Let us do all that we can to help the Cubans, who are struggling in that same spirit, for independence, liberty, and freedom. [Applause.]

Mr. QUIGG. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KIEFER].

Mr. KIEFER. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, nearly six weeks have elapsed since these resolutions, having reference to the situation in Cuba, were reported to the House by the Committee on Foreign Affairs. We had been impatient, and I believe the country had been impatient for a long time prior to the 27th day of February, when the report was finally brought in by the distinguished chairman of the committee, Mr. HITT of Illinois. I had filed many petitions from my people, and I know of my own personal knowledge that the heart of every true lover of liberty within the confines of the Fourth Congressional district of Minnesota is in sympathy with those struggling patriots in Cuba, who have for years been denied the privilege of self-government. And I doubt not that my district is but a fair indication of the sentiments and the sympathies of the people of this country from one end to the other. We have received no protests against the passage of these resolutions. And so great was the pressure of public opinion in favor of the recognition of the belligerency of the Cubans when the resolutions were first reported that the upper branch of the Congress—the Senate, which generally moves with such deliberation as to cause the wish to be often expressed in the public prints and elsewhere that that body might reform itself—the Senate of the United States in this instance actually discounted our efforts, and before we could call the previous question on the resolutions the other branch of Congress sent to our doors a set of resolutions declaring that a state of public war existed in the Island of Cuba, and that the struggling people in that benighted land should be duly accorded the rights to which every nation is entitled in the event of hostilities with another nation.

This House saw fit to amend the Senate resolutions in a few minor details. The main and central idea was not changed in the least. By an overwhelming vote we passed them and sent them back to the Senate with slight amendments. But, alas, where was the spirit of liberty and the genius of representative government which had marked the brief but eloquent and soul-stirring debate only a few days previous? Liberty seems to have fled from the Senatorial semicircle and an evil genius crept in, and, like the serpent at the ear of Mother Eve, whispered "delay." And then light gave way to darkness, patriotism to distrust and doubt, and the Senate abjectly capitulated and refused to maintain its former position or stand by its first declarations. I know not why this was done. I do know that it presents an absurd position to the country. For months we have ample evidence that a state of war existed in Cuba. The army of invasion has been pouring in. Spanish men-of-war have been unloading munitions and provisions to lay siege to the citadels of the Cubans. Why delay action a moment longer? Both House and Senate have once said that we should declare the belligerency of the insurgents. There need be no fear of war with Spain. That effete and crumbling monarchy, which for ages suppressed the freedom of the individual, is now making its last rally to perpetuate primogeniture on the Western Continent. I venture the assertion that if we declare in favor of the Cubans other nations will soon follow, and there will be a new republic established within the next year. So I say, let us pass the Senate resolutions, and thus prevent any more delay. Liberty is the watchword of the American people. Do not let us hesitate to declare for the same rights for others which we ourselves enjoy and which cost so much to secure during the first hundred years of this great Republic. [Applause.]

Mr. QUIGG. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. PICKLER].

Mr. PICKLER. Mr. Speaker, I simply desire to express my sympathy on the side of the Cuban people, and to say that I am for these resolutions. Gentlemen say there is some risk in taking this step. I think that, as far as that is concerned, the risk is small; but, Mr. Speaker, there comes a time to nations as well as to men when to achieve the right, when to stand for principle, when to work out the best results; nations as well as men must take a stand on the side of humanity and progress.

Only a few weeks since, when that ringing message came from the President in regard to upholding the Monroe doctrine on this continent, we heard the same prediction, that war was inevitable. But this House stood by the other House and by the President—stood for the right, stood for the voice of this people as a nation—and the clouds of war have disappeared, and the decision of this people is practically unanimous that Congress was right in the position taken.

The darkest blot, Mr. Speaker, upon the national history in recent years was the refusal of sympathy with the Hawaiian Government in the time of her trouble; and the nation will never be satisfied in regard to that struggling Republic until we have had an opportunity to evince the sentiment which this people have always entertained, and which was misrepresented when the representatives of our Government hauled down the flag upon that island. When freedom, from her mountain height, gave that old standard to this people she required of them that they should keep this old banner in the sky, not only as the emblem of the freedom of her own people, but for liberty struggling people everywhere; that men striving for liberty, men battling for freedom, should behold its folds, be encouraged, and thus be aided in achieving victory.

Struggling Republics always look to this Government. And why? Simply because we are recognized as the greatest Republic on earth; and when gentlemen say we are to take a risk, I would ask them if it is not worth while, when we consider that notwithstanding what it has cost this nation in treasure and lives to uphold a republican form of government, that our liberties maintained and blessings enjoyed compensate for the great cost, is it not worth our while to take such a risk, as we shall in this case, to seek to encourage a people who are striving for liberty and who seek our sympathy in establishing a like form of government, and who are in the same position that we know our fathers were at the institution of this Republic?

There are times, Mr. Speaker, when patriotism can not be measured with dollars. There are times when commerce can not be set off against liberty; and I believe the time has come in this nation as regards the future of that island that for mere mercenary reasons we can not afford to longer remain silent; and the time has come now, in my opinion, when we should speak and when we should speak unanimously. I believe that the people of this nation, Mr. Speaker, after more than a year's reflection, have come to the conclusion not only in the mountains of New England and in the valleys of the West, but on the great prairies beyond, that Congress should act in this matter. I know, Mr. Speaker, that in my own State, where brave pioneers are building homes, sympathy for the struggling people of Hawaii and Cuba, the desire for the enforcement of the Monroe doctrine and a vigorous American

policy abounds; and they are willing to assume the responsibility or an affirmative declaration on the resolutions before this House. The people, after mature reflection, have come to the conclusion that it is our duty as a people loving liberty, disregarding the technical and refined constructions, if need be, of international law, it is our duty as a people honoring our fathers, who fought for freedom, to recognize this people; and, Mr. Speaker, I believe that in this case the voice of the people is the voice of God; and that it is our duty to carry out the wishes of the people of this great Republic. [Applause.]

Mr. TUCKER. Mr. Speaker, on a former occasion I gave to the House my views on these resolutions, and as the House has doubtlessly cherished those views very sacredly, I shall not inflict myself upon it to-night but for a moment. But in closing this debate, sir, I want to call the attention of gentlemen to the cardinal principle involved in these resolutions. We are inaugurating in this second resolution a departure from the precedents of this Government, which, if followed, will return to plague the inventor. It is a disposition of interference in the domestic policy of other nations with whom we are on friendly terms that may be brooked by Spain, but the time will come when, if persisted in, we will meet a foe man worthy of our steel.

Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the resolutions because they are not right. Sympathy for freedom, for liberty, is cheap and beautiful; but I say to my honorable friend from Maine [Mr. MILLIKEN], who always appeals to the warmest sympathies of my heart, that I carry in my heart greater sympathy for 70,000,000 Americans than for a million and a half Cubans. What will it profit this Government if you free Cuba but enslave your own people?

Mr. MAHON. It is not our purpose to do that.

Mr. PICKLER. There is no danger of that.

Mr. TUCKER. Ah! no danger of that. What business have you to interfere with the domestic policy of a foreign country, invite war, and increase the debt of the country?

Mr. MAHON. What business had she to interfere with us?

Mr. TUCKER. When did she interfere?

Mr. MAHON. In 1861. [Loud applause.]

Mr. TUCKER. Why, she did exactly right.

Mr. MAHON. Then we are doing right now. [Renewed applause.]

Mr. TUCKER. Let me say to the gentleman that he is speaking of the first resolution; I am speaking to the second. The first resolution is abstractly right, as the honorable gentleman from New York [Mr. DANIELS] has shown us to-night; but, Mr. Speaker, the first resolution refers merely to belligerency. What right has this House to declare belligerency. The honorable gentleman from Massachusetts who spoke this evening amply developed that subject, showing that the recognition of belligerency is an executive function, and not a legislative one. And but a few weeks ago we heard gentlemen on this floor criticising the Secretary of Agriculture and Mr. Bowler, the Comptroller of the Treasury. Why? Because they had attempted, as parts of the executive of the Government, not to execute its laws, but to make them, as was claimed. Now, what are you doing? With your powers as a legislative body you are simply returning the compliment and attempting to interfere with an executive function. Take the beam out of thine own eye.

Mr. TRACEY. We are trying to hold up his hands.

Mr. TUCKER. Whose hands?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I will ask the gentleman from Virginia what section of the Constitution or what law of the United States vests the power to confer belligerency in the Executive of this nation?

Mr. TUCKER. Mr. Speaker, if I had the time, which I have not to-night, I could convince even my unwilling friend from Michigan of the correctness of that proposition.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Can you name a section of the Constitution or a law of the United States which vests that power in the Executive?

Mr. TUCKER. I have authorities here by the cart load—more than my friend could carry home with him.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. If you do not name such a section of the Constitution or such a law, I shall deny that it exists and defy you to name a constitutional provision or a statute that confers that power.

Mr. TUCKER. Well, I shall have to take my friend's defiance for the present. All I mean is this, and my friend himself must recognize it, that whether it is in the Constitution in words or not the right to accord belligerency is an Executive function.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I do not recognize it.

Mr. TUCKER. Then my friend is in a large minority.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I say to my friend from Virginia that Henry Clay, a distinguished Representative coming from the South, as the gentleman himself does, said in the House of Representatives that when the Executive fails to do his duty, it is the duty of the Legislature to prod him to it and to force him to it. [Applause.]

Mr. TUCKER. And I suppose the gentleman, knowing the

weak character that is now sitting in the White House [laughter], is laughing by these resolutions to force him to do his duty. [Laughter.]

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. We want to call the roll on him.

Mr. TUCKER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Illinois took that view of this matter, that we, as a legislative body, are kindly giving advice to the Executive as to what he ought to do. But, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to take up further time, because I have promised to yield what remains to me to my friend from New York. I hope these resolutions will be defeated for the benefit of Spain, for the benefit of Cuba, but more than all, and above all, for the benefit of the free American people of this country. I hope they will be defeated, because it is the beginning of a policy that means the destruction of our old-time American policy. Unless the United States proposes to become the guardian for all of the weak, puling countries in the South American continent we must not vote for these resolutions.

I now yield the balance of my time to my friend from New York, Mr. QUIGG.

Mr. PICKLER. Before the gentleman sits down, I would like to ask him if he does not think that Cuba is alarmingly near the United States for Spain to be upholding such a government there? Is not Spain a long way from home to maintain a government of that kind?

Mr. TUCKER. Not farther from home than my friend is on this question. [Laughter.]

Mr. BRODERICK. Mr. Speaker, by the law of nations the discoverer of new lands, followed by actual possession, invests the discoverer with good title. Spain having discovered and colonized Cuba, she is entitled to the possession of the island against all the world, except it be the Cubans. The claim that the Cubans assert to the country and the right to an independent government rests upon a different principle.

An island or province situated remotely from the parent government and held after the province has sufficient population, intelligence, and resources to maintain a government and desires its establishment is, as a rule, held for revenue only. History abundantly proves that remote possessions have usually been by the parent government negligently or criminally governed. In the very nature of things they could not be fostered and protected as are the people of the home government. The government for Cuba has been no exception to this rule. She has been denied equal representation in the Spanish Cortes, and there has been scarcely any limit to the taxes imposed on the people. Every species of taxation which the ingenuity of man has been able to devise since the beginning of civil government has been imposed in Cuba. These burdens have been laid on both their imports and exports, on every sort of occupation, and in addition to these a per capita tax has been imposed.

Cuba has much more to complain of against Spain because of unjust and burdensome taxation than the American colonies had, when they so heroically resisted the stamp act and the Parliamentary tax upon tea.

The title of Spain, derived through discovery and colonization, does not carry with it the right to oppress. There is no such natural or acquired right as this. Governments are no longer maintained for the benefit of kings and princes, though some, I confess, are a little slow in learning this great truth.

Spain's relation to Cuba, from equitable considerations, is somewhat analogous to that of guardian and ward. Having planted her colonies on the island it was her duty to promote their welfare until the colonies had reached their majority; that is, until they were able and desirous of maintaining a government for themselves. Spain can have no title to the inhabitants—to human beings—and the Cubans have, through taxation, paid the Spanish Government for the island more than a hundredfold. In equity she would not be bound to pay for the lands after the long and continuous occupancy, but the fact that she has paid the full value many times over ought to strengthen the claim of her people.

Cuba is now past her majority and asserts her right to freedom. She bases her claim upon her long occupancy, upon the broken promises, mismanagement, and oppressions of the parent Government, and upon the further assertion that she is amply able to establish and maintain a form of government better suited to the wants and conditions of her people.

I take it that any people situated as the Cubans are with reference to Spain, when they are prepared for self-government, even if there were no systematic oppression, would have a good claim to independence, and would be entitled to fair consideration from other nations. Separated by the ocean, and thousands of miles from the home Government, Cuba would almost of necessity be neglected. Add to this neglect the broken promises of 1878, long continued abuses, and misgovernment, and her cause most forcibly appeals to everyone who believes in fair dealing and good government. I take it that it will not be denied that the right of revolution to establish independence is inherent in every people which are so widely separated by the seas from the parent Government as is Cuba.

But the serious question and the one about which there are some differences of opinion is, What are we going to do about it? Our Government is republican in form. All our institutions are founded and conducted upon the idea that the people rule. It is therefore natural that our people should sympathize with those of every land who are contending for better conditions and for larger liberties.

I understand that there is a treaty with Spain which prohibits in this country the organization of military companies for the purpose of aiding revolt in any of the Spanish possessions, but this treaty in no sense precludes our Government from recognizing the fact that a state of hostilities exists in Cuba.

By the Chinese restriction act, passed a few years ago, Congress annulled a stipulation in the treaty with China regarding immigration to this country, and the Federal Supreme Court sustained this act. Hence the law is well settled that Congress has power to annul or modify an international treaty. I am willing to concede that such legislation is not defensible, except in extraordinary cases, but every nation has the undoubted right to self-preservation so long as it is endeavoring to uphold and perpetuate good government. But where a province adjacent to the United States is striving to throw off the yoke of oppression and establish a republican form of government this Government has the right, and it is its duty, to see that fair treatment is accorded to such province. And I say in all candor that I believe the time is at hand when the Chief Executive of the United States should accord to the Cubans full belligerent rights. I know this is an important step, and should always be taken with due sense of the responsibility, but when questions of humanity and free government are involved this, the greatest of Republics, should not hesitate to assert its judgment. When emergencies present themselves responsibilities must be taken. Mr. Lincoln drove the French invaders from Mexico near the close of our great civil war. It required courage, under the circumstances, but Mr. Lincoln was equal to the occasion, and he was sustained by his countrymen.

Mr. Speaker, I am not unmindful of the fact that by international law there are certain tests to be applied by a foreign government in determining when belligerency should be extended to a revolting state. I understand the chief test is whether a state of actual war, as distinguished from a mere insurrection, exists. Another test requires that the revolting state must have made some effort to set up a government, for there should be some tangible organized civil authority or some government in process of formation to supersede the former government, if the revolution should succeed. In the case of Cuba, there can be no question but there exists to-day a military conflict within its borders. Civil government is suspended, or set at naught, except in a few places. The Spanish authorities are, and have been for many months, treating the military operations of Cuba as a forcible revolt against the parental sway. These evidences, coming to us in the most authentic manner, settle the question that Cuba is prosecuting a contest by military force for independence, and that Spain is resisting such contest with all the military force at her command. Every gentleman on this floor must be satisfied that there is public war in Cuba. It is waged by the Cubans on the same principle that our patriot fathers made war against British authority in 1776. It can not be expected, nor has it ever been required, that there should be a fully equipped civil government in operation before belligerency should be accorded. It is sufficient if there is an honest effort being made to organize a new government. The Cubans are making this effort. The evidence on this point is conclusive.

In considering the war between Spain and her colonies in 1825, Mr. Clay, then Secretary of State, said:

No statesman can have contemplated the colonial relations of Europe and continental America without foreseeing that the time must come when they would cease. That time might have been retarded or accelerated, but come it must, in the great march of human events.

The former relations between Spain and most of her American colonies did cease about that time, but Cuba still remained under parental control. From 1868 to 1878 she made a heroic contest for freedom, but was finally reconciled by promised reformation. These promises have been broken, or at least have not been kept in good faith, and Cuba has again asserted her right to a separation. She has caught the spirit of the age, and is going to be free. Her cause can hardly be retarded much longer.

It has been said that Cubans are not prepared for self-government. This charge was made against the American colonies. It has been made against every people who were struggling to free themselves from the oppressions of old governments. New responsibilities develop latent powers. Experience has demonstrated that self-government produces independent thought and the ability to meet additional obligations. I am convinced that when Cuba becomes free she will be able to establish and maintain a far better government than Spain has ever given her. Believing this, I shall heartily support these resolutions.

The tendency of the times for nations, as well as for individuals, is toward greater freedom. All peoples are seeking better conditions. This onward march can not be checked. Napoleon once

declared that "the highest quality of a great general is the ability to see things as they are, and not to make pictures in his own mind." We see to-day this battle being waged everywhere. As Americans, we ought to send greetings to every people who are engaged in this struggle. Every member who has spoken upon these resolutions has asserted his sympathy with Cubans. Declarations upon the floor will give little relief, but we can give substantial aid and sympathy by adopting these resolutions, and I trust it will be done by an unmistakable majority. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The hour of 10 o'clock having arrived, the Chair, in accordance with the previous order, declares the House adjourned.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, Mr. LACEY, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred House bill No. 7718, reported in lieu thereof a bill (H. R. 7945) to provide for the entry of lands in Greer County, Okla., to give preference rights to settlers, and for other purposes, accompanied by a report (No. 1113); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

By Mr. HANLY, from the Committee on Claims:

The bill (H. R. 574) for the relief of Maj. Charles A. Woodruff. (Report No. 1114.)

The bill (H. R. 1625) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to determine and pay certain claims against the Fond du Lac Indians. (Report No. 1115.)

The bill (H. R. 5701) for the relief of Julius Stahel. (Report No. 1116.)

The bill (H. R. 953) for the relief of William Gray. (Report No. 1120.)

By Mr. BAKER of Kansas, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions: The bill (H. R. 4281) granting a pension to George Johnson, of Lenox, Iowa. (Report No. 1123.)

PUBLIC BILLS, MEMORIALS, AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GROSVENOR: A bill (H. R. 7946) to reorganize and increase the efficiency of the personnel of the Navy of the United States—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. PAYNE: A bill (H. R. 7947) to amend section 2502 of the Revised Statutes of the United States—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KIEFER: A bill (H. R. 7948) authorizing the Secretary of War to recognize the organizations of the Sons of Veterans as part of the military reserve of the United States—to the Committee on the Militia.

By Mr. FISCHER: A concurrent resolution (House Con. Res. No. 89) concerning the distribution of seed—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PICKLER: A resolution (House Res. No. 235) to fix time for consideration of H. R. 5549—to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills of the following titles were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. DOLLIVER: A bill (H. R. 7949) to increase the pension of Margaret E. Pierce—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DOVENER: A bill (H. R. 7950) granting a pension to Mary E. Radcliffe, of Wheeling, Ohio County, W. Va.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FARIS: A bill (H. R. 7951) to pension Rhoda L. Day and Jettie Annis—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HAGER: A bill (H. R. 7952) granting a pension to Mary J. Shaw—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HANLY: A bill (H. R. 7953) to increase the pension of Philip Caslow—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOOKER: A bill (H. R. 7954) to pension James H. Rathburn, father of Charles B. Rathburn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOWE: A bill (H. R. 7955) to remove the charge of desertion from the naval record of William Kiernes—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HULICK: A bill (H. R. 7956) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of John S. Cadamy—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7957) to remove charge of desertion from military record of Thomas Reveal—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HULL: A bill (H. R. 7958) for the relief of Edmund E. Schreiner—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MILLIKEN: A bill (H. R. 7959) granting an increase of pension to Robert W. Groves—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7960) granting an increase of pension to John Dow—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NOONAN: A bill (H. R. 7961) for the relief of John Mellifont and Ellen Riordon—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. PICKLER: A bill (H. R. 7962) granting a pension to Horace Perry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 7963) granting a pension to Bertha Lovings—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THOMAS: A bill (H. R. 7964) granting a pension to Annie E. Bassett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WELLINGTON: A bill (H. R. 7965) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of the estate of Joshua Newcomer, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7966) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of the estate of John Middlekauff, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7967) to carry into effect a finding of the Court of Claims in favor of William Garrett, late of Montgomery County, Md.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7968) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of H. Harrison Beeler—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WILLIS: A bill (H. R. 7969) to increase the pension of Joseph E. Vantine—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PEARSON: A bill (H. R. 7970) for the relief of Christian Hahn, in accordance with the award of the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. AITKEN: Petition of the Michigan Agricultural College, in favor of a bill to fix the standard of weights and measures by the adoption of the metric system—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. ALDRICH of Illinois: Petition of residents of the First Congressional district of Illinois, favoring a bill to fix the standard of weights and measures by the adoption of the metric system—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. BARHAM: Petition of citizens of Santa Rosa, Cal.; also of citizens of Tehama County, Cal., asking for the passage of House bill No. 2626, for the protection of agricultural staples by an export bounty—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROSIUS: Petition of the Christian Temperance Alliance of Pennsylvania, in favor of a national commission to investigate and report upon the liquor traffic—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. CURTIS of Kansas: Petition of the members of Woodson Post, No. 185, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Kansas, of Yates Center, and citizens of Yates Center, Kans., for the passage of a service-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DE ARMOND: Affidavits in support of House bill No. 4376, for the relief of Christian Daniels—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DOLLIVER: Papers to accompany House bill to increase the pension of Margaret E. Pierce—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DOVENER: Petition of W. W. Badley and 47 other residents of Wheeling, W. Va.; also of Washington Council, No. 1, Order United American Mechanics, of Wheeling, W. Va., praying for the passage of the Stone immigration bill—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. EVANS: Petition of Marion Gordon and others, of Louisville, Ky., in relation to the Marquette statue in Statuary Hall—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. FARIS: Papers to accompany House bill No. 6079, for the relief of Jeremiah Sullivan—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HANLY: Evidence to be filed with and accompany House bill to increase the pension of Philip Caslow—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HEATWOLE: Petition of citizens of Minnesota, praying for the protection of game, birds, and fish—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HEMENWAY: Resolutions of Council No. 61, American Protestant Association, relating to the matter of the Marquette statue—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. HULICK: Petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Cincinnati, Ohio, indorsing the proposition to create a department of commerce and manufactures as a branch of the executive department of the Government—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LACEY: Petition of C. C. Terrell, of Forest Home,

Iowa, asking that religious publications be given the advantage of the act of Congress of July 16, 1894, relative to second-class matter—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of George E. Wilson, of Royalton, Minn., for relief—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. LAYTON: Memorial of the American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, protesting against the passage of Senate bill No. 2261 (H. R. 6508), providing for an international humane and sanitary conference—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LEONARD: Remonstrance of citizens of Lycoming County, Pa., against permitting the statue of Marquette to remain in Statuary Hall—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. LINTON: Petition of Charles H. Bement, of Laingsburg, Mich.; also of G. H. Slocum, of Caro, Mich., in favor of the passage of House bill No. 4566, to amend the postal laws relating to second-class matter—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of Frank H. Rose, of Corunna, Mich., protesting against the passage of House bill No. 4566, to amend the postal laws relating to second-class matter—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of citizens of St. Louis, Mo., praying for the passage of joint resolution No. 11, that neither Congress nor any State shall pass any law respecting the establishment of religion, etc.—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolutions adopted by the National Association of the Agricultural Implement and Vehicle Manufacturers of the United States, asking that the Interstate Commerce Commission publish certain statistics—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition signed by citizens of Saginaw County, Mich., asking that a bill be passed taxing filled and skimmed cheese—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota: Petition of the Department of Minnesota, Grand Army of the Republic, favoring the bill establishing a military park at Vicksburg—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PRINCE: Petition of W. H. Gibbs and 110 other citizens of Galva, Ill., in favor of the passage of the joint resolution No. 11, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUSSELL of Connecticut: Petition of the Liquor Dealers' Association of Connecticut, against the passage of House bill No. 6668, to amend an act regulating the sale of intoxicating liquors in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SHAFROTH: Petition of George H. Harries, of Pueblo, Colo.; also of J. N. Counter, of Colorado, for the passage of House bill No. 4566, relating to second-class matter—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of Colorado Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Mary Jewett Telford, president, favoring the enactment of a Sunday-rest law for the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petitions of citizens of Longmont and Boulder County, Colo., favoring the passage of joint resolution No. 11, proposing an amendment to the Constitution—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SORG: Petition of Wayne Council, No. 90, Order United American Mechanics, unanimously indorsing the Stone immigration bill—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. SNOVER: Petition of Detroit Manufacturers' Club of Detroit, Mich., for financial legislation—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SULLOWAY: Petition of Annie Bell Carswell, counselor, Benjamin Leacock, secretary, and 73 others, of Lady Wentworth Council, No. 18, Daughters of Liberty, Manchester, N. H., praying for the passage of the Stone immigration bill—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. TRELOAR: Petition of Fred Reather Post, No. 420, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Missouri, of Montgomery City, praying for the passage of a service-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WELLINGTON: Petition of Mrs. R. T. Viers, of Montgomery County, Md., praying that the war claim filed by William A. Viers, now deceased, be referred to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of D. H. Wyand, executor, asking aid in the settlement of the war claim of Frederick Wyand—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of Basil L. Bean, of Montgomery County, Md., praying reference of his war claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of the heirs of James Orme, deceased, late of Montgomery County, Md., praying reference of his war claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of John Mullieau, of Montgomery County, Md., praying reference of his war claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of James T. West, of Montgomery County, Md., praying reference of his war claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of William R. Beall, of Montgomery County, Md., praying reference of his war claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of B. L. Fox, of Montgomery County, Md., praying reference of his war claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of Alexander F. Boswell, of Montgomery County, Md., praying reference of his war claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of the heirs of Patrick Connolly, deceased, late of Montgomery County, Md., praying reference of his war claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

SENATE.

MONDAY, April 6, 1896.

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

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday last was read and approved.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, in compliance with the provisions of the act of March 2, 1895, a report from the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, together with a report from Indian Agent D. A. Wisdom, of the Union Indian Agency, Ind. T., showing payments by the Cherokee Nations to such persons as would accept the same and the amounts awarded them by the appraisers appointed under the provisions of the act to appraise the value of improvements of intruders in that nation; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the Postmaster-General, transmitting, in compliance with the act of Congress of May 9, 1888, the claim of R. M. Ridgely, postmaster at Springfield, Ill., for credit on his postal account for postage stamps and key-deposit funds stolen from his office April 3, 1895; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads, and ordered to be printed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT presented a memorial of the American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, of New York, remonstrating against the passage of Senate bill No. 2261, providing for an international humane and sanitary conference; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, praying for the appointment of an impartial national commission of inquiry to investigate and report upon the alcoholic liquor traffic, its relation to crime, pauperism, and the general welfare of the public; which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a petition of the assembly of the State of New York, praying for the enactment of legislation establishing a military park to commemorate the campaign, siege, and defense of Vicksburg; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of New York, praying for the establishment of a department of commerce and manufactures; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the faculty and students of Tualatin Academy and Pacific University, Forest Grove, Oreg., and a petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Wisconsin, praying for the establishment of an international board of arbitration between the United States and Great Britain; which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. SHERMAN presented a petition of Unity Lodge, No. 309, International Association of Machinists, of Cleveland, Ohio, and a petition of Lodge No. 438, International Association of Machinists, of Canton, Ohio, praying for an investigation of the treatment of employees of the Brooklyn (N. Y.) Navy-Yard and other navy-yards of the United States; which were referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. PEPPER presented the petition of Joseph Silver, of Aberdeen, S. Dak., praying for the enactment of legislation requiring the Secretary of the Treasury to redeem Government obligations in gold and silver coin alike; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented the petition of A. N. Lee and 18 other citizens