

twenty-nine Young People's Societies of Christian Endeavor, comprising District No. 4, of the city of Philadelphia, Pa., in favor of the passage of a bill to prohibit the sale of liquors in Government buildings—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, paper to accompany House bill for the relief of Samuel J. Matlack—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, *March 31, 1898.*

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

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

SAGINAW RIVER IMPROVEMENT.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 22d instant, a report of the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, relative to the cost of improving the Saginaw River from its head to a point in Saginaw Bay, with a view of securing a channel 150 feet wide and an increase of depth to 16 feet from the head of the river to the Third Street Bridge in Bay City, etc.; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

REVENUE CUTTER DANIEL MANNING.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, in response to a resolution of January 10, 1898, information relative to the organization of a board of not less than three competent persons to inquire into and determine how much the hull, machinery, and appurtenances of the U. S. revenue cutter *Daniel Manning* cost the contractors over and above the contract price, etc.; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED.

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

A bill (H. R. 93) granting an increase of pension to Isaiah F. Force;

A bill (H. R. 378) granting a pension to Lowell H. Hopkinson;

A bill (H. R. 711) granting a pension to Anna M. Tate;

A bill (H. R. 864) granting a pension to Maria E. Hess, widow of Florian Hess;

A bill (H. R. 983) to grant an increase of pension to Nathaniel Haughton;

A bill (H. R. 1825) to increase the pension of David Parker;

A bill (H. R. 1855) granting an increase of pension to David C. Waring;

A bill (H. R. 1897) granting a pension to Mrs. Susan A. Huber, of Louisville, Ky.;

A bill (H. R. 2113) granting an increase of pension to Lucy Ord Mason;

A bill (H. R. 2119) to grant a pension to Miss Sallie Work;

A bill (H. R. 2123) increasing the pension of William P. Haskell;

A bill (H. R. 2203) granting a pension to George G. Vogel;

A bill (H. R. 2253) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Montieih;

A bill (H. R. 2669) granting an increase of pension to Henry H. Tucker;

A bill (H. R. 2762) granting a pension to Mary C. Case;

A bill (H. R. 3025) increasing the pension of William S. Demott;

A bill (H. R. 3185) granting a pension to Lovezila L. Patterson;

A bill (H. R. 3663) granting a pension to George Barnes;

A bill (H. R. 3953) granting an increase of pension to Calvin P. Lynn;

A bill (H. R. 4143) granting a pension to Elizabeth Holt;

A bill (H. R. 4449) granting an increase of pension to Charles Beckwith;

A bill (H. R. 4469) increasing the pension of Katherine L. Cushing, widow of William B. Cushing, late commander in United States Navy;

A bill (H. R. 4611) granting an increase of pension to Marcia C. Barnes;

A bill (H. R. 4979) granting a pension to Charles A. Foster;

A bill (H. R. 5105) granting a pension to Margaret H. Townsend;

A bill (H. R. 5245) granting a pension to Florence N. Waldron;

A bill (H. R. 5775) granting a pension to Lewis K. Whitmore, a locomotive engineer in the military service and employ of the United States during the late civil war;

A bill (H. R. 5809) granting a pension to Charles E. Taylor;

A bill (H. R. 6680) granting a pension to Mrs. Janet Wemple;

A bill (H. R. 6793) granting an increase of pension to James F. McKinley;

A bill (H. R. 6928) granting a pension to Eva Seeley;

A bill (H. R. 6988) for the relief of Emory T. Hipple;

A bill (H. R. 7501) granting a pension to Daniel J. Melvin;

A bill (H. R. 7523) granting an increase of pension to Mary Speier;

A bill (H. R. 7628) granting a pension to Catherine Wiltse;

A bill (H. R. 7783) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Rogers;

A bill (H. R. 7793) to increase the pension of Susan Brownlow Boynton;

A bill (H. R. 7952) granting a pension to William C. Ryan;

A bill (H. R. 8197) for the relief of Mary B. Hulings;

A bill (H. R. 8515) to increase the pension of William H. Savage;

A bill (H. R. 8636) granting an increase of pension to John X. Griffith;

A bill (H. R. 8770) to repeal chapter 164, laws of 1871, approved March 3, 1871, being an act entitled "An act granting a pension to Hiram R. Rhea;"

A bill (H. R. 8819) granting a pension to Gemima Millsap; and

A bill (H. R. 8834) granting a pension to John B. Hays.

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

A bill (H. R. 4650) for the relief of John Welty, of Portsmouth, Ohio; and

A bill (H. R. 6098) to correct the military record of N. Ward Cady, late major, Second Mounted Rifles, New York Volunteers, and to grant him an honorable discharge.

The bill (H. R. 8614) to correct the naval record of George W. Sherrard was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

CARRIE F. BISSELL.

The bill (H. R. 1181) granting an increase of pension to Carrie F. Bissell, of Pueblo, Colo., was read twice by its title.

Mr. TELLER. I ask that that bill may be taken up and passed. I will state that the beneficiary is an old lady, entirely blind, and is getting now a pension of \$17 a month. The House has passed the bill granting her a pension of \$30. I have spoken to the chairman of the Committee on Pensions, and he has no objection to the bill being put on its passage.

Mr. GALLINGER. I will simply say that while this procedure is unusual, I have examined the bill and I know that the Committee on Pensions would report it back immediately. Hence I have no objection to its consideration.

There being no objection, the bill was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Carrie F. Bissell, widow of Harmon D. Bissell, late regimental quartermaster Eighty-third Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month, in lieu of the pension she is now receiving.

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

MRS. HANNAH LETCHER STEVENSON.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 439) granting a pension to Mrs. Hannah Letcher Stevenson, widow of the late Brig. Gen. John B. Stevenson.

Mr. GALLINGER. I move that the Senate nonconcur in the amendments made by the House of Representatives and ask for a conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses.

The motion was agreed to.

By unanimous consent, the Vice-President was authorized to appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate; and Mr. KYLE, Mr. VEST, and Mr. BAKER were appointed.

Mr. GALLINGER. There are other Senate bills on the table with amendments.

Mr. ALLEN. I desire to suggest to the Senator from New Hampshire that the pension bills which have passed both Houses but have received slight amendments in the House ought to be taken up and considered now.

Mr. GALLINGER. That is what I have suggested. The amendments will be concurred in without question.

CAROLINE A. SLOCUM.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2299) granting a pension to Caroline A. Slocum, which was, in line 8, after "Volunteers," to insert "and pay her a pension."

Mr. GALLINGER. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

ROBERT P. WILD.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 825) granting an increase of pension to Robert P. Wild.

The amendments were, in line 4, to strike out "pay" and insert "place the name of;" and in line 5, after "Infantry," to insert "on the pension rolls and pay him a pension of."

Mr. GALLINGER. I move concurrence in those amendments. The motion was agreed to.

ANNA E. BOTSFORD.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1181) to increase the pension of Anna E. Botsford, widow of Eli W. Botsford, late major of Sixteenth Regiment Ohio Volunteers.

The amendments were, in line 7, after "roll," to insert "and pay her a pension;" and in line 8 to strike out "amount" and insert "pension."

Mr. GALLINGER. I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House of Representatives.

The motion was agreed to.

WILLIAM L. GRIGSBY.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 73) granting a pension to William L. Grigsby, of Belvidere, in the county of Thayer, Nebr.

The amendments were, in line 6, after "States," to insert "and pay him a pension;" and in line 7 to strike out all after the word "month."

Mr. ALLEN. I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House of Representatives.

The motion was agreed to.

SUSAN A. PADDOCK.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 178) granting a pension to Susan A. Paddock, which was, in line 7, after the word "her," to insert the words "a pension."

Mr. ALLEN. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

ANN M. MADDEN.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 431) granting a pension to Ann M. Madden, which was, in line 7, after "Volunteers," to insert "and pay her a pension."

Mr. GALLINGER. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

HARRIET R. MATLACK.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 655) granting a pension to Harriet R. Matlack, which was, in line 8, after "Volunteers," to insert "and pay her a pension."

Mr. GALLINGER. I move concurrence in the amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

OLEVIA S. WASHBURN.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 3178) granting a pension to Olevia S. Washburn, which was, in line 7, after "Volunteers," to insert "and pay her a pension."

Mr. GALLINGER. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. HOAR presented a petition of the Real Estate Exchange of Boston, Mass., praying for the ratification of a reciprocity treaty between the United States and the Dominion of Canada; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of the Young People's Christian Union of Beverly, Mass., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors in all Government buildings; which was referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. GORMAN presented a petition of Berkeley Division, No. 234, Order of Railway Conductors, of Brunswick, Md., praying for the passage of the so-called anti-scalping ticket bill; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Calvert, Md., praying for the enactment of legislation to protect anti-cigarette laws by providing that cigarettes imported in original packages on entering any State shall become subject to its laws; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Hyattsville, Md., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors in all Government buildings; which was referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also presented a petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Hyattsville, Md., praying for the enactment of legislation to raise the age of protection for girls to 18 years in the District of Columbia and the Territories; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Hyattsville, Md., praying for the enactment of legislation to protect State anti-cigarette laws by providing that cigarettes imported in original packages on entering any State shall become subject to its laws; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. MURPHY presented resolutions adopted by C. A. Glidden Camp, No. 6, Sons of Veterans, of Rochester, N. Y., favoring the absolute independence of Cuba; which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of New York City, remonstrating against the passage of Senate bill No. 1063, for the further prevention of cruelty to animals in the District of Columbia; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the West Side Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Buffalo, N. Y., praying for the enactment of legislation to protect State anti-cigarette laws by providing that cigarettes imported in original packages on entering any State shall become subject to its laws; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the East Side Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Buffalo, N. Y., and a petition of sundry citizens of Nelson, N. Y., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors in all Government buildings; which were referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Nelson, N. Y., and a petition of the Order of Good Templars of Buffalo, N. Y., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the interstate transmission of lottery messages and other gambling matter by telegraph; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. PASCO presented the petition of Rev. A. B. Dudley and 29 other citizens of Lake City, Fla., praying for the passage of the so-called anti-scalping ticket bill; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the Christian Endeavor Union of the State of Florida, praying for the enactment of legislation to amend the internal-revenue laws and prohibit licenses in States, counties, and municipalities where the sale of intoxicating liquors is forbidden by law; which was referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. PROCTOR presented a petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Williston, Vt., praying for the enactment of legislation to raise the age of protection for girls to 18 years in the District of Columbia and the Territories; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance unions of Waterbury, Williston, and East Hardwick; of the congregation of the Hedding Methodist Episcopal Church, of Barre; of the congregation of the Methodist Episcopal Church of South Royalton; of the members of the Sunday school of the Congregational Church of Jamaica, and of the Young People's Society of Christian Endeavor of Barnet, all in the State of Vermont, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the interstate transmission of lottery messages and other gambling matter by telegraph; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance unions of Waterbury and East Hardwick; of the congregations of the Congregational Church of Barnet, the Second Congregational churches of Royalton and South Royalton, and the Methodist Episcopal Church of Williston; of members of the Sunday school of the Congregational Church of Jamaica, and of the Independent Order of Good Templars of South Royalton, all in the State of Vermont, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors in all Government buildings; which were referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also presented petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance unions of Williston, Waterbury, and East Hardwick; of the congregations of the Methodist Episcopal Church of South Royalton, the Second Congregational churches of Royalton and South Royalton, the Congregational Church of Barnet, and of members of the Sunday school of the Congregational Church of Jamaica, all in the State of Vermont, praying for the enactment of legislation to protect State anti-cigarette laws by providing that cigarettes imported in original packages on entering any State shall become subject to its laws; which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. THURSTON presented a petition of Elkhorn Lodge, No. 208, Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen, of North Platte, Nebr., praying for the passage of the so-called anti-scalping ticket bill; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the congregation of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Alvo, Nebr., praying for the enactment of legislation to protect State anti-cigarette laws by providing that cigarettes imported in original packages on entering any State shall become subject to its laws; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Hazard, Nebr., and a petition of the congregation of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Alvo, Nebr., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors in all Government buildings; which were referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also presented a petition of the congregation of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Alvo, Nebr., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the interstate transmission of lottery messages and other gambling matter by telegraph; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. McMILLAN presented a petition of sundry business men of Detroit, Mich., praying for the passage of the Torrey bankruptcy bill; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of North Branch, Mich., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors in all Government buildings; which was referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also presented a petition of Local Union No. 393, Cigar Makers' International Union, of Cadillac, Mich., praying for the passage of the so-called eight-hour bill, the prison-labor bill, the anti-injunction bill, and the bill for the relief of American seamen; which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented petitions of Division No. 503, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, of Ionia; of Park Division, No. 555, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, of Detroit, and of Division No. 6, Order of Railroad Conductors, of Battle Creek, all in the State of Michigan, praying for the passage of the so-called anti-scalping ticket bill; which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the Reform Bureau and sundry citizens of the city of Washington, praying for the enactment of a Sunday-rest law for the District of Columbia; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. PRITCHARD presented a petition of sundry citizens of Beaufort and Morehead City, N. C., praying for the establishment of a coast defense for the better protection of Beaufort Harbor, in that State; which was referred to the Committee on Coast Defenses.

Mr. SPOONER presented petitions of the congregations of the Algoma Street Methodist Episcopal Church, the First Methodist Episcopal Church, the Second Baptist Church, the German Methodist Episcopal Church, and the St. John's Universalist Church; of the Epworth League of the German Methodist Episcopal Church, the Young People's Christian Union of the Universalist Church, the Baptist Young People's Union of the First Church, and the Baptist Young People's Union of the Second Baptist Church, all of Oshkosh, in the State of Wisconsin, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors in all Government buildings; which were referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. FAIRBANKS presented a memorial of Local Union No. 1, American Hod Carriers, of Indianapolis, Ind., remonstrating against the passage of the so-called anti-scalping ticket bill; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of Division No. 221, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, of Huntington, Ind., praying for the passage of the so-called anti-scalping ticket bill; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the congregation of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Friendswood, Ind., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors in all Government buildings; which was referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also presented a petition of F. E. Dupell Lodge, No. 231, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, of Terre Haute, Ind., praying for the enactment of legislation to substitute voluntary arbitration for railway strikes; which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. BATE presented a petition of the congregation of the Independent Methodist Church of Harriman, Tenn., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors in all Government buildings; which was referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also presented a petition of the congregation of the Independent Methodist Church of Harriman, Tenn., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the interstate transmission of lottery messages and other gambling matter by telegraph; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. TURPIE presented a memorial of the common council of the city of Elkhart, Ind., approving the action of the President in

regard to the issues between this country and Spain; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. GEAR presented a petition of 30 citizens of Grafton, Iowa, and a petition of Lodge No. 113, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, of Des Moines, Iowa, praying for the passage of the so-called anti-scalping ticket bill; which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. TURNER presented petitions of Mountain Valley Grange, No. 79; of Columbia Grange, No. 87; of Charter Oak Grange, No. 78, and of Enterprise Grange, No. 85, Order of the Patrons of Husbandry, all of the State of Washington, praying for the enactment of legislation to secure to the people of the rural sections of the country the advantages of postal savings banks; which were referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented petitions of Mountain Valley Grange, No. 79; of Columbia Grange, No. 87, and of Charter Oak Grange, No. 78, Order of Patrons of Husbandry, all in the State of Washington, praying for the enactment of legislation to secure to the people of the rural sections of the country free rural mail delivery; which were referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented petitions of Charter Oak Grange, No. 78; of Columbia Grange, No. 87; of Mountain Valley Grange, No. 79, and of Enterprise Grange, No. 85, Order of Patrons of Husbandry, all in the State of Washington, praying for the enactment of legislation to secure to the people of the country protection against the use of adulterated food products; which were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. COCKRELL presented a petition of sundry citizens of St. Louis, Mo., praying for the passage of the so-called anti-scalping ticket bill; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. SEWELL presented a concurrent resolution of the legislature of the State of New Jersey, in favor of securing national recognition of the services of William A. Newell in originating and establishing a life-saving system adopted by our Government; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF NEW JERSEY, EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT.
Trenton, March 17, 1898.

SIR: I have the honor to respectfully call your attention to the following concurrent resolution, passed by the legislature the 17th day of March, A. D. 1898:

"Concurrent resolution.

"Whereas the legislature of New Jersey did, at its session in the year 1896, adopt a series of resolutions recognizing William A. Newell, a Representative in Congress from this State, as the originator, inventor, and founder of the United States Life-Saving Service, and extending thanks to him in the name of the State; and

"Whereas the legislature of the State of Washington, of which State William A. Newell is now a citizen, did at its last session indorse said resolution, and in addition thereto did request their Senators and Representatives in Congress to secure from the Congress of the United States, where the system was inaugurated, an indorsement of their testimonials of the States of New Jersey and of Washington, so eminently merited and so long withheld; and

"Whereas the Washington State resolutions have been thus presented and are now before committees for consideration and report: Therefore,

"Be it resolved, That our Senators and Representatives in Congress be requested to exert their best influence in securing national recognition of the services of William A. Newell in originating and establishing a life-saving system adopted by our Government, which during fifty years of successful operation has been instrumental in rescuing 150,000 human beings from the perils of the sea, together with many millions of dollars' worth of property for our citizens and a proportionate tariff revenue therefrom for the General Government.

"Resolved, That the Governor of this State be, and he is hereby, requested to forward a copy of these resolutions to the Representatives in Congress of the State of New Jersey."

FOSTER M. VOORHEES.

Hon. WILLIAM J. SEWELL,
United States Senator, Washington, D. C.

Mr. SEWELL presented a memorial of the representatives of the Religious Society of Friends for New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Delaware, respecting the controversy between the United States and Spain; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the President, his Cabinet, and the Congress of the United States:

The memorial of the representatives of the Religious Society of Friends of Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Delaware respectfully represents:

That for some months past we have regarded with deep interest and solicitude the disturbed relations between our Government and that of the Kingdom of Spain in connection with the insurrection in the Island of Cuba.

We sympathize with the friendly efforts that have been used by the present as well as by the late Administration to interpose the good offices of the United States in bringing to a close the inhuman warfare between Spain and her insurgent colony, and we deplore their want of success and the continued sufferings of the Cuban people.

Whilst desiring to uphold the hands of the President in all that may conduce to the benevolent end proposed by him, we are firmly impressed with the belief that this purpose is not likely to be attained by a menace of military force on the part of the United States. Should the irritation now felt by the two nations toward each other be inflamed to the point of open warfare, while we may profess to be actuated by the humane desire to relieve the sufferings of the noncombatants in Cuba, shall we not be amenable to the charge of inconsistency by bringing on a second calamity which would add to, rather than remedy, a prior evil? The soldiers and sailors of the United States who will, in case of war, be thrust into the front rank of the battle, many of whom may lose their lives or limbs in the contest, and whose families must suffer the bereavement of husbands, fathers, and brothers, have

surely no less a claim than the people of a foreign country upon the kind consideration of our rulers. Great and solemn, indeed, is the responsibility of men in power, whose action may light the flames of war and doom to death and untold misery many of their fellow-beings who have had no voice in its inception.

We hold the belief that there can be no difference between nations that can not be more advantageously adjusted to the real interests of both parties by peaceful negotiation or arbitration than by a resort to arms, that the principles of the Christian religion forbid war as emphatically as they do private combats, and that national honor can not be vindicated by mutual destruction and injury.

Should the United States and Spain be unable to adjust their present differences by the ordinary methods of peaceful diplomacy, we would urge the resort to arbitration as a course honorable in itself and in accord with the spirit which should animate a Christian nation. This method has been frequently and successfully resorted to by the United States in its intercourse with powerful governments, and would be no less just and honorable when a weaker one is involved in the controversy. In the intercourse between individuals no dispute, however serious or however it may touch an imaginary sense of honor, is regarded as beyond the ordinary peaceful process of the courts. Why, then, should the same principle be less applicable to the settlement of international differences?

We call our Union a Christian nation. The Lord Jesus Christ, whom we thus claim to follow, inculcated a loving regard on the part of His disciples toward all men, even to their enemies. An inspired apostle has declared that "the wisdom that is from above is first pure, then peaceable, gentle, and easy to be intreated, full of mercy and good fruits." * * * And the fruit of righteousness is sown in peace of them that make peace." (James iii, 17-18.)

We would, therefore, express our earnest desire and hope that pacific counsels may still prevail with our honored President, as we have rejoiced to believe that they have in good measure done, in the management of the momentous questions now pressing upon him, and that all departments of the Government may calmly seek for divine counsel so to direct them as to be instrumental in promoting the true interests of our beloved country, and receive the blessing pronounced by the Prince of Peace upon the peacemakers.

By direction and on behalf of a meeting of the representatives aforesaid, held in Philadelphia the 25th day of the Third month, 1898.

WM. EVANS, *Clerk for the Day.*

Mr. THURSTON presented sundry papers in support of the bill (S. 170) granting an increase of pension to Andrew J. Cook; which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. COCKRELL. I am directed by the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 4164) for the correction of the military record of James M. Crabtree, to report it without amendment and submit a report thereon.

I file with the report and the bill the affidavits of R. L. Dugan and R. A. Leonard.

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

Mr. COCKRELL, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 4165) for the correction of the military record of John R. Leonard, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 3177) to extend the time for the completion of the Fort Smith and Western Railroad, reported it without amendment.

Mr. LODGE, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, to whom the subject was referred, submitted a report, accompanied by a bill (S. 4303) for the purchase of a naval station in the West Indies; which was read twice by its title.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PERKINS in the chair). The bill will be placed on the Calendar.

Mr. LODGE. I give notice that to-morrow I shall, at the earliest possible moment, move to take the bill up for consideration in secret legislative session.

Mr. ALLISON. If the bill is to be considered in secret session, I do not see why it should be reported now in open session, though I make no point about it.

Mr. LODGE. I ask that the bill and report be printed at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. SPOONER. What is the subject of the bill?

Mr. LODGE. The bill provides for the purchase of a naval station in the West Indies.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill and report will be printed under the rule.

Mr. LODGE. The report is a very full one.

Mr. PRITCHARD, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 298) granting an increase of pension to Charles McAllister, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. HAWLEY, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom the subject was referred, reported a bill (S. 4304) to increase the Medical Corps of the Army; which was read twice by its title.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 392) to promote the efficiency of the militia, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

ESTATE OF T. C. FINNEY.

Mr. TELLER, from the Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (S. 3895) for the relief of the estate of T. C. Finney, deceased, late of Memphis, Tenn., reported the following

resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the bill (S. 3895) entitled "A bill for the relief of the estate of T. C. Finney," now pending in the Senate, together with all the accompanying papers, be, and the same is hereby, referred to the Court of Claims, in pursuance of the provisions of an act entitled "An act to provide for the bringing of suits against the Government of the United States," approved March 3, 1887. And the said court shall proceed with the same in accordance with the provisions of such act, and report to the Senate in accordance therewith.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. RAWLINS introduced a bill (S. 4299) to grant to the State of Utah the Industrial Christian Home in Salt Lake City; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. MONEY introduced a bill (S. 4300) for the relief of the legal representatives of Ann D. Halsey, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. TURLEY introduced a bill (S. 4301) for the relief of John Conner, sr.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. CHANDLER introduced a bill (S. 4302) granting a pension to Helen G. Sydenham; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. TELLER introduced a bill (S. 4305) for the relief of Capt. George A. Armes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

AMENDMENTS TO BILLS.

Mr. ALLEN submitted an amendment relative to the acceptance of a parcel of land, and the erection of a public building thereon, at Wymore, Nebr., intended to be proposed by him to the Post-Office appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. BUTLER submitted two amendments relative to the reduction of rates now paid to railroad companies for the transportation of the United States mails, intended to be proposed by him to the Post-Office appropriation bill; which were referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. FAIRBANKS submitted an amendment relative to the deposit of moneys in the registry of the United States courts to the credit of the United States, intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAWLEY submitted an amendment relative to an increase in the number of medical officers of the Army, intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. SHOUP submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 3268) to create a circuit court of the United States for the Tenth circuit and to create a court of appeals of the United States for the tenth circuit; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills and joint resolution; and they were thereupon signed by the Vice-President:

A bill (S. 1320) granting a pension to Sophia J. Chilcott;
A bill (S. 1462) granting an increase of pension to Enoch G. Adams;

A bill (S. 1521) granting a pension to Sarah M. Spyker;
A bill (S. 1837) granting a pension to Sarah E. Colton;
A bill (H. R. 290) to increase the pension of William H. Webster;

A bill (H. R. 345) granting an increase of pension to George D. Cook;
A bill (H. R. 771) granting an increase of pension to Bernard Dunn;

A bill (H. R. 1034) granting a pension to William H. Byrum;
A bill (H. R. 1306) increasing the pension of William Warner;
A bill (H. R. 1381) granting an increase of pension to Elisha M. Luckett;

A bill (H. R. 1802) increasing the pension of Mary E. Wallick;
A bill (H. R. 1957) to increase the pension of William P. Cooper;
A bill (H. R. 2199) granting an increase of pension to Henry F. Rice;

A bill (H. R. 2272) granting a pension to John N. Bruce;
A bill (H. R. 2275) granting an increase of pension to Isaac B. Vail;

A bill (H. R. 2295) granting a pension to Mary J. Hart;
A bill (H. R. 2349) granting a pension to Mrs. Weltha Post-Leggett;

A bill (H. R. 2924) granting an increase of pension to R. A. Browning;

A bill (H. R. 2970) to permit an increase of the pension of John A. Anderson;

A bill (H. R. 3160) to place on the pension rolls the name of Minerva Sample;

A bill (H. R. 3184) granting an increase of pension to James H. Blakeman;

A bill (H. R. 3212) granting an increase of pension to Barbara Miller;

A bill (H. R. 3802) increasing the pension of Francis M. Bruner;

A bill (H. R. 3661) granting a pension to Charles L. Stephens;

A bill (H. R. 3798) granting an increase of pension to Milton Iserman;

A bill (H. R. 3915) granting a pension to Delia Elizabeth Woodward;

A bill (H. R. 4116) to increase the pension of Charles G. Short;

A bill (H. R. 4299) for increase of pension to Alexander E. Ingraham;

A bill (H. R. 4467) to increase the pension of Carey H. Russell;

A bill (H. R. 4526) granting a pension to Mary Vockey;

A bill (H. R. 4624) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Herd;

A bill (H. R. 5083) granting a pension to Thomas Lane;

A bill (H. R. 6931) granting a pension to James B. Rawlins;

A bill (H. R. 7008) granting a pension to R. G. English;

A bill (H. R. 7827) granting a pension to Elizabeth M. Tummy;

and

A joint resolution (H. Res. 182) providing for the temporary admission free of duty of naval and military supplies procured abroad.

CONSULAR CORRESPONDENCE ON AFFAIRS IN CUBA.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the resolution reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations, resolution No. 324.

Mr. FRYE. I am instructed by the Committee on Foreign Relations to ask unanimous consent that that resolution may lie on the table until such time as they may desire its consideration.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. What is the resolution?

Mr. ALLEN. I trust the Senator from Maine will make that request subject to my right to call it up for discussion this morning.

Mr. SPOONER. I rise to inquire what the resolution is to which the Senator from Maine refers.

Mr. FRYE. It is a resolution calling for the Cuban consular correspondence.

Mr. TELLER. I should like to state that here in the rear of the Chamber we do not hear a word that is going on. We might as well be on the outside of the building.

Mr. FRYE. It is the resolution calling for the Cuban consular correspondence, and I am instructed by the Committee on Foreign Relations to ask unanimous consent that it may lie on the table until such time as they request that it may be taken up.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President—

Mr. FRYE. The Senator from Nebraska desires to address the Senate with some remarks in relation to it this morning. I ask unanimous consent that that order may be made after the Senator from Nebraska has completed his remarks, as I may not be here at the completion of his address.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Will the Senator from Maine have the question taken now?

Mr. FRYE. Yes.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is unanimous consent given, as requested by the Senator from Maine, that the resolution shall be taken up when requested by the Committee on Foreign Relations, subject only to the address to be made by the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. HOAR. I do not understand that that is the request of the Senator from Maine.

Mr. FRYE. The request was that it might lie on the table—

Mr. HOAR. Yes; that it lie on the table.

Mr. FRYE. Until such time as the committee shall request that it may be taken up.

Mr. HOAR. Of course.

Mr. CULLOM. That is all.

Mr. CHANDLER. I do not object, but—

Mr. FRYE. The committee is engaged in the committee room all the time, and there are reasons why it does not wish the resolution to be taken up and passed without the presence of the committee.

Mr. CHANDLER. I make no objection to the resolution being laid on the table, but I do not think a contract should be made by Senators with the Committee on Foreign Relations that the resolution shall never be taken up except by their consent.

Mr. ALLISON. I ask unanimous consent that after the observations of the Senator from Nebraska I may be permitted to proceed during the day with the consideration of the sundry civil appropriation bill.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The request of the Senator from Maine is before the Senate. Is there any objection?

Mr. CHANDLER. I object to it in the form in which it is put.

Mr. FRYE. Then I move that the resolution be recommitted to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. ALLEN. Upon that motion I desire to be heard.

Mr. FRYE. I hope the Chair will consider that motion as pending.

Mr. CHANDLER. I suppose the motion to recommit is open to debate, and that we shall hear the views of the Senator from Nebraska on the motion.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question before the Senate is the motion to recommit the resolution made by the Senator from Maine. The Senator from Nebraska is entitled to the floor.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, my zeal for Cuban independence is not new born, nor the growth of a mere night. I spoke for the liberation of the Cuban people when it was by no means a popular thing to do, and I recall very distinctly at this time that several years ago the then senior Senator from Florida [Mr. Call] and I were apparently the only persistent and outspoken friends of the Cuban people in this Chamber. We were indefatigable in our advocacy of independence and intervention. We were so persistent that we incurred the displeasure of many Senators, some of whom I am now glad to know have become the sincere and fearless advocates of independence. That I may prove the correctness of my statement, I will refer briefly to the record.

December 4, 1895, I introduced a resolution, of which this is a paragraph:

That the Government of the United States of America should promptly recognize the revolutionists of Cuba, who are now honestly struggling to secure their independence of the Spanish Government, as composing an independent nation and possessing the rights thereof according to the law of nations.

And, in speaking in its support at that time, I said, among other things:

I am of the number who believe that this Government should promptly recognize the revolutionists of Cuba and assist them in all lawful ways to secure their independence of the Spanish Government and enable them to establish an independent republic. I would not have this Government plunge headlong into a needless quarrel with the Spanish Government, but I would lend every assistance that could be lawfully and properly given to the aspirations of the people of Cuba for a republican form of government. I believe it to be the true policy and the true doctrine of our country that whenever a people show themselves desirous of establishing a republican form of government upon any territory adjacent to us they should receive our encouragement and support. If our form of government is the correct one—and of that I have no doubt—then its recognition or establishment in other lands should be encouraged, and when an opportunity shall present itself to us to lend this encouragement it should be promptly and effectually given.

Speaking to the same resolution December 11, 1895, I urged its adoption.

February 27, 1896, I said:

What is there to prohibit this Government, by proper act of Congress, whether it be in the form of a joint or concurrent resolution, from declaring the acknowledgment of the existence of the Cuban Republic; and would not that be a recognition of the independency of that republic, although as a matter of fact it may not have yet succeeded in repelling the power that assails it?

February 28 I introduced this resolution:

Resolved, That the President of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and requested to issue a proclamation recognizing the Republic of Cuba as it exists under the constitution and form of government proclaimed at Jimaguaya, under President Cisneros, in the month of May, A. D. 1895, as a free and independent nation, and according the envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary of said Republic all the rights and privileges accorded to the envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary of the Government of Spain.

And in its support said:

The Cubans have an established republic. It may be feeble, it is true, but certainly those people are in possession of three-fourths of that island and its life is maintained by their valor.

When we declare that the Republic of Cuba is an independent and sovereign nation, it becomes such in the meaning of international law, so far as we are concerned, although its complete independence of Spain may not have been accomplished. If the conclusion reached by the Senator from Delaware and the Senator from California is to be accepted as final, there are no circumstances under which a struggling people can be recognized as independent until, unaided and alone, they are able to maintain a government independent of those against whom they are in revolt. This is not the independent government spoken of and recognized by international law.

And again:

Mr. President, I would go further in the interest of humanity than these resolutions propose to go. I would not only recognize the belligerent rights of Cuba, but I would establish her as one of the republics of this earth. If need be, I would muster every man in the United States and every war vessel necessary to the accomplishment of the task, and I would erect on the ashes and ruins of Spain's control of that island a republic modeled after the institutions of our own. Sir, I would not only do that, but, if I had it in my power, I would admit the minister of the Republic of Cuba, feeble as it may be, unimportant in the eyes of the world as it may be, to the diplomatic circles at this capital upon terms of equality with the minister from Spain.

The same day, the Senate having under consideration a concurrent resolution reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations, declaring—

That the United States of America should maintain a strict neutrality

between the contending powers, according to each all the rights of belligerents in the ports and territory of the United States.

And—

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.

I offered as a substitute the resolution I have just quoted. A motion was made by Mr. Sherman, of Ohio, to lay my amendment on the table, and in support of it a ye-and-nay vote was taken, and the amendment was defeated—yeas 52, nays 17.

March 19, 1896, in discussing the constitutional power and the duty of the Government to recognize Cuban independence, I said, in reply to the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. CAFFERY]:

The Senator from Louisiana, as I said, is talking upon a very important question. Let it be conceded that authority may be found in international law applicable to the case of a kingdom or an empire, where the power of the executive is undoubted; but has the Senator any authority applicable to a Government like ours, where the governing power rests in three coordinate departments, which would lead him to believe that this high power is exclusive in the executive department?

Again, March 20, 1896, in combating the contention of the Senator from Louisiana that the Supreme Court had jurisdiction to determine a question of belligerency, I declared:

That the power to recognize the belligerency or political independence of a people is a purely political question with which the Supreme Court has no concern.

And I held, as I now hold, that it belongs to Congress, or, possibly in some instances, to Congress and the Executive together.

Yet, again, March 23, 1896, in discussing the Cuban question somewhat at length, I said:

Certainly a state of war exists on the Island of Cuba. What is war? Mr. President, it is simply an armed conflict between nations or between parts of nations. It must be something that rises above a riot; it must be a rebellion; and so far as Cuba is concerned, it is a rebellion, with a regular military organization upon the part of the insurgents. If that is not a state of war in fact, then I am entirely mistaken in my conception of what constitutes public war.

And further along:

My understanding is that about two-thirds of the Island of Cuba, possibly three-fourths, is under the dominion of the insurgents under the command of Gomez and Maceo and their followers. There is a distinct portion of that territory that has on its face as well equipped armies as could be expected under the circumstances, where the Republic of Cuba has absolute control and dominion over life and property. That is a portion of the territory through which the Spanish forces do not march and over which they do not exercise any control. There are well-equipped and drilled armies in the field under martial law. I have the number of troops here, to which I am going to refer in a moment. If that does not constitute a state of war, according to the definition of the books—if war is to be fought according to books—then I am mistaken in my understanding of what the books define to be necessary to constitute war.

And again:

Are we to stand here until the Spaniards cut the throats of the Cubans, and until the bloody events pass into the permanent history of the country, before we take any notice of what is transpiring there? We know that a state of war exists there, and the only question, in my judgment, is whether we have the patriotism to say that those people in Cuba who are struggling for their liberty shall be recognized as belligerents and have equal opportunities with the people of Spain in this country and in the ports of this country.

Still again:

If the struggling patriots of Cuba are entitled to any recognition whatever at our hands, why not give them that kind of recognition which will be of benefit to them? Why say to the people of Cuba who are waging this war for the preservation of their political rights, for the preservation of their homes, for the preservation of their wives and children, "We sympathize with you, but we can not extend to you aid under these circumstances?"

Mr. President, it occurs to me that it would be no more cruel to place water within the sight of a dying man upon a desert and to say to him, "We sympathize with you, but we can not give you the water." If we stand here and suffer Spain to apply the knife to the throats of the Cubans, we will be justly chargeable in the eyes of the civilized world with impotency and with cowardice. Why not put these resolutions in the form of a joint resolution? Why not send them to the President of the United States and say to him, "Sign these resolutions, make them a part of the law of the country, or take the responsibility of inviting the adverse criticism of your countrymen?"

A few days ago Senators in this Chamber, to use a phrase which probably is not altogether parliamentary, were falling over one another to vote for the resolution. There was a wonderful burst of patriotism and patriotic sentiment here, among Republicans and Democrats alike—and Populists were inspired a little, too—in order to demonstrate to the world by our votes that we not only sympathized with Cuba, but that we were willing, if need be, to afford her substantial aid under these distressing circumstances.

Yet our patriotism has been sifting out from that moment to this, until it is very doubtful whether the resolutions can pass here to-day. First came the senior Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] antagonizing the resolutions, then the honorable senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR], and finally the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I guess, has concluded that it is about time for him to retreat, and we are offered the resolution now before the Senate to recommit the Cuban resolutions for further consideration. I suppose that is the end of it.

February 24, 1897, I introduced the following resolution:

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the President should speedily and effectually protect the lives and liberties of peaceable American citizens residing or sojourning in Cuba, and that he should promptly insist that Spain in her war against her colonists in the Island of Cuba should conduct the same on principles of civilized warfare, eliminating all unusual and unnecessary cruelty and barbarity; and for the enforcement of these reasonable and just requirements United States battle ships should be sent without delay to Cuban waters.

And on the succeeding day, in discussing and urging its passage, remarked:

It seems to be conclusively established that the Spanish military authorities in Cuba are gathering up the little girls in that island and selling them into a species of slavery, the worst conceivable in the human mind, selling them to lives of shame. Above that and beyond that, it seems to be conclusively established that Spanish soldiers have in one or more instances taken little infants by the heels, held them up, and hacked them to pieces with the deadly machete in the presence of the mothers and the fathers, and then have destroyed the mothers and fathers themselves.

But it does seem to me absolutely humiliating that a government of 72,000,000 people, claiming to be the most powerful government upon the face of the earth, with all the means in its hands to settle this question, will sit idly and supinely here and make no effort to protect these people, these innocent little girls and children, who are being treated with this extreme barbarity from day to day. Here is this decaying monarchy of Spain, a blot upon the map of the world, a disgrace, Mr. President, to the present civilization of Europe, a disgrace to the civilization of the Western Hemisphere; and here is Congress, with this conduct going on almost within 100 miles of our shores, and not a substantial effort is put forth to check it. Mr. President, the time will come, and come speedily, unless we take prompt action in this matter, when a man will have to hang his head in shame for being an American citizen.

Again, February 25, 1897, I said:

For the purpose of testing the question whether we shall have war or peace and whether there is any sincerity in these resolutions, I move that the Indian appropriation bill be temporarily laid aside and that the joint resolution with reference to Julio Sanguily be taken up for consideration.

May 11, 1897, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. MORGAN] having introduced a resolution declaring that a condition of public war existed in Cuba and that neutrality should be maintained, I observed:

The world knows that Spain has been guilty of atrocities that no civilized nation can sustain either directly or indirectly. The cruelties have been without a precedent in the last one hundred years of the world's existence. This Government has sent special agent after special agent to Cuba to ascertain the truth, and yet when we want information from the State Department we have to seek it as supplicants, not as Senators charged with a public duty and capable of discharging that duty. We have to appeal to the State Department or to the executive branch of the Government for information. Repeatedly the Senator from Alabama [Mr. MORGAN] has told us what the facts are, and he is a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations; and yet constantly we have this delay.

Is it possible that the United States by this indirection is willing to commit itself to the Spanish policy of atrocity and cruelty?

Is it possible that the President of the United States, or those who may represent him in this Chamber, are willing that these cruelties shall go on and that the Senate shall not voice its conviction of Spanish cruelty in Cuba? If that is the policy, Mr. President, I feel confident that the people of the United States will condemn it. If that is the policy, it is a cowardly policy for any Administration to adopt. The joint resolution ought to be adopted unanimously, without a dissenting voice.

December 8, 1897, I introduced this resolution:

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that Congress should, with all due and convenient speed, acknowledge by appropriate act the political independence of the Republic of Cuba—

And, in support of it, said:

Notwithstanding the President has urged the contrary in his message, I would not be content or satisfied with a simple acknowledgment of the belligerent rights of the people of that island, but I would demand absolute and unconditional political liberty and a recognition of the government they themselves have formed and to whose sovereignty they owe allegiance.

The American people believe in political and religious liberty, and they are anxious to accord to others what they themselves esteem the birthright of all, and I am confident they will not be content with the course advised by this, as they were not with that pursued by the preceding Administration in withholding from Cuba that priceless blessing.

And further along:

We have declared our unchangeable devotion to the doctrine that this continent shall be free soil and be trodden alone by freemen, and yet we sustain the hold of a tottering and cruel monarchy, the institutions of which are passing into decay and which is satisfied only when inflicting on a civilized people, struggling for their political independence, the most cruel torture. In His own good time, God will call us to account for such rank hypocrisy and such a flagrant neglect of public duty.

February 8, 1898, in speaking on the subject of Cuba, I remarked:

My attention has been called to the fact that since the opening of hostilities between the Republic of Cuba and the Spanish forces in that island 300,000 pacificos have died by starvation and disease generated and directly traceable to the lack of sufficient food and sanitary conditions. I had a conversation a few days ago with a gentleman who is very familiar with the island and the conditions existing there, whose word can not be doubted and whose position warrants him in speaking with authority, in which he informed me that it was the custom of the Spanish Government to herd hundreds of families together in sheds and exposed positions, without any sanitary conditions whatever, starving them until disease as a result of their starvation intervenes, and that over 300,000 of them had died in consequence of that treatment.

Mr. President, I have quoted freely from my resolutions and remarks, not to exalt myself in the eyes of anyone, but to show that in the years that have gone by I have steadfastly advocated the political independence embraced in the present discussion. I have never wavered in the belief nor lost faith in the fact that ultimately Cuba, by force of the public sentiment of this country and of the civilized world and by the gallantry of her soldiers, would win her freedom and add her name to the republics of this continent. I have at all times been convinced that sooner or later she would stand forth, perhaps weak at first, but ultimately strong, a splendid young republic added to the grand galaxy of republics of the earth. In the hour of her deepest political night, when there did not seem a ray of hope or a gleam of light, I felt

confident that in the providence of God she would wrest her liberty from Spain and proudly take her station in the ranks of self-governed peoples.

Mr. President, nations, like men, that would accomplish great results must not grow weary; they must not hesitate; they must not turn back; they must not grow faint-hearted, but persistently push on, determined to accomplish their high purpose, and bide the time when an awakened sense of right in the enlightened world will aid them.

During the years of Cuba's gallant struggle for liberty—now happily, in my judgment, almost at an end—there were those who said our Government ought to tender its good offices for autonomy under the Spanish flag, while others favored merely the recognition of belligerency; but Cuba's true friends, penetrating the cloud of darkness, foresaw the outcome of the unhappy and unfortunate condition then prevailing.

Sir, we stand to Cuba as an elder brother. We owe her a duty we can not honorably escape. To desert her at this time would be base cowardice—a cowardice the people of the United States and the men of other generations would not palliate or excuse. We are the guardians of liberty on this continent. We must do our duty without temporizing or hesitancy, not in a swaggering manner like the bravo or the bully; not in a way that will indicate we are moved by prejudice or by passion, but in a manner that will convince the world that we believe the time has come at last when every foot of American soil occupied by the hideous monarchy of Spain should be wrested from her and be henceforth dedicated to the cause of human freedom.

I will not weary the Senate with lengthy remarks. I shall not take time to define my position, for I have defined it an infinite number of times before. I stand now where I stood at the first moment the war began—in favor of prompt, unconditional recognition of the political independence of the Republic of Cuba.

Our ancestors declared to the world that all men are by nature free and equal and entitled to certain inalienable rights, among which are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. They did not confine themselves to the inhabitants of the colonies; they did not limit the declaration to the people of the Western Hemisphere; but they held that all men, under whatever sun they might be born or on whatever soil they might live, were created free and equal and entitled to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Sir, I hold human freedom and the right of self-government to be as inalienable as the right to breathe the air or to enjoy the sunlight, or any of the manifold gifts of God to his people. My right to govern myself, if capable of doing so; to believe and act as I will, not interfering with the like right of others, and to worship the Supreme Being in my own way is as inseparable from my existence as life itself. The right of self-government is God-given and inalienable, and whoever violates it flies in the face of Providence and wrests from the individual the most precious gift of all.

Mr. President, for forty years the children of Israel wandered in the wilderness, fleeing from Pharaoh and his host of persecutors and taskmasters. For forty years they sought religious and political freedom in desert wastes. They fled from the land of oppression and bondage to the land of promise that flowed with milk and honey. Their great leader, in the nobleness of his nature, could not endure to see his people in slavery, compelled to make brick without straw for the Egyptians under the lash of their cruel masters. To him was revealed the duty of leading his brethren and the hosts of Israel to the promised land. They started on a journey made memorable by Biblical record—a journey unparalleled in the history of the world.

They had no food for their sustenance, but He who sees even the sparrow's fall fed them with manna and quail from on high. Their raiment was inadequate, but He who clothes the lily of the field wonderfully preserved their garments. Their cause was right. They trusted to God, who guides the destiny of nations and of individuals, and were delivered from the land of captivity and bondage and founded a mighty nation, whose people have increased and spread throughout the earth.

Mr. President, there is a striking similitude found in the condition of the Cubans. Twice forty years they have struggled for liberty and for freedom from Spanish masters. War has been repeatedly waged, thousands of human lives have been lost. While the struggle was an unequal one, resulting in disaster to their cause, they have been inspired by an unquenchable thirst for freedom by the example we furnished them, and they have persevered until now they stand within the dawn of absolute independence under the guidance of the master hand of Maximo Gomez. Gomez will occupy a bright page in the history of his country, now being rapidly written by current events, while Weyler's page will be made infamous by murder and assassination.

Gomez, advanced in years, frail of body, but stout of heart and resolute of purpose, can justly be ranked among the great commanders and revolutionists of the century. Almost any other

man at his time of life would have sought repose rather than war, but he chose the field of glory whereon liberty is to be won or lost forever for his countrymen. He spurned bribes and offers of position at the hands of a cowardly Spanish dynasty. He is the firm and steadfast friend of his people, and has smitten the rock that will cause political freedom to gush forth and save a famishing nation.

Gomez, like his illustrious prototype, may not live to see the complete deliverance of his people from the bondage of Spain. He may be permitted to view the promised land from some mountain height and then be lost to the world forever and no man know the place of his burial, but the memory of his deeds will live fresh in the minds of the people as long as liberty has an abiding place on earth.

The life of Spain, extending over two thousand years, is written in innocent blood and is black with crime. Who can turn to the history of Cortez's conquest of Mexico from 1518 to 1521 and read of the hundreds of thousands of inoffensive men and women who were slain without turning from the appalling account sick at heart; or to Pizarro's expedition to Peru, where thousands of innocent lives were sacrificed and the Inca foully murdered after having paid over 4,600,000 ducats as the price of peace for his country; or to the account of the Duke of Alva in the Netherlands, whose crimes are so vividly portrayed by the historian Motley, without being absolutely appalled.

This savage monster first established what is known in history as the Blood Council. He destroyed all domestic judicial tribunals, and before himself and his Blood Council the innocent peasantry were brought for trial; but they were not tried. Without evidence and without hearing they were indiscriminately sent to the stake, to the rope, or to the funeral pile. The sickening account of blood and death is thus related:

Thus the whole country became a charnel house; the death bell tolled hourly in every village; not a family but was called to mourn for its dearest relatives, while the survivors stalked listlessly about, the ghosts of their former selves, among the wrecks of their former homes. The spirit of the nation, within a few months after the arrival of Alva, seemed hopelessly broken. * * * The blood of its best and bravest had already stained the scaffold; men to whom it had been accustomed to look for guidance and protection were dead, in prison, or in exile. Submission had ceased to be of any avail, flight was impossible, and the spirit of vengeance had lighted at every fireside. The mourners went daily about the streets, for there was hardly a house which had not been made desolate.

The scaffolds, the gallows, the funeral piles which had been sufficient in ordinary times, furnished now an entirely inadequate machinery for the incessant executions. Columns and stakes in every street, the doorposts of private houses, the fences in the fields, were laden with human carcasses, strangled, burned, beheaded. The orchards in the country bore on many a tree the hideous fruit of human bodies. Thus the Netherlands were crushed, and, but for the stringency of the tyranny which had now closed their gates, would have been depopulated.

Mr. President, this is a most striking and vivid parallel of the career of Weyler. That monster went to Cuba with the deliberate and premeditated purpose of depopulating it by every known process of extermination. The midnight darkness was made lurid by the torch applied to the habitations of a peaceful peasantry and the inhabitants were shot down or hacked to death by the machete in the light of the consuming flames. Those who were not engaged in the war and gave it no aid or sympathy, old men, innocent women, and sucklings, were destroyed indiscriminately.

Women were violated in the most shocking manner and destroyed, while orphaned children, as they wandered aimlessly about, were killed by an idle and reckless soldiery whose occupation is murder and whose pastime is pillage. The prison was the tomb from which none were permitted to escape alive. There was universal destruction, devastation, mourning, and ashes. Finally, being convinced that death was not speedy enough for his purpose, Weyler issued an order that all the pacificos should be concentrated at stated places, huddled together like animals, not furnished with food nor permitted to seek it for themselves, and, having no sanitary conveniences, they became the victims of certain starvation until the record of mortality, as we are informed, has reached 500,000 souls.

We have heard from the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROCTOR], from the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER], from my colleague [Mr. THURSTON], and from the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. MONEY] vivid relations of the sad story of death and devastation. In all history a more hideous and cruel character than Weyler can not be found. Cortez, Pizarro, the Duke of Alva, and Weyler will stand forth in all ages as typical Spanish soldiers, and Weyler will be regarded as the most inhuman of all. They are the butchers of the past and present age. The sea-green Robespierre in the palmiest days of the French Revolution, when heads were falling daily by the hundreds, was not more malicious or more fiendish than Weyler in Cuba, but 90 miles from our shores.

Is it to be supposed that the American people, the Christian conscience of the world, will longer submit to this wholesale murder and assassination? Weyler's rule was absolutism, tempered alone by murder and modified by assassination. The aim was

total extermination of the inhabitants of the island and a re-peopleing of that blood-soaked land by willing slaves from Spain and other servile countries.

Mr. President, I pass for a moment only to the sinking of the battle ship *Maine*. According to the recent custom of nations an armed vessel is permitted to enter the port of a friendly power and anchor at such place as may be designated by competent authority. The anchorage may be changed at the instance of the nation owning the port. It is an act of courtesy recognized by civilized governments. It can not be doubted that when an armed vessel of one nation enters the port of another and casts anchor in her waters at a place designated by her authorities there is at least an implied guaranty that the place of anchorage is reasonably safe and that no mine or outside explosive is concealed beneath the waves to send her to the bottom and the souls of her inmates to eternity.

I am not disposed to discuss the painful circumstances of the destruction of the *Maine* and the loss of life incident thereto. It is humiliating, it is mortifying, to say nothing of the inhumanity attending the act. I fully concur in the opinion that Spain must be made to atone for this wholesale murder, not by the payment of money, for she does not possess gold enough to compensate the insult offered this nation, or for one precious human life lost in the disaster of February 15. But she must compensate by freeing Cuba, by furling her dirty flag and leaving the Western Hemisphere never to return again; never, at least, while the Government of the United States exists and exercises a controlling influence in the politics of this continent.

Mr. President, I am the jingo of jingoes. From the time the war broke out between Spain and Cuba I have been the steadfast and uncompromising advocate of independence. I have never doubted that it would be won, although at times it looked dark; but that ultimately the Cubans would be able to wrest their freedom from the Spanish throne I have always thought certain, and they stand to-day in hailing distance of a new and more perfect civilization. Whatever adjustment is made of the *Maine* disaster, one thing must be definitely understood—it must not be submitted to the arbitrament of foreign powers. Spain must reckon with the American people alone.

Mr. President, possibly I would have exhibited better taste by closing my remarks in simply calling attention to the resolutions I have offered and the speeches I have made on the subject of recognizing Cuban independence, but I have thought it not out of place to take a brief general view of the Cuban situation.

I rejoice to know that the American people have become aroused to the extent that they will no longer listen to Spanish lying or give ear to Spanish threats. We are not a nation of braggarts; we do not seek war with Spain or with any other country. We will resort to arms only when our cause is just and when the enlightened judgment of the American people and of the world will approve our conduct. But, sir, because we are peace loving it must not be thought we are unmindful of the duties imposed on us or that our people are lacking in spirit. We at all times seek peace rather than war, but not that kind of peace that is to be purchased at any price, nor peace with Cuba in chains. In the language of the English ballad—

We don't want to fight, but, by jingo, if we do,
We've got the ships, we've got the men, we've got the money, too.

If Spain will hunt down and execute the deadly assassin who, under cover of darkness, sunk the battle ship *Maine* and sent, without warning, 266 souls into the presence of their Maker; if she will relinquish her occupancy of Cuba, take down her flag from this continent—a flag whose only claim to public attention is that it is stained with twenty centuries of innocent blood, cruelty, and crime—and leave American soil forever, we will be content. We have no greed for Spanish territory nor for Spanish gold. Our policy is that of a contented, domestic people. We do not want Cuba. We do not even desire to be her guardian. But we are determined she shall be free and that for all time we will be rid of the close proximity of a nation whose chief occupation is the shedding of innocent blood.

The torch that has lighted Cuba so long must be extinguished, the shrieks of dying women and children must be hushed, broken hearts must be bound up, wounds be healed, the prison pens be opened, and the people made free. Cuba, now draped in mourning, must once more become the gem of the Caribbean Sea, and when all these shall have been accomplished, speedily, let us hope, the American people can well afford to announce to the world that their account with the Spanish Kingdom is forever closed.

Sir, if I could have my own way, I would promptly recall our minister from Madrid and give Spain's minister at Washington his passport. I would close forever the political, financial, and commercial relations of the two nations, and not again permit an armed Spaniard to set foot on American soil.

Mr. President, it is well known that I am thoroughly and unalterably opposed to the President in most of his policies. It

would be impossible for us to be brought together unless he should cease to be a Republican and become a Populist, a thing he probably will not do. I have no faith that our country can ever become permanently prosperous by an application of the domestic policies he would enforce.

But in this time of great national anxiety, when there is an impending cloud of war, as one of the Senators of one of the greatest and best States of the Union, I am willing to give him my support and encouragement and aid him in the solution of this troublesome question. In the presence of the grave circumstances now confronting the American people all mere party differences must for the time be laid aside, and all American citizens, regardless of political affiliation, stand together for the honor and glory of their country.

Sir, in all I have said in behalf of Cuban independence in the years gone by, from the time the subject first came to the notice of Congress to this moment, my conscience has been my sole guide. It has been—

A lamp unto my feet and a light unto my path.

I have said for the Cubans what I would say for any other nation under like circumstances, and what I would want them to say for my country if positions were changed.

Mr. President, I believe Cuba is free. I believe but a few more days and we will witness the flag of the new Republic, consecrated by thousands of human lives, by so much blood, by the tears and groans of her people, the wailing of her womanhood and the sacrifice of her childhood, waving in triumph from Pinar del Rio to Santiago de Cuba. Then we will be able to exclaim, as did one of our old:

The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he hath anointed me to preach the gospel to the poor; he hath sent me to heal the broken hearted, to preach deliverance to the captives, and recovering of sight to the blind, to set at liberty them that are bruised, to preach the acceptable year of the Lord.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, the resolution now before the Senate was reported yesterday by the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. FRYE] from the Committee on Foreign Relations. It requests the President—

If not incompatible with the public interest, to transmit to the Senate all of the consular correspondence relating to the conduct of the war in the Island of Cuba, the condition of the people, and other matters relating thereto.

The Senator from Maine twice stated in connection with the resolution yesterday that he should to-day ask for its consideration. The Senator now asks that the resolution may lie on the table, not to be called up without the consent of the Committee on Foreign Relations, and that request being objected to, he asks that it may be recommitted to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

This action indicates doubt and indecision on the part of the Committee on Foreign Relations, perhaps proper under existing circumstances. Yesterday they thought there ought to be a new call made upon the President of the United States for information as to the condition of the Cuban population. To-day they think the call ought to be delayed.

Mr. President, the first call made upon the President for information as to the condition of the suffering Cubans brought about by the Cuban war was adopted by the Senate on motion of the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. MORGAN] on the 14th day of February. The first clause of the resolution then agreed to unanimously by the Senate requested the President—

If in his opinion it is not incompatible with the public service, to send to the Senate copies of the reports of the consul-general and of the consuls of the United States in Cuba written or received since March 4, 1897, which relate to the state of the war in that island and the condition of the people there, or that he will send such parts of said reports as will inform the Senate as to these facts.

On the same day, the 14th of February, a resolution was reported from the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, calling for the same information on that day asked for by the Senate. The House request was stated in detail and asked for full information on all points in relation to the condition of the Cubans in the Island of Cuba in connection with the pending war.

Mr. President, on the next day, February 15, at 9.40 o'clock in the evening, an answer to those resolutions came from Spain, but to this hour no answer has been received from the President of the United States. I am not unaware that there may be reasons why this information should be withheld. I am bound to presume that there are such reasons from the fact that from the 14th day of February until this moment we have had from the Executive no statement of the knowledge possessed by him as to the condition of the people of Cuba derived from the reports of Consul-General Lee and the other consuls on the island.

But the Senate and the country are not without some information as to the condition of the Cuban people. Such information was needed by the Senate and the country in order to determine what action, if any, should be taken by the United States in connection with the war in Cuba, and it has been furnished to us by four members of this body who have seen with their own eyes, who have heard with their own ears, and who have testified to us what they know on this subject; and whatever criticisms may be

made concerning the visit of any of those Senators to the Island of Cuba, I take occasion to say that the four Senators have rendered the greatest possible service they could render at this time to their own country, to the world, and to suffering humanity.

Mr. President, if there is any reason why the country should not know whether or not the official reports of Consul-General Lee and the United States consuls in Cuba confirm or refute the stories which have been told to us by our associates, I should be glad to be so informed. I do not myself believe there is a sufficient reason for withholding the reports of the consuls. I am impressed with the idea that the reports might have been sent in immediately after the calls were made upon the 14th of February, and I certainly think that upon the 16th day of February, after the news had come to the people of the United States of the destruction of the *Maine*, the Congress and the people of the United States ought to have been told what the testimony was on file in the State Department concerning the condition of the oppressed Cuban population.

But, Mr. President, I am not disposed to enlarge upon this subject. I have the fullest confidence in the Committee on Foreign Relations. I have confidence that the President of the United States intends to pursue a patriotic and righteous course in the pending crisis; and I shall thank God when he announces his conclusion concerning the present emergency. [Applause in the galleries.]

The VICE-PRESIDENT rapped with his gavel.

Mr. CHANDLER. Therefore I am not in rebellion as yet against the powers that be. I wait upon the President of the United States; I wait upon the Committee on Foreign Relations; but I do feel that as that committee yesterday deemed it advisable that this second call should be made upon the President for information and now have reached the conclusion that the second call should not be made, the Senator from Maine ought to give us some reason for their delay.

Mr. FRYE. Mr. President, the confidence which the Senator from New Hampshire expresses in the Committee on Foreign Relations renders any reply to his remarks unnecessary. The committee are acting advisedly in asking that this resolution may, for the present, lie over.

Mr. GRAY. We will try to be worthy of that confidence.

Mr. FRYE. And, as the Senator from Delaware says, we will try to entitle ourselves to the confidence which the Senator from New Hampshire reposes in us.

Mr. CHANDLER. Individually the two Senators before me have always had my confidence. Collectively, sometimes I think they are wrong and make mistakes.

Mr. FRYE. The committee has been made aware of that fact on several occasions.

Mr. CHANDLER. Undoubtedly, I shall always commend the two Senators when they are doing right and admonish them when I think they are doing wrong. I wish to be informed what is the present request of the Senator from Maine concerning his resolution.

Mr. FRYE. I made a motion to recommit.

Mr. CHANDLER. I shall not object to the control by the committee of their own resolution. They may start and back and start and back and start again, and I will help them whenever I can. I do not object if I may be allowed to offer a resolution myself and have it go over until to-morrow.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Maine to recommit the resolution to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. CHANDLER. I present a resolution which I ask may be read and lie over.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the President be requested, if it is not incompatible with the public service, to send to the Senate the copies of the reports of the consul-general and of the consuls of the United States in Cuba referred to in the resolution of the Senate adopted on February 14, 1898.

Mr. FRYE. I give notice to the Senator from New Hampshire that to-morrow when the resolution is called up, I shall move its reference to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. CHANDLER. I am very much obliged to the Senator from Maine for the information.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution will lie over.

SUNDBY CIVIL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. ALLISON. I ask the Senate to take up the bill (H. R. 8428) making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1899, and for other purposes.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I shall not object to the request of the Senator from Iowa, knowing that if he chose to move to take up the bill, it would undoubtedly be carried in the Senate;

but I wish to call the attention of the Senator to the fact that the quarantine bill—a very important measure—is before the Senate, and I suggested yesterday that I desired to address the Senate on it to-day. I am quite content to have it go over for a few days, if necessary, or for a day or two, until the appropriation bill is out of the way; but I wish to say in the absence of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST], who has charge of the so-called quarantine bill, that the other members of the committee are very anxious to have it pressed to a vote, so that the country may know whether or not we are to have legislation on this important measure.

Mr. ALLISON. I was not aware of the notice given by the Senator from New Hampshire. I take it for granted he will yield for an appropriation bill at any time.

Mr. GALLINGER. Certainly.

Mr. ALLISON. Therefore I hope there will be no objection to taking up the bill.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Iowa asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the sundry civil appropriation bill. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

UNCOMPAGRE INDIAN RESERVATION.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I ask the Senator from Iowa to yield to me for the present consideration of the joint resolution (H. Res. 199) to postpone the opening of the Uncompahgre Indian Reservation, in the State of Utah.

Mr. ALLISON. I yield.

Mr. PETTIGREW. It was up yesterday and was objected to. I understand there will be no objection to it at the present time.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from South Dakota asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the joint resolution indicated by him. Is there objection?

Mr. COCKRELL. I call the attention of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. JONES] to the request.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Has the joint resolution been modified to meet the views of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON]?

Mr. NELSON. I have withdrawn objection to the consideration of the joint resolution, but in my opinion the changes which I suggested to the Senator from Arkansas ought to be made. They are not consented to, however. I think the effect of the Senate amendment will be to open all gilsonite lands outside of those surveyed to anybody who sees fit to take them; and that will be contrary to the spirit of the law. I think the words "known to contain" ought not to be in the Senate amendment, but I shall not take the responsibility of objecting to the measure, inasmuch as it is claimed to be important that it should pass. But in my opinion those words in the joint resolution will lead to this condition, that all gilsonite lands outside of the little which has been surveyed will be secured, and it will ultimately lead to a scandal.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I agree with the Senator from Minnesota that the term "known to contain" ought to be stricken out. I do not believe it is proper and right. Before objecting, I ask the attention of the Senator from South Dakota and the Senator from Utah, who I understand are taking some interest in the matter, to this expression:

That all lands within said reservation other than agricultural land and lands known to contain asphaltum.

There is no reason why lands containing asphaltum, whether it is known at the present time or not, should not be excepted from the operation of the measure. Any lands containing asphaltum ought to be excepted from the bill, and it ought to be made clear. I suggest to the Senators that the words "known to contain" ought to be stricken out; so as to read:

That all lands within said reservation other than agricultural land and lands containing asphaltum, etc.

I suggest the omission of those words and changing the word "contain" to "containing."

Mr. PETTIGREW. I will say to the Senator from Arkansas that the amendment is not mine. However, I believe that in the form in which I have presented the joint resolution it is entirely proper and that it protects the interests of the people of the United States. A large body of land containing gilsonite was discovered within this reservation. We sent the Geological Survey there, which investigated it and mapped it. It is supposed they have found and mapped all there is. Now, I can see no reason why, when we have reserved that which is already known, the other portion of this reservation shall not be opened to American enterprise.

The joint resolution opens it to the explorer to find a gold mine, and if he finds it his title is secure under the laws of the United States. If he finds gilsonite or elaterite or kindred substances through his energy and enterprise, why should that land be reserved, when a gold mine, if he should find one, even if it contained untold millions, would be accorded to him at once? It is a

reward for enterprise and discovery that induces the miner to go into that region, and if he finds beds of gilsonite not now discovered there is no reason under heaven why he should not have the same right to enter those under the mineral laws as to enter gold mines.

However, so far as I am personally concerned, I have no objection to the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas, but the Senators from Utah object, and if we are to get this measure through, it must be by unanimous consent; for by to-morrow this country will be open to settlement, agricultural and mineral lands as well.

Mr. NELSON. The gilsonite lands will not be open to settlement.

Mr. RAWLINS. Mr. President, the proposed amendment to the joint resolution as it passed the House was so framed as to be satisfactory to the representatives of the views entertained by some Senators, and it seems to me there is no reasonable objection to the words which are sought to be stricken out.

Mr. President, as already stated by the Senator from South Dakota, these lands in the Uncompahgre Indian Reservation have been subjected to a careful examination under the Geological Bureau, and all the lands supposed to contain asphaltum or gilsonite have been investigated, and a report as to those lands has been made by the Department. If there are any lands containing asphaltum outside of the pieces thus designated and described, they are unknown. It is the purpose of the joint resolution to throw open to entry on and after the 1st of April of this year all lands within that reservation excepting agricultural lands, and it is the design to give six months additional time to the Department to allot those lands to the Indians and to except lands known to contain asphaltum and gilsonite.

I am unwilling that the word "known" shall be stricken from the joint resolution for this reason: That is a desolate country. The poor prospector will go out when these lands are thrown open to prospect and enter under the mineral-land laws of the United States, and he may locate his mining claim 1,500 feet long and 600 feet wide; he may spend one, two, three years, or any other number of years and all the money he has in the development of his claim; and if in the course of that development work he should strike a vein of elaterite or gilsonite or asphaltum, I think he is entitled to it.

It is the rule which now prevails. For instance, if a man enters agricultural land and obtains title to it, mineral being unknown to exist in the land, and he should subsequently discover any valuable mineral upon the land, he is entitled to it. If a man locates a mining claim for lead, supposing it to contain lead, and it subsequently develops that it contains some other valuable mineral, he is entitled to it. I am unwilling to cloud the title of every man who goes into that desolate country and endures the hardships which he necessarily is compelled to endure in locating and developing a claim, as we would do, because, if the contention of the Senator from Minnesota and the Senator from Arkansas is correct, if he should locate land and subsequently obtain title to it and thereafter it should be discovered that there was some asphaltum or gilsonite or elaterite on the land, his title would be destroyed.

Again, there is no reason why this word should be stricken out, because the sole object of the reservation of these asphaltum lands from entry under the mineral-land laws, as I understand it, is that this mineral is known and located, and a man going in there and locating it would not have to run any risks in respect to its discovery. Therefore it is sought to reserve these lands in order to dispose of them by some other method. If the Senator from Arkansas is unwilling to let this measure pass as it is proposed, I shall be compelled to object to its consideration.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I believe it is very important that the time for opening this land shall be extended, and I am very anxious to comply with the request of the Interior Department to do it, but if the Senator from Utah is inclined to say that that can only be done on the condition that he shall be allowed to change the laws now applying to gilsonite lands, I say at once it can not be done.

Mr. STEWART. What is the amendment pending?

Mr. RAWLINS. The question is as to the consideration of the joint resolution, and I object.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. There was a request for unanimous consent, which has not been granted. The discussion has been proceeding by unanimous consent.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Unanimous consent has not been given. The amendment was proposed without unanimous consent having been formally given.

Mr. NELSON. I desire to say to the Senator from Arkansas that he is absolutely correct; that if the amendment is adopted it will change the existing law in respect to the disposal of gilsonite lands.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. There can be no question about it.

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

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I object.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Objection is made.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I am perfectly willing to allow the joint resolution to pass as it comes from the House. I have no objection to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Utah if he will allow the land laws as applied to gilsonite lands to remain as they are; but if the measure as it comes from the other House can not be allowed to pass without a material change in the law in regard to gilsonite lands, I shall object to the present consideration of the joint resolution.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Objection is made.

PRESIDENTIAL APPROVALS.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. O. L. PRUDEN, one of his secretaries, announced that the President had on this day approved and signed the following acts:

An act (S. 179) granting a pension to Mary F. Hawley;

An act (S. 294) granting increase of pension to John J. Boatwright;

An act (S. 1111) granting an increase of pension to Joseph V. Bowie;

An act (S. 1200) granting a pension to Miss Mary Hayne;

An act (S. 1465) granting an increase of pension to Daniel Phillips;

An act (S. 3179) granting a pension to Bethiah H. Rollins; and

An act (S. 3373) to authorize the relocation and rebuilding of a pontoon bridge across the Mississippi River at Prairie du Chien, Wis.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 4936) for the allowance of certain claims for stores and supplies reported by the Court of Claims under the provisions of the act approved March 3, 1883, and commonly known as the Bowman Act, and for other purposes; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. ALLISON. I ask that the sundry civil appropriation bill be now proceeded with.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 8428) making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1899, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. ALLISON. I ask unanimous consent that in the consideration of the bill the formal reading be dispensed with and that the bill be read for action upon the amendments, the amendments of the committee to be first considered.

Mr. NELSON. I want to reserve all points of order in connection with the bill. By waiving the formal reading I do not want to waive any point of order.

Mr. ALLISON. I will say to the Senator from Minnesota that he will have an opportunity to make any points upon any items in the bill.

Mr. NELSON. Very well. That is all.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PERKINS in the chair). If there be no objection, the course suggested by the Senator from Iowa will be pursued.

The Secretary proceeded to read the bill. The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the head of "Under the Treasury Department," on page 2, after line 9, to insert:

For completion of construction of a one-story annex building to the temporary post-office building at Chicago, Ill., \$20,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, after line 21, to insert:

Old post-office building, Detroit, Mich.: That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby directed to disregard sections 2 and 3 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Detroit, Mich.," approved March 2, 1885, authorizing the sale of the old post-office building located in the city of Detroit, Mich., and is hereby authorized to transfer from the appropriations heretofore made for the construction of a new public building in said city such sum as may be necessary to remodel said old post-office building and put the same in suitable repair for the use and accommodation of the Government departments at said city of Detroit, Mich.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ALLISON. At the request of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. FAIRBANKS], the chairman of the Committee on Immigration, I ask that the amendments relating to immigrant buildings at Ellis Island may be passed over for the present, so that lines 10 to 19, inclusive, shall be open—all that deals with the subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments indicated by the Senator from Iowa will be passed over for the present, if there be no objection.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 3, after line 19, to insert:

For post-office and custom-house at Jacksonville, Fla.: For outbuilding for toilet-room purposes, \$2,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, after line 9, to insert:

For mint building at San Francisco, Cal.: For necessary repairs, \$45,000, to be immediately available.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, after line 12, to insert:

For post-office at Annapolis, Md.: To enable the Secretary of the Treasury to select, designate, and procure, by purchase or otherwise, a suitable site, and to commence the construction of a fireproof post-office building thereon, in the city of Annapolis, Md., said site to contain at least 16,000 square feet of ground, and to leave an open space around the building to be erected thereon, including streets and alleys, of 40 feet, \$120,000.

The amendment was agreed to,

The next amendment was, on page 4, after line 21, to insert:

Purchase of old Globe Building: To enable the Secretary of the Treasury to purchase the following real estate in the city of Washington, D. C., with the improvements thereon, known and designated as original lots No. 14 and 15, and part of original lot No. 16, in reservation No. 10, beginning, for said part of lot 16, 70 feet 2 inches northwardly from Pennsylvania avenue and running back with the full width of the lot to the public alley in the rear thereof, and containing 11,146 square feet, being the property of Edward H. Thomas, trustee, \$45,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, against that amendment I make the point of order that it is not a proper amendment under the first subdivision and the third subdivision of Rule XVI. It is entirely a new appropriation, and is not in pursuance of any existing law. The amendment provides for the purchase of an old, dilapidated building along the Avenue that was on the market when I came to Washington first, in 1883. I noticed in the newspapers a short time ago that a real estate man by the name of Warner has now got control of the property. I see the amendment says it belongs to Thomas, trustee. Why the Government should buy that old, dilapidated building at \$45,000 I do not know. I make the point of order that the amendment is contrary to the provisions of Rule XVI of the Senate rules.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota makes a point of order against the amendment under Rule XVI.

Mr. COCKRELL. I wish to state that it does not seem pertinent for any point of order to lie against any action which the Senate and the House may desire for their own convenience and for the management of their own business. The amendment provides for the purchase of the building for the benefit of the Senate and the House, and it is certainly no ordinary legislation, such as is contemplated by the rule.

Mr. NELSON. Nothing of the kind appears on the face of the amendment, and that can be urged in reference to any item of appropriation. It is an entirely new appropriation; it is not in pursuance of any existing law, and I am surprised to find it in this appropriation bill. When we who are not fortunate enough to be on the Appropriations Committee have any matters to bring before that committee, when we desire to have any appropriations put on, we are met with a most solemn countenance and told, "You can not put this on; it is contrary to the rules; it is new legislation; it is an increase of the appropriation."

I think when the members of the Appropriations Committee apply these rigid rules to us, they ought at least to apply the same rules to themselves. Here is an old piece of dilapidated property that has been on the market here for a generation, down on the Avenue, and now it is proposed in these times, when the Government is economizing in all directions and getting ready for war, you might say, to buy the old lumbering building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will direct the Secretary to read for the information of the Senate the clauses of the rule bearing on the point of order raised by the Senator from Minnesota.

The Secretary read as follows:

RULE XVI.

AMENDMENTS TO APPROPRIATION BILLS.

1. All general appropriation bills shall be referred to the Committee on Appropriations, except bills making appropriations for rivers and harbors, which shall be referred to the Committee on Commerce; and no amendments shall be received to any general appropriation bill the effect of which will be to increase an appropriation already contained in the bill, or to add a new item of appropriation, unless it be made to carry out the provisions of some existing law, or treaty stipulation, or act, or resolution previously passed by the Senate during that session; or unless the same be moved by direction of a standing or select committee of the Senate, or proposed in pursuance of an estimate of the head of some one of the Departments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order made—

Mr. COCKRELL. One moment, Mr. President. Let me state the case. This amendment was referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds and favorably reported by that committee. It is clearly within the purview of the rule.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair was about to so state.

The present occupant of the chair, occupying it by courtesy, thinks the question should be delegated to the Senate to pass upon. Therefore those who are in favor of sustaining the point of order made by the Senator from Minnesota will please signify the same by saying "aye;" contrary minded, "no." [Putting the question.] The "noes" appear to have it.

Mr. NELSON. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. STEWART. Before the vote is taken, I should like to inquire whether the amendment reported by the Committee on Appropriations was recommended by any committee or how it got on the bill. What is its status? Was it recommended by a standing or a select committee?

Mr. ALLISON. The amendment was introduced by some Senator—I do not remember who introduced it—and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. That committee reported favorably upon it and it was sent to the Committee on Appropriations under the rule. The Committee on Appropriations made an investigation, such an investigation as they could, respecting it, and thought it would be a wise thing to purchase the building, to be used by the two Houses for storage purposes in lieu of rented buildings now occupied by the two Houses costing \$3,600 per annum. I have no care about the amendment, but I do not think that it is in any sense liable to a point of order. If we can not rent a building or buy one for our own immediate purposes, I do not see how we can get on. The Committee on Appropriations, as far as I know, have no special desire about the amendment one way or the other.

Mr. SPOONER. I should like to have the Senator from Minnesota restate his point of order.

Mr. NELSON. I will state my point of order succinctly. This is a new item of appropriation put in the bill, and it is not in pursuance of any existing law or treaty stipulation.

No amendments shall be received to any general appropriation bill the effect of which will be to increase an appropriation already contained in the bill or to add a new item of appropriation, unless it be made to carry out the provisions of some existing law or treaty stipulation.

Now, this is a new item of appropriation, and it is not made—

Mr. SPOONER. I had always supposed that rule applied to amendments offered on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. NELSON. It applies to all amendments.

Mr. SPOONER. I supposed it applied to amendments offered after the bill was reported.

Mr. BERRY. The Senator from Minnesota did not read all of the rule. The rule says:

Or unless the same be moved by direction of a standing or select committee of the Senate.

Mr. NELSON. That is another requisite. Those are both conditions. First, it must be recommended by a committee; and then it must be in pursuance of existing law. We are always met with that by the Appropriations Committee when we seek to get appropriations made; that the amendment is not in pursuance of existing law. We frequently get amendments recommended by other committees. In my experience I have had amendments referred to that committee recommended by other committees, and yet I have been politely told (and I do not find any fault with it) that it is not in pursuance of existing law; that it is new legislation.

A rule that is applied with such rigidity to us, the Committee on Appropriations ought to apply to themselves. The only excuse is that they want the old Globe Building, that has been an eyesore here on Pennsylvania avenue for years, as a sort of lumbering storeroom, and especially now, when we are getting the new Post-Office building ready and will have ample room. The idea of buying an old closet to store the odds and ends of creation on Pennsylvania avenue at this time for \$45,000 seems to me supremely out of place. For that reason I object to the amendment both on its merits and as being, under the rules of the Senate, subject to a point of order.

Mr. WOLCOTT. This is an important matter, Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The roll will be called by the Secretary.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aldrich,	Faulkner,	Mallory,	Shoup,
Allen,	Gallinger,	Martin,	Smith,
Allison,	Gear,	Mitchell,	Spooner,
Bacon,	Gorman,	Money,	Stewart,
Bate,	Hale,	Morrill,	Teller,
Berry,	Hanna,	Murphy,	Thurston,
Butler,	Hansbrough,	Nelson,	Tillman,
Cannon,	Harris,	Pasco,	Turley,
Carter,	Hawley,	Penrose,	Turner,
Chandler,	Hoar,	Perkins,	Walthall,
Chilton,	Jones, Ark.	Pettus,	Wetmore,
Clay,	Jones, Nev.	Platt, Conn.	Wilson,
Cockrell,	Lodge,	Platt, N. Y.	Wolcott.
Deboe,	McBride,	Pritchard,	
Elkins,	McEnery,	Rawlins,	
Fairbanks,	McMillan,	Sewell,	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-one Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. CHILTON. Mr. President, the point of order made by the Senator from Minnesota, it seems to me, is clearly untenable. While I sympathize in a general way with the object of the Senator, yet it will be impossible to reach the item except by a vote. The rule referred to provides that—

All general appropriation bills shall be referred to the Committee on Appropriations, except bills making appropriations for rivers and harbors, which shall be referred to the Committee on Commerce; and no amendments shall be received to any general appropriation bill the effect of which will be to increase an appropriation already contained in the bill, or to add a new item of appropriation—

That is this case—

unless it be made to carry out the provisions of some existing law, or treaty stipulation, or act, or resolution previously passed by the Senate during that session; or—

Not "and" but "or"—

or unless the same be moved by direction of a standing or select committee of the Senate, or proposed in pursuance of an estimate of the head of some one of the Departments.

Now, if either of those alternatives be met, the item of appropriation is in order in the shape of an amendment to a general appropriation bill. A distinction must be drawn between new items of appropriation and items of general legislation which would be governed by the third clause of this rule. If it were general legislation proposed in the shape of an amendment to an appropriation bill, then the fact that it was reported by some standing or select committee of the Senate would not relieve it from the point of order. A distinction must also be drawn between a new item of appropriation such as this and an item of appropriation in payment of a private claim.

If this were an amendment to pay a private claim, then it would fall under section 4 of the rule and would be subject to the point of order, unless it was to carry out the provision of an existing law or a treaty stipulation. But, sir, being a new item of appropriation it is clearly in order if either state of case which I have described be met; that is, it may be proposed either under the estimate of a Department, under a law or a treaty, under an act or resolution of the Senate passed at the same session, or moved by a standing or select committee of this body.

Mr. COCKRELL. This amendment was recommended by a committee.

Mr. CHILTON. It has been so stated, and hence the point of order can not be sustained.

Mr. NELSON. To save time, and probably it will amount to the same thing, I will withdraw the point of order and ask for a yea-and-nay vote on the amendment.

Mr. STEWART. Before the vote is taken, I should like to make some inquiry in regard to the pending amendment and the one that follows it. I do not know so much about the value of the old Globe Building. The size of the lot and the frontage on the Avenue are not given. The description of it is very incomplete, and there is no statement that will enable the Senate to make a fair estimate of its value and no statement showing the necessity for it. The next amendment, which is connected with the one pending, is to me very objectionable. It proposes to purchase the Union Building:

Purchase of Union Building: To enable the Secretary of the Treasury to purchase lots B and C, 3 and 4, in square No. 454, situated on the north side of G street between Sixth and Seventh streets, in the city of Washington, D. C., and improved by a building known as the Union Building, \$650,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary.

I know something about that building, having stabled my horses near that location while it was being constructed, and I know it is a very roughly constructed building, a cheap building, and not such a building as the Government of the United States wants for any purpose.

If we want a building, we ought to have one properly constructed, which will be suitable for the purposes designed. The building referred to is not a proper Government building by any means, and I think the price is excessive. I do not believe it could be sold in the market for \$300,000, or anything like that sum.

As to the Globe Building, there is not a sufficient description given of it in the bill so as to enable us to know what is its frontage, and I am not familiar enough with it to form a correct estimate of its value. It seems to me before we buy that building we ought to have a report giving its dimensions, its height, etc., an estimate of the value of the improvements on the land, and also some statement as to the necessity for the Government owning it.

It seems to me both of these amendments ought to go out of the bill, and I shall vote against them. I am glad, however, that my friend from Minnesota has withdrawn his point of order, for that was not well taken; but as to the merits of the amendment, I am not sufficiently familiar with either one of the appropriations to vote for them.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, the amendment, as I understand it, is now before the Senate on its merits. What is the amendment? Down on the north side of Pennsylvania avenue, between here and the National Hotel, is an old, rickety building. Once on a time, before the Government itself assumed the publication of the proceedings of the two Houses of Congress, the proceedings were published there by a private company. That was when the proceedings of Congress were published in what was known as the Congressional Globe. That company occupied that building and published the proceedings of Congress as a private enterprise. Years ago Congress decided to publish its own debates in its own Printing Office, and inaugurated the publication of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Since that time the old Globe Building has been practically vacant and abandoned, and it stands there to-day an old, dilapidated wreck of a building.

As to the piece of land there, we have many places in Washington where there are more desirable and better pieces of land for the Government to occupy, land that is more likely to rise in value, and land that occupies a far better location than that. Such being the case, what is the use, what object can there be, in buying an old, rattletrap of a building down there, for the purpose of what? Of storing certain records.

Mr. President, if we need a place to store any of the records of Congress, if we need a public storehouse, there is a straight, legitimate way of getting at it. We do not want to buy a building that is good for nothing, that is a mere wreck, that is almost tenantless, and that you could not rent to-day for the taxes—we do not want to buy such a building and load up the Government with it. That is not the way, to my mind, to run the Government business.

I therefore trust, whatever else is done, that this item in the appropriation bill will be stricken out. I am sorry that I am compelled to object to the amendment. It may seem ungracious for an ordinary, plain member like myself to object to anything proposed by the Committee on Appropriations, but, in the language of the good old Methodist hymn, I can say,

Just as I am, O Lord, I come.

I am so built that when I see anything that is not just and fair, no matter if it comes from the Angel Gabriel, I can not help it, I have got to object. [Laughter.]

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I occupied a little time this morning in looking over the sundry civil appropriation bill as it came from the Committee on Appropriations, and I confess that these two items were the ones which caused me to wonder more than all the rest of the bill as to whether or not the committee had really acted wisely.

I can not see for the life of me any more than can the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON] what we want with the old Globe Building. I chance to know another party who a few months ago bargained for it, at least temporarily bargained for it, no money having been passed, but upon an examination of the building, that gentleman said to me, it was in such a dilapidated state that it was not fit for his purposes, and he did not think it was fit for any purpose. Why the Government wants to buy that old building on Pennsylvania avenue surpasses my comprehension. I trust the Senate will not agree to the recommendation of the Committee on Appropriations.

I am aware of the fact that Pennsylvania avenue ought to be improved. If we would follow the example set by Napoleon, and buy the entire property from Sixth street to the Peace Monument, tear down those buildings, and erect on the ground modern buildings, there would be wisdom in it; but to purchase for the use of the Government an old building in the midst of that conglomeration of architecture, when it is about ready to tumble down, is, to my mind, a procedure that we ought not to consent to.

Mr. President, while I am on my feet, I think that the next item is equally as objectionable. I think I am correct in saying that the so-called Union Building is the building that is now occupied by the city post-office. Am I correct in that, I will ask the chairman of the committee?

Mr. ALLISON. The first two floors of that building are occupied by the city post-office, the next two floors by the Interior Department, and the next two floors by the Public Printer, and from there are distributed all the documents that Senators and Representatives send out. We are paying for this building \$47,000 rent per annum.

Mr. GALLINGER. That is about what I understood the building was used for. A very considerable portion of it is used for the city post-office, but the city post-office is soon to be moved to the building which the Government has erected on Pennsylvania avenue at a very large cost; and I do not wonder when the owners of the Union Building lose as good a tenant as the United States Government for a considerable part of that building that they want to sell it to somebody.

Mr. ALLISON. Will the Senator allow me to make a statement in respect to that?

Mr. GALLINGER. Certainly.

Mr. ALLISON. For the portion of the building occupied by the city post-office the Government pays \$20,000 a year rent, and for the remainder of the building, occupied by other branches of the Government, there is paid \$27,000 rent.

Mr. GALLINGER. So it is \$47,000.

I was about to observe, further, that I notice in this bill a provision for the purchase of land for the Government Printing Office, which I think is a very judicious thing to be done—land adjacent to the present structure—something that I have always advocated, while other Senators have taken the view that we ought to purchase land in some other part of the city and erect a new Government Printing Office. If the proposition of the Committee on Appropriations to purchase that additional land for the Government Printing Office shall meet with the concurrence of Congress, then the third story of the Union Building probably will be for rent, because the Government Printing Office occupies it, and it will have additional room in the new building to be constructed and very likely will not require the third story of that building. Again, I do not wonder that the owners of that building want to sell it to somebody, and there is never so good a customer as the Government of the United States.

In addition to that, as suggested by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PLATT], there is going to be a great deal of additional or waste room, as we might call it, in the new Government Post-Office building into which the Government can move some of the bureaus, for the rooms occupied by which the Government is now paying rent.

Mr. CHANDLER. May I ask my colleague what it is proposed to do with the present Post-Office Department building after the Department moves into the new building on Pennsylvania avenue, leaving the whole of the present Post-Office Department building subject to Government use? Will not that be the case?

Mr. GALLINGER. I should judge that that will be the case, but I have no information as to what is to be done with that building.

In reference to these two proposed amendments, however, I have only to repeat that I am clearly of the opinion that no discreet business man, acting for himself, would invest any money in the old Globe Building, so far as the building is concerned. Whether the land, situated, as it is there, in not a very desirable part of the city, is worth \$4 a foot or not I am not prepared to say; but I think if the Government is going to purchase land on which to erect a building, it should not go on that part of Pennsylvania avenue for that purpose.

Regarding the building, I have expressed myself very clearly. I do not know anything about its construction. The Senator from Nevada [Mr. STEWART] says it is a very cheaply constructed building, which I think is probably the fact from its appearance.

I shall vote against both these amendments, and I intended to do so when I read the bill. I hope the majority of the Senate will vote against them. If the Government is to expend money for further buildings, I trust the Government may purchase land in some desirable position of the city and erect a building, as the Government always erects buildings, of a first-class character.

Mr. PASCO. Mr. President, I was not in the Chamber at the time when the amendment was first discussed, and I have not heard the reasons why the two pieces of property referred to should be purchased. It may be that there are some important reasons why they should come into the possession of the Government by purchase; but it seems to me that unless there is some purpose to which this property can be immediately dedicated and for which it can be used the expenditure at the present time is unnecessary.

I also think when property is to be used by the Government that property in the middle of a block should not be taken; that it should be segregated as far as possible. The buildings which the Government uses for any purpose should be on land apart from other buildings, so that they may aid in decorating, adorning, and beautifying the city.

The amount of these two appropriations is about \$700,000, and I think some very strong reasons should be urged if this large outlay is to be made. The building on Pennsylvania avenue certainly is not a desirable one, and I do not see any possible use to which it can be put except the storage of documents. The sum proposed to be appropriated is a very large amount of money to pay for an old building for such a purpose. I would rather have some larger accommodations provided near the present Printing Office, or in some other suitable place, where unused public documents can be stored.

The amount of \$650,000 for the purchase of the Union Building, just as the Government is about to vacate a large portion of it and carry its post-office into another part of the city, seems to me to be altogether unnecessary. I think we ought to hear more as to the necessity for the expenditure before the Senate adopts these amendments.

Mr. COCKRELL. Mr. President, in regard to the first item here, as to the Globe Building, an amendment was offered to the bill, referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, investigated by that committee, and reported favorably. When the matter came before the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, we had the Acting Architect of the Capitol, Mr. Woods, whom we all know is acting as Architect, who is a man of decided ability and character, to go and examine the building and make a report to us, and also to examine the Union Building and make a report upon that. His report was that at an expenditure of anywhere from \$10,000 to \$15,000 the Globe Building could be made entirely safe and put in good condition for the storage of documents. The walls are good. There will need to be some additional floors, as would be needed in any building where documents are to be stored, and a new roof will also be needed.

Just in the rear of the building is an alley running north and south at a slight angle, and there is a little cross alley where there is a small piece of ground with a building on it, for which, in 1878 or 1879, we paid \$100,000 for the ground, the building, printing plates, and certain bound volumes of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. To-day the Senate is paying \$1,800 for the rent of rooms for the storage of documents which are distributed through our folding room, and the House of Representatives is paying \$1,800 for like rooms for the storage of documents to be distributed by members of the House. That building is convenient. It is accessible, remarkably so, having an alley on one side and an alley at the end. It has strong walls, and it can be made suitable for the storage of documents of both the Senate and the House of Representatives. It will be economy in the end to make this purchase, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON] to the contrary notwithstanding.

The Union Building is a large building, and we had it examined. It is to some extent, though not absolutely, a fireproof building; that is, it has a steel frame and is very strong. We investigated that question very thoroughly. We were told that its actual cost was the amount named in this bill. We have been paying for years \$47,000 rent for that building. The city post-office occupies the lower floor and a part of the second floor, and Government employees and business occupy nearly the entire space that is left. Two floors are occupied by the Superintendent of Public Documents, where the documents which are distributed to the States, public libraries, and collegiate institutions are placed for distribution. This does not include the documents which are distributed through the Senate folding room.

A certain class of documents and a certain number of all documents go to the Superintendent of Documents, and it is through him that the general distribution to the colleges, libraries, and institutions of learning is made. Occasionally documents are distributed by him on the order of Senators, as in the case of the Messages and Papers of the Presidents. Those are placed not in the Senate and House folding rooms, but they are placed under the Superintendent of Documents, just as we heretofore placed the Census reports under the Superintendent of Documents in the Interior Department.

Mr. HOAR. May I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. COCKRELL. Certainly.

Mr. HOAR. How much rent does the Senator say the United States is now paying for the accommodations which they will get in these two buildings?

Mr. COCKRELL. Thirty-six hundred dollars and \$47,000 would be \$50,600.

Mr. HOAR. I understand for what we are now paying \$50,600 a year, that we shall have to pay, if these two items are adopted, only \$20,850; in other words, we make \$20,000 a year by the operation.

Mr. GALLINGER. That is a mistake. The entire amount proposed for the purchase of the two buildings is \$695,000, and I suppose we ought to reckon it at 6 per cent. I can not borrow money for less than that.

Mr. HOAR. But the Government borrows money for less than 3 per cent.

Mr. GALLINGER. Probably so; but I think in making such a calculation we ought not to put it at 3 per cent.

Mr. HOAR. If you put it at 6 per cent, you would save over \$10,000, and at the present rate of Government bonds you would save \$30,000.

Mr. COCKRELL. Yes; more than that. The Government bonds are not bringing 3 per cent.

We are paying a large sum for the rent of a great many other buildings outside of these. The Indian Office is outside of a Government building, the Geological Survey is outside, and all the outside offices will not be accommodated in the new Post-Office building. When the post-office goes into that building, and the Sixth Auditor's Office, as it was originally—now the office of the Auditor of the Post-Office Department—goes in there, and the building is occupied, there will be no space there for anything

else, as everybody knows who has investigated the matter and who has heard the contention in regard to it. It is not thought that there will be rooms for the Auditor in that building.

The Auditor of the Post-Office Department has a large number of employees and requires a large space, and there are other bureaus of the Government which are going into that building. The Indian Office will not go there; the Patent Office has not room; the General Land Office has not room, and they are all occupying outside buildings. This building was erected largely, not at the instance of the Government—I do not believe any such thing as that—but at the instance of officials of the Government, for the express purpose of being leased to the Government for governmental purposes, and was built strongly for that reason, with a steel frame and strong floors, some of the upper floors being stronger than the second floor.

Mr. WOLCOTT. In what year was the building erected; can the Senator tell us?

Mr. ALLISON. It was built in 1891.

Mr. COCKRELL. That is the present post-office on G street, less than a block east of the Interior Department. It is true that in that building there are not many brick partitions erected; but there is the frame. It was so left that partitions could be put up to suit the Government. Nearly all the models belonging to the Patent Office are there, and they occupy, if not all of two floors, nearly so. The Superintendent of Documents has stored there the documents I have described, which do not come to us, but which are distributed by him directly under general law to institutions of learning, to the libraries of the country, and to individuals upon our orders. He has them stored on those strong floors.

We had the Architect examine the building, and there was no indication of any sagging, no indication that the building was strained in any way. In the interest of the public, and knowing that the new Post-Office building will not accommodate all the Government offices and bureaus which are outside, we thought it would be economy to purchase the Union Building. That is the reason which governed the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. WOLCOTT. May I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. COCKRELL. With pleasure.

Mr. WOLCOTT. The Senator from Missouri is interested more than most of the Senators in seeing that eventually we have in Washington, built modernly and one at a time, perhaps, a series of splendid public buildings, which shall be an adornment to the city and a credit to the whole country. I ask the Senator if he does not think, in view of that hope, which I know the Senator cherishes with the rest of us, that it would be wiser for us to lease buildings for a time, rather than to load ourselves with the burden of ownership of small, segregated pieces of property, which would be of no value eventually if these larger buildings are constructed, and the ownership of which might stand in the way of the erection of large and new and independent buildings, such as ought some day to adorn the city of Washington?

Mr. COCKRELL. The Government will never erect a costly ornamental building simply for the purpose of storing documents until such time as they can be distributed.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Oh, no; I do not mean for temporary storage.

Mr. COCKRELL. We had an instance of that in the erection of the building for a folding room. The bureaus that will go into this building can be accommodated.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Let me ask the Senator if his own colleague did not have a bill pending here for years for the erection of a hall of records which would be for that very purpose?

Mr. COCKRELL. Not for the storage of documents. That was to provide a place for the storage of the paper records of the different Departments, so as to take them out of the Department buildings, but it was not for the storage of documents, as I understood it.

Mr. PASCO. I ask the Senator from Missouri if he does not think the two objects could properly be combined in one large, handsome, and magnificent building for the storage of records and documents? One large building erected for those two important purposes would justify the expenditure of a large amount of money.

Mr. STEWART. A thoroughly fireproof building.

Mr. COCKRELL. So far as being fireproof is concerned, either one of these buildings is practically fireproof. There is no danger about that. We may theorize about what may be done and what can be done, but we shall never get a building of that kind. The jurisdiction over such buildings is always in contest. We have had a sad experience in regard to the Post-Office building, a wrangle and contention as to who shall have jurisdiction over it and who shall control it, and that will exist all the time. You will never see, in my judgment, a time when some of the branches of the Government will not be occupying buildings outside of the Department buildings proper.

For the Senate and House officers we need a building where

documents can be stored, which will be convenient to the Printing Office, so as to store them until Senators wish to distribute them. That was the idea in proposing to purchase this building. If we undertake to erect a public building here, by the time we get it finished the increase of the Government employees will be such that there will be as many left outside as there were at the time it was begun; and that is now the case with the new Post-Office building on Pennsylvania avenue. We have been at work on that building for years, and yet we are not in occupancy of it, and by the time we get another building there will be a further increase in the number of employees.

These are the views of the committee. The committee simply thought it would be economy in the end to purchase these two buildings.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. President, knowing well the many difficulties the Committee on Appropriations contend with from day to day, and fully appreciating their commendable desire to reduce expenditures for rent in this District, I nevertheless feel that a public policy is involved in this question that should be pretty thoroughly understood before proceeding upon the lines indicated by these two amendments.

In the first place, it is proposed in a clause of the bill to enlarge the Government holdings of ground adjacent to the Government Printing Office. That extension should go far enough to accommodate the document rooms intended to be supplied in the Globe Building. Why transport public documents from the Government Printing Office ten or twelve blocks to a point on Pennsylvania avenue, instead of sending them from the printing room to an adjacent room for distribution? So the Globe Building proposition could be more advantageously taken care of contiguous to the Government Printing Office itself, and thus avoid an external expense of cartage or drayage charges between the place where the document is produced and the place where it is intended to be distributed.

But beyond that, Mr. President, the very apt suggestion of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. WOLCOTT] is to be considered. The building of an appropriate fireproof hall of records within the limits of this District has been a necessity for many years recognized by those familiar with the facts. If we begin now to purchase in piecemeal shanties and buildings here and there throughout the District for the purpose of storing documents and transacting the Government business in various parts of the city, rather than in concentrated points or places, we initiate a policy which will defer indefinitely and perchance ultimately defeat the commendable purpose of building a substantial, central, fireproof hall of records, accessible equally to all the Departments and to the Capitol Building as well.

I had some years ago occasion to visit the Union Building. It was proposed to move the General Land Office into that building. The Architect of the Capitol was called upon at that time to look the building over, and as the result of examinations by committees appointed by the Secretary of the Interior, the committee appointed by the Commissioner of the General Land Office, and personal examinations by both officers it was determined that the building was so constructed that the waste room within it would forbid the attempt to use it as any part or portion of a public office connected with the Land Office.

The building is constructed upon what is known as the slow-burning process. Anyone familiar with construction will pronounce it a cheap building. It is not a fireproof building. It is not a building fit for office purposes. It is not a suitable building for storage purposes. It is a building, in my humble judgment, put up in the cheapest possible manner, to be temporarily rented to the United States at a high rent and ultimately dumped upon the Government at a high figure.

The old Globe Building I only know as a passer-by on Pennsylvania avenue. It may be for sale at a very low figure compared with the rental we pay. My observation is that the Government, for the same accommodations, pays greater rent in the District than can be obtained from any individual, company, or corporation in the District; that, as a rule, the Government rents buildings that can not be rented to individuals. It was the case with the Census Office. It is the case with most of the buildings rented from time to time.

Now it is suggested that because, forsooth, we can save \$30,000 a year for the next few years in rent or interest, if you please, it behooves us to load upon the Government a pile of property at an exorbitant price, for which the Government, when the hall of records shall have been constructed, will have no use whatever. Will Senators reflect upon the probable price we could get for the Union Building when the Government ceased to find it available for Government purposes and offered it at public auction? The part of the city in which it is located is not desirable for Government offices. It is a livery-stable community. It has livery stables either upon both sides of it or one, and I believe upon the opposite side, above and below. The street is narrow. There is no

vacant space on either side of the building such as is contemplated usually for a Government building, to guard it against fire from external cause or contact with other buildings.

If we are in need of a hall of records, and I believe we are, let the \$700,000 that is to be invested in these two old buildings be doubled and let us start at once upon the work of construction. The Government to-day has a part or portion of the Judiciary Square in which a hall of records may be constructed, and we could connect that central building with the various Departments by a pneumatic-tube system or otherwise, so that documents may not only be preserved from fire, but may be rapidly distributed and at slight cost.

I doubt not that the prices named for these buildings are the best that can be obtained, but the plan or theory upon which we thus drift in the purchase is a pernicious one and will tend to prevent the accomplishment of the ultimate end in view, to wit, the concentration of the Government buildings rather than scattering them all over the District.

Mr. ELKINS. Mr. President, I quite agree with everything the Senator from Montana [Mr. CARTER] has said. I look upon this purchase as if I were going to purchase it myself. I do not think I would buy for myself any land on Pennsylvania avenue, especially an old building hardly suited to any purpose requiring modern conveniences. I think the Government has too much land on Pennsylvania avenue already. It is known that whenever there is high water in the Potomac the cellars are flooded, and I do not see what the Government wants with property of that kind.

The Senator from Montana is right when he says, if we need buildings for public service, let us build them in good places and on good sites, and construct modern buildings—for the best kind is none too good for the Government—with all the fittings, conveniences, and improvements that belong to a modern building, steam heat, electricity, etc.

This is an old building. It could hardly be used for anything else than what is proposed here, and it will not properly serve the purpose for which it is to be bought. I think that in the future, in making purchases for the Government, we ought to make them upon the theory that the Government is going to last a long time, that the buildings shall be useful, and that we should construct the best possible buildings, according to some approved plan or system, and let the buildings be befitting in their architecture.

I agree with the Senator that perhaps on Capitol Hill, connected with some other public building, would be a suitable place. This seems a high price to me. I do not know any individual who would give so much money for this property. That we already have land there is no argument to me to agree to this amendment. We ought not to increase our bad investments. We ought not to buy any bad land. My judgment would be to sell the land badly located and buy good land elsewhere and erect a modern building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the Committee on Appropriations.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. PENROSE. I should like to ask the Senator who has the bill in charge whether he knows what the actual assessed value of the property is?

Mr. ALLISON. I do not. I will state that this amendment was sent to us by the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, of which the Senator's colleague is chairman, and of course that committee is more familiar with the details than I can be. The general information before the committee was that the building cost about \$650,000 to construct, in addition to the land.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator refers to the Union Building?

Mr. ALLISON. The Union Building. Personally, I do not know what its value is.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Does the Senator know at what the property is assessed?

Mr. ALLISON. I have just answered that I do not know. The matter was sent to us from another committee—the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. MORRILL. I merely wish to state that if this matter was considered in the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, it was at some time when I was not present.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MALLORY (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROCTOR]. If he were present, I should vote "nay."

Mr. MARTIN (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANTLE]. As he has not voted, I will withhold my vote. I should vote "nay," if he were present.

Mr. NELSON (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST]. If he were present, I should vote "nay."

Mr. PASCO (when his name was called). I am paired with

the Senator from Washington [Mr. WILSON]. If he were present, I should vote "nay."

The PRESIDING OFFICER (when the name of Mr. PERKINS was called). The present occupant of the chair is paired with the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. ROACH].

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. CAFFERY. I am paired generally with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. BURROWS]. I am not advised how he would stand on this question, and I will therefore withhold my vote. If he were present, I should vote "yea."

Mr. GALLINGER (after having voted in the negative). I have a general pair with the Senator from Texas [Mr. MILLS], who seems to be absent. I suggest to the Senator from Florida [Mr. PASCO] that we transfer our pairs. I have voted, and that will enable my vote to stand and the Senator from Florida to vote.

Mr. PASCO. Very well. I vote "nay."

Mr. NELSON. The Senator from Montana [Mr. MANTLE] is paired with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. MARTIN]. I suggest to the Senator from Virginia that he transfer his pair to the Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST], so that he and I may vote.

Mr. MARTIN. Very well.

Mr. NELSON. I vote "nay."

Mr. MARTIN. I vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 19, nays 38; as follows:

YEAS—19.

Allison,	Hale,	McMillan,	Spooner,
Cockrell,	Hawley,	Murphy,	Teller,
Faulkner,	Jones, Ark.	Quay,	Turley,
Gear,	McBride,	Sewell,	Warren.
Gorman,	McEnery,	Smith,	

NAYS—38.

Allen,	Elkins,	Mitchell,	Stewart,
Bacon,	Fairbanks,	Money,	Thurston,
Bate,	Gallinger,	Morrill,	Tillman,
Butler,	Harris,	Nelson,	Turner,
Cannon,	Heitfeld,	Pasco,	Walthall,
Carter,	Kenney,	Penrose,	Wellington,
Chandler,	Kyle,	Pettus,	Wetmore,
Chilton,	Lindsay,	Platt, Conn.	Wolcott.
Clay,	McLaurin,	Platt, N. Y.	
Deboe,	Martin,	Rawlins,	

NOT VOTING—32.

Aldrich,	Davis,	Lodge,	Pritchard,
Baker,	Foraker,	Mallory,	Proctor,
Berry,	Frye,	Mantle,	Roach,
Burrows,	Gray,	Mason,	Shoup,
Clark,	Hanna,	Mills,	Turpie,
Cullom,	Hansbrough,	Morgan,	Vest,
Daniel,	Hoar,	Perkins,	White,
	Jones, Nev.	Pettigrew,	Wilson.

So the amendment was rejected.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 5, after line 8, to insert:

Purchase of Union Building: To enable the Secretary of the Treasury to purchase lots B and C, 3 and 4, in square No. 454, situated on the north side of G street between Sixth and Seventh streets, in the city of Washington, D. C., and improved by a building known as the Union Building, \$650,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, this is a very large sum of money, and I think it fair to the Senate that the committee should give us more information than I certainly at present have on this subject. I should like to be informed how the amount which has been fixed here, \$650,000, has been arrived at, and also to reiterate the request that was made as to the last item in the bill, for information as to the assessed value of the property for taxation. I know that is not an infallible guide, but it is of some value in considering a question of this kind. I am led to believe myself from mere observation of this building that the sum fixed is an exorbitant one. I wish to know how it was reached, and what is the assessed value of this building for taxation.

Mr. QUAY. I am not able to inform the Senator from New Hampshire what is the assessed value of the building. The amount stated in the bill represents its actual cost. It is the building now occupied by the city post-office, which we all know is shortly to be removed to the public building now in process of erection. It was built at the suggestion of the Government in 1890. The character of the building will appear from papers in the possession, I believe, of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, which I trust he will place before the Senate, if he has them here. It is a building which was built especially, as I have stated, for public uses. It is occupied entirely by the Government. The Government to-day pays a rent of \$47,000 for it, which is much more than a fair percentage upon the amount fixed in the bill as a proper indemnification for the owners of the property.

The Census Office are now, I believe, anxious to occupy the space which is shortly to be vacated by the post-office, and it appeared to the Committee on Appropriations that it was wise economy on the part of the Government to take possession of the building now. That is about all I have to say upon the subject, I believe. The Senator from Iowa in charge of the bill has in his possession a letter from the corporation addressed to the chairman

of the Committee on Appropriations in the House which will explain everything that is necessary for the enlightenment of the Senate upon the subject. If the Senator from Iowa will send me the letter, I will ask to have it read. I ask the Secretary to read the paper I send to the desk.

The Secretary read as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., December 11, 1897.

DEAR SIR: Complying with your request, I send you herewith drawings showing the basement and first and second floors of the Union Building, situate on G street, between Sixth and Seventh streets NW. The five remaining floors are identical with the second-floor plan. I also inclose a statement showing the floor of each floor. You will observe the total floor space in the building is 138,297 square feet, a fraction over 3 acres. This statement will also show the occupancy of each floor, date of occupancy, and amount of rent paid per annum. In addition to this, you will find a statement showing the superficial carrying capacity of each floor and the thickness of the walls of the building. The average carrying capacity is a fraction over 90 pounds per square foot, evenly distributed. The usual superficial carrying capacity of the average office building is 20 pounds per square foot.

The building has a frontage of 103 feet 6 inches by a depth of 212 feet 6 inches, and is fireproof. There is a 15-foot alley on the west side opening on G street, 30 foot alley in the rear, and a 30-foot alley on the east side running back 112 feet 6 inches to a 15 foot alley opening on Sixth street, giving two outlets and offering the best possible facilities for loading and unloading United States mail or freight of every description.

The Union Building was built in 1891 and 1892 at the suggestion of the Government, which at that time was greatly in need of quarters for the city post-office. It is centrally located, was built in the belief and on a style that would commend and insure its entire occupancy by the Government, and cost \$650,000.

Very truly yours,

MYRON M. PARKER,
President Union Building Company.

HON. JOSEPH G. CANNON,
Chairman of Appropriations Committee,
House of Representatives, City.

Schedule of information, Union Building, G street, between Sixth and Seventh streets NW.—Floor spaces.

	Square feet.
Area of building entire.....	28,868.75
Basement:	
Front..... square feet.....	8,021
Back..... do.....	6,493
	14,514
Boiler room, toilet, stairs, and elevator.....	4,998
First floor:	
Post-office uses..... square feet.....	18,560
Stairs and elevator..... do.....	952
	19,512
Second floor:	
Post-offices uses..... do.....	18,634
Stairs, elevator, and toilet..... do.....	1,088
	19,722
Third floor:	
Interior Department..... do.....	18,685
Stairs, elevators, and toilet..... do.....	1,088
	19,773
Fourth floor:	
Interior Department..... do.....	18,685
Stairs, elevator, and toilet..... do.....	1,088
	19,773
Fifth floor:	
Government Printing Office..... do.....	18,685
Stairs, elevator, and toilet..... do.....	1,088
	19,773
Sixth floor:	
Government Printing Office..... do.....	19,144
Stairs, elevator, and toilet..... do.....	1,088
	20,232
Total square feet in building for office uses.....	126,907
Total square feet in building for stairs, toilet, elevator, boiler room, halls about stairs, and elevator.....	11,390
Total square feet in building.....	138,297

N. B.—I might add that the attic, or seventh floor, could, with nominal expenses, be utilized, which would add over 19,000 square feet. The walls are also of sufficient thickness and strength to admit of additional stories.

Superficial carrying capacity of floors.

- First floor, 100 pounds per square foot, evenly distributed.
- Second floor, 80 pounds per square foot, evenly distributed.
- Third floor, 125 pounds per square foot, evenly distributed.
- Fourth floor, 80 pounds per square foot, evenly distributed.
- Fifth floor, 80 pounds per square foot, evenly distributed.
- Sixth floor, 80 pounds per square foot, evenly distributed.

Thickness of walls.

	Inches.
Basement.....	30
First floor.....	23
Second floor.....	22
Third floor.....	18
Fourth floor.....	18
Fifth floor.....	18
Sixth floor.....	13

Annual rentals Union Building.

City post-office, front basement, first and second floors.....	\$20,000
Interior Department, third and fourth floors.....	13,000
Government Printing Office, fifth and sixth floors.....	13,000
Sixth Auditor's Office, rear basement.....	1,000
Total annual rentals.....	47,000

Date of occupancy.

City post-office, from June 1, 1892; Department of the Interior, from August 1, 1893; Government Printing Office, from November 1, 1894; Sixth Auditor's Office, from July 1, 1893.

Mr. CHANDLER. I did not gather from the reading whether the building is fireproof.

Mr. QUAY. It is fireproof.

Mr. CHANDLER. I did not gather whether it is built of iron and brick.

Mr. QUAY. It is entirely fireproof.

Mr. CHANDLER. I wish the Senator from Pennsylvania, the chairman of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, would tell us, if he knows, what Department is to be the future occupant of the present post-office building after the Post-Office Department has been moved into the new building upon Pennsylvania avenue?

Mr. QUAY. I mentioned in my remarks before that the Census Bureau or some of the officers have been consulting with the proprietors of this building in relation to the occupancy of the space to be vacated. Of course it will be occupied for any purpose for which the Government may lease it.

Mr. CHANDLER. I mean the present Post-Office Department building, which is to be vacated—the general Post-Office Department, where the Postmaster-General is. What is to become of that building when it is vacated if we are to buy all the present buildings in the city that are now occupied by Government offices?

Mr. QUAY. My understanding is, although I have it not officially, from the Secretary of the Interior that the office will be taken possession of by that Department. I do not know that there is any special arrangement to that effect.

Mr. CHANDLER. By the overflow from the Interior Department?

Mr. QUAY. Yes.

Mr. CHANDLER. I am opposed to paying so large a sum as this for that building at the present time. I do not see now any valuation of it. I am not told how much it is valued at for purposes of taxation. My belief is that it is not valued for purposes of taxation at over \$150,000.

Mr. QUAY. I do not know.

Mr. CHANDLER. I think we are entitled to more information before the Senate is asked to take so large an appropriation upon itself as an amendment to a House bill, when the House of Representatives does not appear to have been convinced from the letter, which has been read, to the chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations, that this purchase ought to be made. I do not think the Senate ought to put this large amount upon the bill with its present information, or rather lack of information, as to its real value and as to the necessity of further using it for the purposes of the Government.

The statement that the building was built at the suggestion of the Government is very indefinite. Who is the Government? If there had been any formal or official request for the construction of this building, it would have been here. Who is authorized to suggest the construction of a \$600,000 building for the Government? Did the chairman of the Senate Committee on Appropriations make the suggestion? I can think of no person connected with the legislative branch of the Government who would be any more entitled to make the suggestion or any more likely to carry out any intimation that at the proper time the building would be purchased by the Government than the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. CANNON. May I interrupt the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. CHANDLER. Certainly.

Mr. CANNON. The Senator appears desirous of learning the assessed valuation of this building and the ground upon which it stands. I am advised by the proper official of the District that the assessed valuation of the ground and building is \$173,912.

Mr. CHANDLER. I did not think it was over \$200,000. I guessed that it would be \$150,000. If the assessed value had been \$200,000, then we should have been obliged to assume that property in this District is assessed for only about one-third of its real value. I suppose over the country a fair rate of valuation for purposes of taxation is about two-thirds of the value of property. Suppose the assessment were \$200,000 and it was two-thirds of the value, then the property would be worth \$300,000.

I repeat, Mr. President, that is an enormous overvaluation of this piece of property, even if the Government ought to purchase it.

Mr. QUAY. Mr. President, I know nothing about the valuation of the property except from what was stated by those who seem to understand the proper value of property in this city. I am told that the building and site could not be replaced for the amount of money here appropriated. As the Senator from New Hampshire, as usual, seeks to have all the information possible upon this subject, I suggest to the chairman of the committee that the item go over and by to-morrow I shall be able to give him the information of which he is in search.

Mr. ALLISON. I quite agree to that course.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no objection, the amendment of the committee will go over for the present.

Mr. STEWART. We had better have it disposed of now, I think.

Mr. ALLISON. The Senator from New Hampshire desires some information which the Senator from Pennsylvania thinks he can furnish.

Mr. QUAY. I desire to have the amendment go over until tomorrow, when I can furnish the information of which the Senator from New Hampshire is in search.

Mr. ALLISON. I will allow it to be passed over.

Mr. STEWART. For what purpose?

Mr. ALLISON. For the information which the Senator from Pennsylvania proposes to furnish to the Senator from New Hampshire and other Senators.

Mr. QUAY. As to the valuation of the property under the officers of the Government at whose suggestion the house was built.

Mr. STEWART. I think if Senators will look at the building and inform themselves a little concerning it between now and the time the vote is taken there will be no danger of the amendment being agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The proposed amendment will be passed over for the present.

The reading of the bill was resumed. The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 6, after line 18, to insert:

For marine hospital at Chicago, Ill.: For invalid elevator, including dynamo, \$2,350; for new building for boiler and power plant, isolation ward, stable, and laundry, \$35,000; in all, \$37,350.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 7, to insert:

For marine hospital at Cleveland, Ohio: For boiler house, stack, and new boilers, \$3,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 7, after line 7, to insert:

For marine hospital at San Francisco, Cal.: For improvements to station, \$18,625.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 7, line 18, after the word "dollars," to insert "lavatories to barracks, \$1,200; cistern, \$1,000; baths and closets for contagious hospital, \$500; in all, \$3,200;" so as to make the clause read:

For quarantine station, Delaware Breakwater, Delaware: For fire-extinguishing apparatus, \$500; lavatories to barracks, \$1,200; cistern, \$1,000; baths and closets for contagious hospital, \$500; in all, \$3,200.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 8, line 15, after the word "Florida," to insert "For improvement of wharf and new pier, \$7,000; contagious-disease hospital, \$1,200; in all, \$8,200;" so as to read:

For quarantine station, Tortugas (Key West), Florida: For improvement of wharf and new pier, \$7,000; contagious-disease hospital, \$1,200; in all, \$8,200.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 9, line 12, after the word "dollars," to insert "improvement of water service, \$1,000; in all, \$2,600;" so as to make the clause read:

For quarantine station, San Diego, Cal.: For new engine for quarantine launch, \$1,600; improvement of water service, \$1,000; in all, \$2,600.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 9, after line 14, to insert:

For quarantine station, San Francisco, Cal.: For steam disinfecting boiler and baths for quarantine hulk *Omaha*, \$1,000; telephone to mainland, \$1,800; additions to disinfecting apparatus, \$2,300; bichloride tank and pipes, \$500; fire-extinguishing apparatus tanks, etc., \$3,120; in all, \$8,620.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 9, after line 23, to insert:

For quarantine station, Astoria, Oreg.: For the establishment of a quarantine station at or near Astoria, Oreg., and for the maintenance of said station, \$30,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 10, line 9, to increase the appropriation for heating apparatus for public buildings from \$100,000 to \$125,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Light-houses, beacons, and fog signals," on page 11, after line 1, to insert:

Whitehead light and fog-signal station, Maine: For construction of a keeper's dwelling, \$3,400.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 11, after line 4, to insert:

Boon Island light station, Maine: For construction of a keeper's dwelling \$3,400.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 11, after line 6, to insert:

Cape Elizabeth light station, Maine: For construction of a keeper's dwelling, \$2,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 11, after line 8, to insert:

Pollock Rip light and fog-signal station, Massachusetts: For establishing a light and fog-signal station to mark the channel through Pollock Rip Shoals, off the coast of Massachusetts, \$40,000; and the total cost of said light and fog-

signal station complete, under a contract which is hereby authorized therefor, shall not exceed \$80,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 11, after line 15, to insert:

Sankaty Head light station, Massachusetts: For roadway from the station to the public road, \$300.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 11, after line 18, to insert:

Plum Beach light and fog-signal station, Rhode Island: For completing the station, \$9,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 12, to insert:

Hart Island fog-signal station, Long Island Sound, New York: For establishing a fog-signal station at the southern end of Hart Island, New York, \$2,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 12, after line 4, to insert:

Hog Island Shoal light and fog-signal station, Rhode Island: For establishing a light and fog-signal station on or near Hog Island Shoal, Narragansett Bay, Rhode Island, to take the place of the light-vessel now there, \$35,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 12, after line 14, to insert:

Cape May light station, New Jersey: For an additional keeper's dwelling, \$4,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 12, after line 16, to insert:

Edgemoor light-house depot, Delaware: For depot-keeper's dwelling and outbuildings, \$5,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 12, after line 18, to insert:

Hooper Island light and fog-signal station, Maryland: For establishing a light and fog-signal station on the shoals of Hooper Island, east side of Chesapeake Bay, Maryland, \$30,000; and the total cost of said light and fog-signal station complete, under a contract which is hereby authorized therefor, shall not exceed \$60,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 13, to insert:

Ragged Point light and fog-signal station, Virginia: For constructing a light and fog-signal station near Ragged Point, Potomac River, Virginia, \$20,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, after line 3, to insert:

Cape Fear light station, North Carolina: For establishment of a first-order light station at or near the pitch of Cape Fear, North Carolina, \$35,000; and the total cost of said light station complete, under a contract which is hereby authorized therefor, shall not exceed \$70,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, after line 9, to insert:

Hillsboro Inlet light station, Florida: For constructing a first-order light station at or near Hillsboro Inlet, east coast of Florida, \$45,000; and the total cost of said light station complete, under a contract which is hereby authorized therefor, shall not exceed \$90,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, line 18, to increase the appropriation for building a light-keeper's dwelling at Egmont Key light station, Florida, from \$2,000 to \$3,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 14, after line 3, to insert:

Cubits Gap fog-signal station, Louisiana: For constructing a keeper's dwelling, \$2,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 14, after line 6, to insert:

Red Fish Bar light station, Texas: For reestablishing Red Fish Bar light station, Texas, on the edge of Red Fish Bar cut, \$8,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 14, after line 15, to insert:

Grand Traverse (Cat Head) light and fog-signal station, Michigan: For establishing a fog signal at Grand Traverse (Cat Head) light station, Lake Michigan, Michigan, \$5,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 14, after line 19, to insert:

South Milwaukee light station, Wisconsin: For establishing a light station at or near the north Government pier at South Milwaukee, Lake Michigan, Wisconsin, \$7,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 14, after line 23, to insert:

Tail Point, Wisconsin, light and fog-signal station: For moving the Tail Point light and fog-signal station to a point near the channel, head of Green Bay, \$7,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 15, after line 8, to insert:

Depot for the Ninth light-house district, Lake Michigan: For establishing a light-house and depot near the northern end of Lake Michigan, \$15,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 15, after line 11, to insert:

Toledo Harbor light and fog-signal station, Ohio: For constructing a light and fog-signal station to mark the outer end of the main channel, entrance to Toledo Harbor, Ohio, \$37,500; and the total cost of said light and fog-signal station complete, under a contract which is hereby authorized therefor, shall not exceed \$75,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 15, after line 18, to insert:
Grassy Island range light station (Ecorse), Michigan: For building a dwelling for the keeper of Grassy Island Range (Ecorse), Michigan, \$5,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 15, after line 21, to insert:

Grosse Isle North Channel range light station, Michigan: For building a range light keeper's dwelling at Grosse Isle North Channel range light station, Michigan, \$3,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 16, to insert:

Grosse Isle South Channel range light station, Michigan: For building a dwelling for the light keeper at Grosse Isle South Channel range light station, Detroit River, Michigan, \$5,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 16, after line 4, to insert:

Cheboygan River front range light station, Michigan: For the purchase of additional lands for the Cheboygan River front range light station, Straits of Mackinac, Michigan, \$1,750.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 16, after line 8, to insert:

Lake St. Clair, Michigan, light and fog-signal stations: For light and fog-signal stations to mark the new 20-foot channel, \$20,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 16, after line 11, to insert:

Mud Lake, Michigan, light station: For establishing a light to mark the turning point in the channel through Mud Lake, St. Marys River, Michigan, \$3,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 16, after line 15, to insert:

Head of St. Marys River, Michigan, range lights: For establishing an additional set of range lights to mark the channel at the entrance to St. Marys River, \$1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 16, after line 19, to insert:

Depot for the Eleventh light-house district, Lakes Superior, Huron, and St. Clair: For establishing a light-house and buoy depot in the vicinity of Sault Ste. Marie, Michigan, \$15,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 16, after line 23, to insert:

Cape Mendocino light station, California: To erect a keeper's dwelling at Cape Mendocino light station, California, \$5,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 17, after line 2, to insert:

Point Hueneme light station, California: For right of way to public road, \$3,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 17, after line 4, to insert:

Santa Barbara light station, California: For constructing a keeper's dwelling and tower, \$7,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 17, after line 7, to insert:

Quarry Point fog signal station, California: For establishing a fog bell or other fog signal at or near Quarry Point, Angel Island, San Francisco Bay, California, \$8,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 17, after line 15, to insert:

Point No Point light station, Washington: For establishing a fog signal at Point No Point light station, Puget Sound, Washington, \$8,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 17, after line 18, to insert:

Point Brown beacon light and fog-signal station, Puget Sound, Washington: To establish a fog bell, with suitable dwelling, including site, \$8,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 17, after line 21, to insert:

Battery Point light and fog-signal station, Puget Sound, Washington: To establish a fog bell, with suitable dwelling, including site \$8,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 18, to insert:

Relief light vessel for the Fourth light-house districts: For constructing, equipping, and outfitting, complete for service, a first-class steam light vessel, with steam fog signal, \$95,000.

Mr. ALLISON. In line 1, page 18, after the word "Fourth," I move to insert "and Fifth," and the clerks will add a capital "L," so as to read: "Light-House." The clause should read:

Relief light vessel for the Fourth and Fifth Light-House districts.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 18, after line 4, to insert:

Relief light vessel for the Twelfth and Thirteenth light-house districts (Pacific coast): For constructing, equipping, and outfitting, complete for service, a first-class steam light vessel, with steam fog signal, \$85,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 18, after line 9, to insert:

Cape Lookout Shoals light vessel, North Carolina: For constructing, equipping, and outfitting, complete for service, a first-class steam light vessel, with steam fog signal, \$95,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 18, after line 13, to insert:

Tender for the Third light-house district: For new steam tender, for construction and repairs in the Third light-house district, New York, \$85,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 18, after line 16, to insert:

Tender for the Great Lakes: For constructing, equipping, and outfitting, complete for service, a new steam tender for buoyage, supply, and inspection on the Great Lakes, \$85,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Light-House Establishment," on page 19, line 9, to increase the appropriation "for supplies of light-houses" from \$400,000 to \$450,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 19, line 17, before the word "thousand," to strike out "five hundred and seventy-five" and insert "six hundred and fifty;" and in the same line, after the word "dollars," to insert the following proviso:

Provided, That necessary new auxiliary structures, at a total cost not to exceed \$20,000, may be erected under this appropriation at established stations, no structure so erected to exceed in cost \$1,000 at any one station.

So as to make the clause read:

Repairs of light-houses: For repairing, rebuilding, and improving light-houses and buildings; for improvements to grounds connected therewith; for establishing and repairing day marks and pier-head and other beacon lights; for illuminating apparatus and machinery to replace that already in use, and for incidental expenses relating to these various objects, \$650,000: Provided, That necessary new auxiliary structures, at a total cost not to exceed \$20,000, may be erected under this appropriation at established stations, no structure so erected to exceed in cost \$1,000 at any one station.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 20, line 1, to increase the appropriation for "salaries of keepers of light-houses," from \$720,000 to \$730,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 20, line 23, before the word "Florida," to insert "and Indian River;" so as to read:

Lighting of rivers: For establishing, supplying, and maintaining post lights on the Hudson and East rivers, New York; the Raritan River, New Jersey; Connecticut River, Thames River between Norwich and New London, Conn.; the Delaware River between Philadelphia and Bordentown, N. J.; the Elk River, Maryland; York River, Virginia; Cape Fear River, North Carolina; Savannah River, Georgia; St. Johns River and Indian River, Florida, etc.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Life-Saving Service," on page 24, after line 6, to insert:

That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized to establish a life-saving station at or near Nahant, Mass., at such point as the General Superintendent of the Life-Saving Service may recommend.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Revenue-Cutter Service," on page 25, line 9, after the word "dollars," to insert the following proviso:

Provided, That the President be, and is hereby, authorized to appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, one naval constructor in and for the Revenue-Cutter Service, who shall have the relative rank and pay of a first lieutenant in said service, as prescribed in section 2753, Revised Statutes.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 25, after line 15, to insert:

For constructing two revenue steamers, under the direction of the Secretary of the Treasury, one for harbor service at Boston, Mass., to replace the revenue steamer *Hamlin*, and one for harbor service at Philadelphia, Pa., to replace the revenue steamer *Washington*, at a cost not to exceed \$45,000 each, \$90,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 25, after line 22, to insert:

For constructing two revenue steamers of the first class, under the direction of the Secretary of the Treasury, one for service in the Gulf of Mexico, to take the place of the revenue steamer *Seward*, and one for service at Charleston, S. C., and on the Atlantic coast, to take the place of the revenue steamer *Colfax*, \$160,000; and the total cost of said revenue steamers, under a contract which is hereby authorized therefor, shall not exceed \$160,000 each.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 26, after line 7, to insert:

For constructing a revenue steamer of the first class, under the direction of the Secretary of the Treasury, for service on and in the vicinity of the Columbia River Bar, Pacific coast, \$125,000; and the total cost of said revenue steamer, under a contract which is hereby authorized therefor, shall not exceed \$250,000.

Mr. ALLISON. I move to amend the amendment, in line 10, after the words "Pacific coast," by inserting "and Puget Sound."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Iowa to the amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In line 10, after the word "coast," it is proposed to amend the amendment by inserting "and Puget Sound;" so as to read:

For constructing a revenue steamer of the first class, under the direction of the Secretary of the Treasury, for service on and in the vicinity of the Columbia River Bar, Pacific coast, and Puget Sound, \$125,000; and the total cost of said revenue steamer, under a contract which is hereby authorized therefor, shall not exceed \$250,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed. The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 26, after line 14, to insert:

For the purchase of six eophones, at not exceeding \$500 each, \$3,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Engraving and printing," on page 26, line 22, to increase the appropriation "for labor and expenses of engraving and printing" from \$455,000 to \$475,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GALLINGER. I call the attention of the Senator in charge of the bill to line 23, on page 26, where the word "directions" should be "direction." I think the Senator will agree to that correction.

Mr. ALLISON. That is undoubtedly a typographical error.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That correction will be made, in the absence of objection.

The reading of the bill was resumed. The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 27, line 7, to increase the appropriation "for wages of plate printers," etc., from \$580,000 to \$575,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GALLINGER. I will state to the Senator having the bill in charge that I propose to offer an amendment to the paragraph just read, but I presume that the Senator prefers that the bill should be gone through with before amendments are offered upon the floor. If that is correct, I will withhold my amendment.

Mr. ALLISON. I do prefer to have that course adopted, as I think I have some anticipation of the amendment to be offered by the Senator from New Hampshire, and I want, on behalf of the Committee on Appropriations, to make some further investigation respecting the plan of the amendment.

Mr. GALLINGER. I simply want it understood by the friends of the amendment that I am diligent in the matter, and merely withhold it for the present.

Mr. ALLISON. They will undoubtedly take notice.

The reading of the bill was resumed and continued to the end of the appropriations for the Coast and Geodetic Survey, in line 3, on page 36.

ERECTION OF TEMPORARY FORTIFICATIONS IN STATES.

Mr. HAWLEY. The Senator in charge of the appropriation bill kindly consents, in view of the near close of the day's session, to my calling up Senate joint resolution No. 129, which was introduced by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. BACON]. The Senator from Georgia has prepared a substitute which will obviate, I think, all objections or criticisms which were made to the joint resolution in its original form.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, I have, as stated by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. HAWLEY], prepared a substitute for all that portion of the joint resolution following the resolving clause, which I submit at the suggestion of the Senator from Florida [Mr. PASCO], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BATE], and several others who objected to some of the phraseology of the pending joint resolution, and I propose to present my substitute for the original joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the joint resolution (S. R. 129) relative to suspension of part of section 355 of Revised Statutes, relative to erection of forts, fortifications, etc.

Mr. BACON. I now offer the substitute to which I have referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Georgia will be stated.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to strike out all after the resolving clause of the joint resolution and insert:

That in case of emergency, when in the opinion of the President the immediate erection of any temporary fort or fortification is deemed important and urgent, such temporary fort or fortification may be constructed upon the written consent of the owner of the land upon which such work is to be placed; and the requirements of section 355 of the Revised Statutes shall not be applicable in such cases.

Mr. HAWLEY. I will accept the substitute, so far as I have authority to do so.

Mr. BATE. Is that the original joint resolution introduced by the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. BACON. It is not.

Mr. BATE. I opposed that joint resolution, but I think this is all right.

Mr. BACON. I so understood, and one of the objects I had in presenting the substitute was to conform to the views of the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. BATE. I am very much obliged to the Senator. I always want to stand up for the rights of the States.

Mr. PASCO. The substitute offered by the Senator from Georgia avoids all the objections hitherto made to the original joint resolution, and I think it is now entirely satisfactory to all.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the adoption of the amendment submitted by the Senator from Georgia.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

COST OF MAIL TRANSPORTATION.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I ask unanimous consent to have printed as a document a paper prepared by James L. Cowles with regard to railroad transportation and the cost of transporting the mails, in order to use it before the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request made by the Senator from South Dakota? The Chair hears none, and that order will be made.

SUBLETTING OF MAIL CONTRACTS.

Mr. STEWART. I have here a statement, signed by a large number of persons acquainted with the matter, showing the evil of the subletting of mail contracts. I ask to have it printed as a document and referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads. It is very short, being a simple statement of facts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request made by the Senator from Nevada? The Chair hears none, and that order will be made.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED.

The bill (H. R. 4936) for the allowance of certain claims for stores and supplies, reported by the Court of Claims under the provisions of the act approved March 3, 1883, and commonly known as the Bowman Act, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

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

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After twenty minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 4 o'clock and 22 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, April 1, 1898, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 31, 1898.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY.

Samuel L. Overstreet, of Oklahoma Territory, to be attorney of the United States for the Territory of Oklahoma, vice Caleb R. Brooks, resigned.

CONSUL.

Walter H. Faulkner, of Texas, to be consul of the United States at Durango, Mexico, vice Lewis M. Berg, declined.

SURVEYOR OF CUSTOMS.

James H. Bolton, of Iowa, to be surveyor of customs for the port of Sioux City, in the State of Iowa, to succeed W. B. Humphrey, whose term of office has expired by limitation.

PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY—ARTILLERY ARM.

To be captains.

First Lieut. Sebree Smith, Second Artillery, March 8, 1898, vice Burbank, Third Artillery, promoted.

First Lieut. Henry Albert Reed, Second Artillery, March 8, 1898, vice Mills, Fifth Artillery, promoted.

First Lieut. Albert Simpson Cummins, Fourth Artillery, March 8, 1898, vice Story, Fourth Artillery, promoted.

First Lieut. Alexander Brydie Dyer, Fourth Artillery, March 8, 1898, vice Vose, Second Artillery, promoted.

First Lieut. Leverett Hull Walker, Fourth Artillery, March 8, 1898, vice Greenough, Fourth Artillery, promoted.

First Lieut. William Penn Duvall, Fifth Artillery, March 8, 1898, vice Russell, First Artillery, retired from active service.

First Lieut. Henry Merritt Andrews, First Artillery, March 8, 1898, vice Grugan, Second Artillery, promoted.

First Lieut. Charles Dyer Parkhurst, Fourth Artillery, March 8, 1898, vice Mitchell, Second Artillery, retired from active service.

PAYMASTER IN NAVY.

P. A. Paymaster Thomas S. Jewett, to be a paymaster in the Navy, from the 30th day of March, 1898, vice Paymaster George H. Read, retired.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, *March 31, 1898.*

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.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. BAILEY. Before the Journal is approved, I desire to suggest that I hardly think the Journal is quite full enough with reference to the decision on the point of order decided yesterday. The Speaker held, and in that holding I fully concur with him—and for the sake of the subsequent proceedings of the House I desire the Journal to show fully and exactly what the holding was—that if the resolution I had the honor to submit was a privileged matter, it was entitled to be disposed of at once, without any reference to a committee. I believe that was the holding of the Chair.

The SPEAKER. The statement of the Chair is set out in full in the Journal.

Mr. BAILEY. I did not catch the reading of it in that way. If so, I am, of course, content.

The SPEAKER. It is embodied in full in the Journal.

Subsequently,

Mr. BAILEY said: Mr. Speaker, having examined the Journal, I find that the Speaker's full statement of the matter referred to is there. The Clerk did not read it, as it is not usual to do so.

CONTESTED-ELECTION CASE—PATTERSON VS. CARMACK, TENTH DISTRICT, TENNESSEE.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK, on behalf of Committee on Elections No. 3, submitted the report of that committee in the contested-election case of Josiah Patterson, contestant, vs. E. W. Carmack, contestee, from the Tenth Congressional district of Tennessee; which was ordered to be printed, and referred to the House Calendar.

On motion of Mr. KIRKPATRICK, by unanimous consent, the minority of the committee were allowed one week in which to present their views.

NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

And then, on motion of Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the naval appropriation bill (H. R. 9378), with Mr. SHERMAN in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. At the time the committee rose last night an amendment was pending which, for the information of the committee, the Clerk will again report.

The amendment was read, as follows:

In line 15, page 44, after the word "dollars," insert the following:

"For the erection of new buildings at and for the use of the Naval Academy, Annapolis, Md., of the character and to the extent that the Secretary of the Navy may in his judgment deem necessary and practicable under the appropriation, in accordance with plans to be determined upon by the Secretary, and for the removal of such old buildings as may, in the judgment of said Secretary, be necessary to be removed for the convenient and suitable location and construction of the said new buildings, \$500,000."

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Chairman, as I have at no time since I have been a member of this body inflicted myself in the slightest upon it, I will now, in view of the importance of the matter now pending, ask the indulgence of the House for fifteen minutes in addition to the five minutes to which I am entitled under the rule.

Mr. DINGLEY. On this question?

Mr. McINTIRE. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. McINTIRE] asks unanimous consent that he may proceed for fifteen minutes in addition to the five minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. The gentleman will confine himself, of course, to the amendment.

Mr. McINTIRE. Absolutely to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair hears no objection.

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Chairman, in rising to speak to the matter under consideration, I do so impelled by a consciousness that I would be derelict in my duty were I to remain silent at such a time. I approach the subject with a feeling that is a strange mixture of shame and pleasure; shame that my country has for so long neglected the school at which our naval heroes, the Sigsbees of the future, are to receive their first instruction in their noble profession; pleasure because of a hope—born of egotism, perhaps—that some word of mine may tend to raise this honorable body from its state of lethargy to a sense of the folly of the course it is pursuing toward the Academy at Annapolis.

That Academy, gentlemen, should be the nation's glory. As it stands to-day it is the nation's disgrace. I do not make this assertion carelessly, but base it upon a large and indisputable array of

cold, convincing facts. These facts are not of my discovery. The knowledge of them is in the exclusive possession of no man or set of men. The Navy Department knows of them and has laid them before the proper committees of both the legislative branches of the Government. The officers of the naval arm of the service have been cognizant of them for years. The press has published them, and the people, gentlemen, read the papers.

We alone seem blind to the real condition of that institution, or, if seeing, do so without realizing what the effect may be of further withholding from the Academy that support which should have been tendered it long ago. I do not go so far as to charge criminal neglect against this body, but I utter only what is the simple truth when I say that that is the view held by men abler than I am to pass upon the matter, and that there is good ground for this opinion I think is shown in the official reports, as well as by the individual expression of persons competent to judge. That the cadets who in later years are to command our warships should have to abandon their quarters, or a portion of them, for fear they would tumble down about their heads is a sad and melancholy truth. But truth it is, as I shall show a little further on, and one of which even the most energetic of those who oppose an appropriation for the Academy somewhat commensurate with its needs can scarcely feel proud. The buildings in which the cadets are even now housed are none too safe, and if this spirit of procrastination is longer to prevail a day may come when we will repent in sackcloth and ashes our present ill-directed efforts at economy.

The Naval Academy is as much a part of this Government and as important a part as any institution of the Republic, and yet the scant attention it has received from Congress and the meager sums rant in the matter to the supposition that it was in reality an American edition of London's famous Blue Coat Charity School on a little cheaper scale.

Why the Academy has been treated in this fashion I for one do not know. Various reasons have been assigned, among them that the Maryland delegation in past Congresses has been slow to recognize its pressing necessities and that politics in one way or another has tended to retard its progress. I do not know about this, and I think that whether or not the delegation has been slow to see the wants of the institution is a question the agitation of which at this time would be profitless to the Academy. Personally, I have little knowledge upon that point, and I will not the more quickly accept the criticism because the Maryland delegation up to the present Congress happened to be composed almost wholly of Democrats. To hold up the mirror to reflect the sins of omission of which anyone has been guilty will count for naught now except in so far as it bears directly upon the question at issue.

This is my first term in this body, and never before have I had even a suspicion that the Naval Academy was in the disgraceful condition that it is to-day. But since I know the truth, I will not hesitate to plead with this House for a change in its ruinous course with reference to it, and I am proud to say that there is not a single member of the solid Republican delegation from the Old Line State who will not join hands with me, and perhaps go me one better, in this work of redemption.

And I further trust, and I can not help but believe, that you gentlemen, without regard to party or faction or section, will come nobly to the rescue when once you fully comprehend the enormity of our mistake in denying or delaying the succor of which the school at Annapolis stands so much in need.

In doing what I can to aid in turning the search-light of truth upon the miserable pile of antiquated masonry, rotten shingles, and hideous architecture on the banks of the Severn, I would first make a comparison between the treatment of the Naval Academy and that vouchsafed its sister institution, the United States Military Academy at West Point.

In doing so I do not wish the comparison to be considered invidious. Not one cent do I envy West Point of the many thousands of dollars that have gone year after year for the upbuilding of that great army training school. If it were practicable, I should favor enlarging our annual appropriation for it. But, while according generous treatment to this branch of the service, I should not forget that there is another arm which is equally, I might well say more, deserving of our consideration.

To my mind—and the thought is not original—the sea power is destined to be the most important means of defense of this nation. With good ships, and plenty of them, carrying the best of guns, with brave and intelligent officers in command, and Americans at the guns, Uncle Sam may feel secure to face, without flinching, every just and righteous cause. With such a navy ready for instant action and a small army trained to the highest efficiency, so as to form a nucleus for the great bodies of citizen soldiery that would spring up at the first call to arms, we might well rest ourselves in the sustaining knowledge of our invincibility. [Applause.]

Such a navy would be a source of safety and comfort to our citizens in foreign lands, while to the people of the great commercial ports and seacoast of our own country it would be a means of protection which we of this generation may not fully appreciate until a hostile fleet comes thundering at our doors. Nay, more, it would be, indeed, a guaranty of our country's peace so long as we conduct ourselves in conformity to the laws of God and the practices of just and honest nations, for, with the best ships that money can buy, with nothing wanting in the brain and brawn of their crews, and nothing lacking in the number and quality of weapons, no government would care to disturb our serenity except for good and sufficient reasons.

You gentlemen I see around me grown gray in the country's service must know all this, and I can hope but to emphasize a fact well recognized wherever good thought and sound judgment obtain among men. And yet, filled as you are with this knowledge, you still hold doggedly to a policy that you know is wrong, showering upon West Point the bounties of your table while allowing Annapolis to pick up the crumbs of cold comfort which the gentlemen of the Naval Affairs Committee grudgingly sweep to the floor.

These are facts, not fancies. And right here I shall read a few figures, culled from official sources, to sustain me in my position. They are contained in statements of the amounts expended on the buildings and grounds of the Military and Naval Academies, respectively, for construction, repairs, grading, etc., during each fiscal year from July 1, 1886, to January 31, 1898:

Fiscal year.	Military Academy.	Naval Academy.
1887	\$140,520.00	\$21,000.00
1888	2,670.00	30,950.51
1889	617,470.20	50,991.87
1890	5,161.96	20,996.57
1891	123,328.00	64,455.41
1892	65,672.70	39,875.83
1893	114,646.00	20,815.17
1894	90,685.69	76,900.75
1895	340,000.23	48,968.71
1896	58,451.25	30,980.00
1897	111,770.00	98,913.35
1898	82,244.00	18,412.00
Total	1,732,088.03	523,280.76

During the fiscal year 1890 the sum of \$90,000 was expended for the purchase of land adjacent to the Naval Academy, which is not included in the above statement.

Why you have treated the naval school in this way year after year I can not say. If it is because of the condition of the country's finances, I would respectfully submit that there is a broad inconsistency in this upholding of the appropriations for the military students and the scaling down of the appropriations for those for the Navy. And if you have never seen the matter in this light—which I grant is highly improbable—readjust your glasses and get the right view of things. Remember that the Navy is the bulwark of the country, and the nation that neglects its navy in these days will find itself at the mercy of another power when it is too late to remedy the mistake.

What is the feeling of the public upon this subject? The newspapers of Maryland, and especially those of Baltimore City, have given much publicity to the general condition of the Naval Academy and to the proposition to replace gradually the existing buildings with others befitting the importance and dignity of the institution. I have no doubt that the matter has been given wide circulation, and I would ask any member whether he has had one letter from a constituent urging him to use the pruning knife upon any amendment that might be offered to increase the appropriation with this purpose in view.

For myself I will say that the people of Baltimore City, a large portion of whom I have the honor to represent, are a conservative community who watch carefully the trend of national legislation, and are quick not to allow their Representatives to remain in the dark as to their wishes upon any important question; and yet I have not heard one word of protest against the effort to have given to the Naval Academy what rightfully belongs to it. The merchants, not only of Baltimore, but the country over, know that it is to their interest to have an efficient Navy to protect their property from foreign invasion; they know that there can be no efficient Navy without efficient officers and that there can be no efficient officers without the facilities to train them to efficiency in both a physical and mental sense.

And right in this connection I think it is proper to ask the members of this House if they know that fifty of the naval cadets, or 20 per cent of the whole number at the Academy, are suffering from an affection of the eyes caused by the poor light by which they have to study. That was the case a few weeks ago, and I can not say whether the number of cadets so afflicted has decreased or increased since. As one newspaper very truthfully remarks, "The

sight of fifty naval cadets, robust, healthy-looking youngsters, equipped with eyeglasses is not a tribute to the lighting system of a school where it might be supposed that everything is done to promote the health of the students." I should like to ask the members of this body whether they are willing that the boys they nominate for Annapolis should suffer from the want of proper lighting facilities? I am sure you do not, and I am convinced that whether you vote for this amendment or not you will demand that some improvement be made in this regard at least.

You will realize how serious the condition is when you know that the imperfect lighting may cause the dismissal of a number of students whose eyes will not permit them to keep up with their studies, and among them are several who stand well in their classes, and whom the instructors think would make fine naval officers. Gas is still used, one burner for two boys to study by, and the gas fixtures are identically the same that were put in place more than thirty years ago. There should be a modern electric-lighting plant at the Academy, but there is not, and a story could be told in that connection that would mantle the cheeks of honest people with righteous indignation. [Applause.]

But bad lights are but a single item in the bill of complaint that might be lodged against the Naval Academy as it stands today, for the parsimonious policy of Congress has wrought sad havoc. I wish you gentlemen could find time to take a stroll through the old town of Annapolis, as I have done, along its quiet streets, beneath its spreading trees, past its quaint cottages of another century. I would have you go to the chamber in the state-house where Washington resigned his commission of Commander in Chief of the Continental forces, to turn your thoughts to that noble man and to think of the pride he would have taken in seeing the country he did so much to make prospering and expanding under the blessings of God and the virtues of its people. Then quickly I would have you leave the chamber, cross the sward of State House Circle, and a moment later enter the grounds of the Naval Academy. Beautiful grounds, you say. Yes; well laid out and well kept, thanks to the care of the officers of the post. But the buildings you would never take to be the only naval school of the greatest nation of the globe. You could scarcely blame the Washington who laid down the sword but a few rods distant were he to appear in the flesh and repent having been the father of a country whose progress, taking its naval school as a criterion, must have been of the snail, if not the lobster, variety.

And John Paul Jones and Decatur and Perry, to say nothing of the later-day Farragut, were they allowed to talk, would not hold golden opinions of a nation which let the rising young exponents of a profession they helped to make glorious dig away for knowledge in badly ventilated garrets and buildings that have to be propped up to prevent collapse. No, gentlemen, the Naval Academy has not kept pace with the march of progress, and we alone are responsible.

Why, sirs, it is a marvel to me, when I see the conditions under which the bright boys down there are striving to prepare themselves for their life's business, that we have such a splendid set of officers as sail our ships to-day. Perhaps things were not so bad some years ago, but certainly the Academy has never been accorded that liberality by Congress to which it is entitled. The buildings seem to have been put up without regard for any idea that took into consideration the future importance of the institution. They were erected on a sort of "come day, go day, God send Sunday" plan, a plan for which some excuse might have been found in the earlier stages of life of the Academy, but which, continued as it has been up to the present time, is simply without the pale of apology.

Whenever the needs of the growing school became so urgent that the demand for covered space for the cadets could no longer be ignored, some kind of a makeshift structure was thrown up in which neither the art of the builder nor the skill of the architect was put to any pains, and the result was another addition to the unsightly group of rookeries which now form the larger part of the buildings. For some forty years this haphazard process has been going on, and the lamentable outcome is open to all who care for an ocular demonstration of the Government's grievous error. With no large appropriation for the school for thirty years, the officers in charge have had to do the best they could with what was at their disposal. When decay began to fasten itself upon this patchwork of framework can not be told, but it has eaten its way along until there is little left of the buildings but so many rotten timbers.

An illustration that may be cited to show that this is so is the old recitation hall, daily used by about 250 cadets, which was in last November reported by Superintendent Cooper to be liable to collapse at any time. In so much danger was it that the Superintendent begged the Department to take some action "to prevent a terrible catastrophe." The Secretary immediately wired Captain Cooper to vacate the hall at once. When the hall was later made the subject of an official inspection, it was ordered to be

torn down, not only because of its unsafety, but also for the reason that its condition caused apprehension that other structures in the neighborhood might be endangered by it. Upon recommendation of the Navy Department Congress appropriated \$5,000, to be immediately available, for a temporary shed for recitation purposes.

This shed is now in course of building. Pending its completion these 250 cadets recite in a loft or attic, with pieces of sail for partitions between the several classes. Each class has to recite in the lowest tone in order that the others may not be disturbed, and you can easily imagine that the course of instruction is much interfered with.

It would be a heavy task to point out in detail all the shortcomings of the Academy, for it may be said with truth that such a work would embrace the buildings, almost without exception, on the grounds. There are a few points, however, to which I should like to call particular attention. Take, for instance, the "new quarters," as it is called, the most impressive building of the group. Erected to tide over an emergency, it is in the same condition as the rest of the temporary structures, pressed into permanent use. Imposing as it looks, it is a poor building, and there is a suspicious unsoundness about everything.

Crowded to a degree that the health of the cadets is endangered, with a lack of conveniences for living and bad studying arrangements, and an air of rack and fast-approaching ruin visible on every hand, this building is anything but a source of comfort to the young men who are compelled to pass their days under its roof. There is no place for the proper inspection of the cadets, and some portions of the floor are so weak that the cadets have to adopt "route step" in marching to lessen the likelihood of a collapse.

The armory, the only place in which the cadets can drill in bad weather, is totally inadequate for the purpose. The walls are cracked, the floor is shaky, and the building as a whole has been declared unsafe. That this is so is evidenced by the fact that it had to be abandoned until it was propped up from the outside by heavy timbers. The foundations of the boathouse, built six years ago, are already tremulous. There is not accommodation for all the boats used, and the house is very badly located. This building has been condemned.

The gas works are unsafe and "not susceptible of improvement." These are a few of the defects. I might refer to the store-rooms, which are in such shape that the paymaster has notified the Department that he will not be responsible for the safety of the articles in his charge; to the officers' quarters, and to the chemical and physical laboratories, in scarcely more complimentary terms, but it would consume too much time.

Instead I would simply direct your attention to the report of Superintendent Cooper on the condition of the buildings, and to bring to your mind the terms "disgrace to the nation," "in dangerous condition," "better than nothing," "capacity too limited," "unworthy of repair," "tumbling down," "unsightly and unsuitable," "walls cracked," and a host of other phrases descriptive of the structures.

I would also invite your inspection of the letter of Secretary Long, under date of January 8 of this year, on this matter, to the Committees on Naval Affairs of both Houses of Congress, and that of Assistant Secretary Roosevelt to his chief. In one comprehensive sentence Mr. Long gives pointed expression to the thought which I attempted to impress upon you a few moments ago. He says:

It would be poor economy to construct at great expense a numerous fleet of modern war vessels, complicated in every feature, without at the same time making ample and generous provision for the training of a body of officers who shall possess the requisite skill to care for and handle them economically, safely, and, should national emergency arise, effectively.

This "requisite skill," I may add upon my own responsibility, if it is being attained at the Academy, is acquired under adverse circumstances, such as we have no right to enforce upon the students here.

Mr. Roosevelt, in his usual forceful style, points out that there is certain work which it is absolutely indispensable should be done now; confirms in every particular the statements, coming from official and unofficial sources, of the decrepitude of the Academy buildings, and then goes into details with reference to the scheme submitted by Superintendent Cooper for the gradual development of the institution on common-sense lines, indorsing the plan without qualification.

Annapolis is the natural abiding place of the Naval Academy, and it was a keen, far-sighted judgment that chose the site. In a State that forms a connecting link between the North and South; near the seacoast, and upon a sheet of water that offers splendid facilities for naval evolutions; in proximity to the capital of the nation, and at a point that is susceptible of strong defense in time of war; with no large city or excessive festivities to distract the thought of the students, the Ancient City defies competition based upon a test of true merit.

With the \$500,000 which the present amendment calls for to start in this work of revivification and fitting appropriations in succeeding years the school will by degrees assume that dignity and standing which its character demands. Then, with West Point and Annapolis both in the best possible condition, equipped with the proper facilities for fashioning the brain and body, our Army and Navy will be officered by the best material that the world can command.

It is pleasing to me to note that men whose experience makes their opinion worth something are of one mind on this matter of developing the Naval Academy, if the words attributed to them by the press be recorded correctly. A commission composed of officers whose ability and judgment are not to be questioned inspected the Academy in 1895, and transmitted a report to the Senate. Nothing ever came of that report and its suggestions, and the reports of the Board of Visitors, recommending that something be done for the relief of the school, have been treated in the same manner.

The report of the commission was especially exhaustive. Every building and every foot of ground had been studied by the members, plans for the improvements contemplated were drawn up by a competent architect, and estimates made showing what it would cost to remodel the Academy. The plan, while calling for the expenditure of a large sum of money, about \$6,000,000, was really not extravagant, and made the burden upon the Government light by extending the expenditure over a term of years. It was based simply upon the actual requirements of the Academy. But, as I say, nothing ever came of the recommendations, the matter having been allowed to drop until the imperative needs of the school were emphasized by the threatened collapse, which called forth the cry for help from Superintendent Cooper last November.

Rear-Admiral Matthews, formerly commandant of the Yards and Docks Bureau, who was president of the commission to which I made reference, is in accord with the view which I would ask the House to accept to-day. He says the plan, if carried out, would soon give the Government the right sort of an academy. Commander W. H. Brownson, formerly commandant of cadets at Annapolis, after pronouncing the school "a disgrace to the Government," proceeds to advocate a complete rejuvenation. Rear-Admiral Norton says the Academy is "a reproach" and should be attended to at once. Captain Crowninshield, Chief of the Navigation Bureau, says:

If Congress does not attend to the Academy at once there will be no place where the future officers of the Navy can be properly educated.

Naval Constructor Dashiell says it is remarkable that the course of instruction has been kept up so well in the face of the existing difficulties.

I am glad to note, too, that Senators and Representatives, without distinction of party, have stamped the plan for the development of the school with their approval. Can we afford to hesitate in the face of the overwhelming, nondivergent, intelligent, and convincing mass of opinion that confronts us? Shall we longer sit idly by and allow the Naval Academy to languish when we know full well the inevitable result of such a course? Shall we not be held accountable by the people, to whom this school is an honored and loved institution, for our action to-day? Let us rise to the occasion like wise and patriotic men, and in doing so infuse new hope and energy in the breasts of our naval students, place one more act to our credit upon which to base the claim of the confidence of the people in their representatives, and show to the world that we have strengthened our protection in time of war and the means of prolonging peace. [Applause.]

During the delivery of the foregoing,

Mr. NORTON of Ohio said: Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order. This is a most important subject, and I think the gentleman is giving us valuable information for our action. I ask that the committee be in order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained. The committee will please be in order.

The time of Mr. MCINTIRE having expired,

Mr. HARTMAN asked unanimous consent that he be allowed to complete his remarks.

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. If the House desires to hear the gentleman further, I have no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCINTIRE resumed and completed the delivery of the foregoing remarks.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York.

Mr. HOPKINS. Before the gentleman from Maryland takes his seat, I desire to ask him a question.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York yield? Mr. CUMMINGS. I do.

Mr. HOPKINS. Some suggestion has been made that if this amendment should be carried it means more money than is expressed in the amendment. I desire to ask the gentleman who has just addressed the committee whether this amendment contemplates the expenditure of any more money than is expressed in the amendment itself?

Mr. McINTIRE. Not at this time.

Mr. HANDY. What was that reply?

Mr. McINTIRE. Not at this time.

Mr. MUDD. The amendment does not provide for the appropriation of any more money than is stated in the amendment.

Mr. DINGLEY. What expenditure does the plan contemplated by the Navy Department involve?

Mr. McINTIRE. The plan as contemplated by the Navy Department and recommended by Matthews contemplates the expenditure, in possibly a period of eight or nine years, of \$6,000,000.

Mr. HENDERSON. How much by the pending amendment?

Mr. McINTIRE. Five hundred thousand dollars.

Mr. MUDD. I will state in reply to the question of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HOPKINS], that the amendment provides for no further expenditure of money and for no further contracts for the expenditure of money than that which is named in the amendment, \$500,000. Of course the future will take care of itself.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I should like to have the amendment read.

The CHAIRMAN. For the information of the committee the Clerk will again report the amendment.

The amendment was again read.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, for ten years an effort has been made to improve the grounds and reconstruct the buildings at the United States Naval Academy. They were unfit for the Academy in the first place, but we have been using the old buildings for years, patching them up and spending thousands upon thousands of dollars upon them in an effort to make them habitable and healthy. Still, sir, it is in evidence to-day that they are hardly habitable and are actually unhealthy. I have been a member of the Board of Visitors to the Academy. I have been on the subcommittee on Buildings and Grounds, and I tell you to-day that in my opinion many a cadet has died at the Naval Academy from typhoid fever because the Congress of the United States has not done its duty toward the reconstruction of this Academy.

The Academy to-day, as it stands, its buildings, and its grounds are an absolute disgrace to the American Government, and I know what I am talking about. Several efforts have been made by the Committee on Naval Affairs, at different times, to take initiative steps toward the rebuilding and reconstruction of the Naval Academy. All have failed. Why they have failed is not for me to say. Possibly in other cities of the United States there are business men who have a longing eye on the Naval Academy and desire its transfer to another location. I do not say that that is so, but I do say it seems to be the underlying spirit which has prevented the rebuilding of the Naval Academy and the putting of it into the condition in which it ought to be.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I shall favor this amendment. It is time that the initiative step was taken. It is time that the young men of our country who are sent there to learn naval engineering and take the course which is prescribed at the Academy shall have some provision to insure their lives when they enter the Academy. This can only be done by providing spacious and healthy quarters for their use, with proper sanitary precautions and grounds ample for naval evolutions and drills.

I hope, Mr. Chairman, that this step will be taken by Congress; for I believe if it is not taken, the committee will be in the same condition for years to come as it has been for years in the past and the reconstruction of this Academy be delayed for years. [Applause.]

Mr. BROMWELL. Mr. Chairman, I shall take but a few minutes of the time of this House in urging the passage of this amendment. I made a personal inspection a short time ago of the buildings and grounds at Annapolis, and I wish to assure the House that the statements that have been made by Representatives on this floor in regard to the condition of those buildings and their unfitness for the use of this great Naval Academy have not been overdrawn. There was a time, in the days of old wooden ships, when the cadet at Annapolis could prepare himself for the duties connected with the naval service by acquiring knowledge merely of navigation and the handling of a few of the old-time guns.

To-day the man who goes upon one of our war vessels must be an expert in every line of scientific knowledge. He must be a man that is in the forefront of the inventions and discoveries of science in the world. A single disqualified or unfit commander of one of these great battle ships, for which we spend millions of dollars, can cause the loss to this Government of a great many more dol-

lars even in a few minutes, to say nothing of possible loss of life, than all the expenditures that we can reasonably expect to make on this Academy.

Mr. Chairman, the time was when the Army of the United States was looked upon as our great arm of defense. The time was, in the days of wooden vessels of war, that a few months were all that were required to build up the Navy. It was largely recruited from our merchant marine; but our merchant marine has gone, and there is no longer a possibility of constructing vessels of war inside of one, two, or three years. The Army of the United States is no longer the one arm of defense upon which we must depend. The battles of our country in the future, the battles of our country at this time, if we are to have any, must be fought by the Navy of the United States.

It is absolutely necessary, then, that we should prepare in a proper manner the young men who are one day to become the Sigsbees of our future Navy. I have seen the dilapidated condition of these buildings, and I say it is a disgrace to this Congress that this great Naval Academy should be in the condition it is in. It is not a local matter; it is not a matter simply of the State of Maryland; not a matter that concerns the Representatives of that State.

It is our matter, your matter and mine, that this great Academy should be put in proper condition. We take out of our districts the pick and choice of the young men among our constituents to send them to Annapolis to get this training which is going to fit them for future usefulness; and it is a duty we owe them that we should give to them, while taking this course of academic instruction, buildings that are safe in which to get an education which will in the highest and best manner possible make them the skilled handlers of the future navies of the United States.

Mr. HANDY. Mr. Chairman, I wish to offer a substitute for the pending amendment, which I will send to the desk and ask to have read.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the substitute.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Secretary of the Navy is authorized to contract for the construction, at the Naval Academy, Annapolis, Md., of a building suitable for use as an armory, at a cost not to exceed \$300,000; a boathouse, at a cost not to exceed \$300,000; a power house, at a cost not to exceed \$100,000; four double houses for officers' quarters, at a cost not to exceed \$60,000, and for grading, electric-light wiring, removing old buildings, and preparing plans, at a cost not to exceed \$90,000; and the sum of \$500,000 is hereby appropriated toward the construction of the public works herein authorized.

Mr. HANDY. I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed to discuss this amendment and its substitute for ten minutes beyond the five allowed under the rule.

There was no objection.

Mr. RIDGELY. Before the gentleman proceeds, I would like to ask him a question.

Mr. HANDY. Certainly.

Mr. RIDGELY. I have been informed that this locality, Annapolis, is not as healthy a locality as are many others which might be made available for the naval school.

Mr. HANDY. I think the gentleman has been misinformed.

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. Of course he has.

Mr. RIDGELY. Can you give any statistics as to the sanitary condition, as to health reports, compared with other places?

Mr. HANDY. I have not the health reports with me, but the salubrious climate of that part of the country is well known by everybody living in this general section of the country.

Mr. LOVE. I wish to ask the gentleman a question for information, and perhaps I had better do it now and not interrupt him later. If I am correctly informed, the buildings are all in a dilapidated condition, and I want to know if the amount asked for is to repair these old buildings, said to have been poorly constructed in the beginning and not in keeping with the progress of modern architecture or present necessities; and if so, whether it would be wise to put this appropriation of \$500,000 into the repair of old buildings that must necessarily soon be replaced by new ones?

Mr. HANDY. That is a pertinent question. The substitute for the amendment is taken word for word from a clause prepared by the Secretary of the Navy and submitted to this Congress. It does not provide for the repairing and patching up of old buildings. It provides for building several new buildings in accordance with a general plan. It differs from the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MUDD] only in this respect: His amendment appropriates \$500,000, which is enough for the present year, and stops there. My substitute makes exactly the same appropriation for this year, but the Secretary of the Navy wishes to contract for the construction of three or four buildings, their total cost to be \$850,000. I consider it wiser and more economical to give the Secretary of the Navy authority to make the contract to complete the buildings than to give him a lump sum of \$500,000 (not sufficient to complete them) and tie

him up with the provision that he must build them all within that sum.

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

Mr. HANDY. Certainly.

Mr. BELKNAP. Are these buildings that your amendment proposes to contract for the ones that are most needed?

Mr. HANDY. So says the Secretary of the Navy. The substitute I have offered is the substitute drafted by the Secretary of the Navy and submitted to the House. You will find in this Senate Document No. 55 a draft of a clause drawn by the Secretary of the Navy with the hope it would be inserted in the naval appropriation bill. I have offered that clause as a substitute for the amendment of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MUDD].

Now, Mr. Chairman, this Government has two great schools, one at West Point and the other at Annapolis; one for the Army and the other for the Navy. The one at West Point is in the North and the one at Annapolis is in the South. The party controlling this House, the party controlling the Naval Affairs Committee at the present time, has allowed the Naval Academy at Annapolis to rot. The school in the South has been neglected; its buildings have been permitted to fall into absolute decay, until at last, in November, 1897, the recitation building actually was in danger of collapsing. They telegraphed, I believe, so great was the necessity—no, it was sent by mail—they sent a report from Annapolis to the Secretary of the Navy setting forth that the recitation hall in that institution, daily used by 250 cadets, was liable to collapse at any time, and recommended that immediate action be taken to prevent some terrible catastrophe.

The Department immediately by telegraph directed the Superintendent of the Academy not to use the recitation hall thus reported unsafe. The Department sent down an engineer, who made an investigation and such a report on the building that it has been abandoned and torn down. Congress appropriated \$5,000 to put up a temporary shelter, which is being used for recitations. The general situation is so bad at Annapolis that another building is in such a condition that it has to be propped up by timbers to keep it from falling down. They had to abandon that building or prop it up. While the Naval Committee of this House has thus permitted the buildings at Annapolis to decay, the committee in charge of the Academy at West Point has been building it up and putting up good buildings there until the buildings of the Military Academy are all that can be asked for.

Mr. Chairman, I say now that the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs, as the committee stands here, is seriously to blame for having allowed this Naval Academy to run down in the matter of its buildings to its present condition. Yesterday the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs interposed objections to this matter because, forsooth, the amendment did not do enough. He wanted to wait, as I gathered from him, until he could bring in a measure that would do all that was necessary. His committee has for years had this situation before it. For years the gentleman from Maine has been very patient and willing, apparently, to let the buildings at Annapolis go to decay. But suddenly, when there is a bill here that is going to pass—the naval appropriation bill—and it is proposed to do something substantial in this bill for the Academy—suddenly he is not willing to do a little; he wants to wait to bring in a bill (which will not pass) that shall reorganize the whole affair and do a great deal. Mr. Chairman, I wonder whether the gentleman from Maine wants that Academy to rot to the ground, so that he may have it moved somewhere up in New England?

This is a bill of most generous appropriation. This is a naval appropriation bill, actually appropriating millions more than the Department asks for. Yet in this bill, granting millions more than were ever granted before, the gentleman from Maine can not find a place to do anything for this Naval Academy at Annapolis. "Emergency," he says. "Emergency" required the authorizing of expenditures which can not be utilized for years. An "emergency" required, I presume, that the Naval Academy at Annapolis should rot further and further toward the ground. The gentleman had to have—I call the attention of the House to this fact—the gentleman had to have a dry dock at Portsmouth, N. H.; but he did not have to have a new building at Annapolis, Md.

We people of the Southern and Middle States do not object to all proper expenditures at West Point; but we have reached a position where we object to allowing the Naval Academy at Annapolis to rot in order—well, I will not say in order to accomplish any particular purpose, but the gentleman from New York [Mr. CUMMINGS] suggested that he had heard whispers that it was desired to move this Academy to some other place.

Mr. Chairman, the Secretary of the Navy has reported on this matter favorably. Every Board of Visitors for years has reported on it favorably. The Superintendent of the school, Captain Cooper, has presented a report showing in vivid light the necessities of the institution in the matter of buildings.

This substitute provides for three principal buildings. First, an

armory. What does the Superintendent say about the present armory?

The armory, which was abandoned until supported by the erection of heavy timber props along the western wall.

Mr. Chairman, when the armory at the Naval Academy has to be "supported by heavy timber props along the western wall," there is certainly necessity for a new armory.

I provide further in this substitute for a boathouse. On this subject the Superintendent says:

The boathouse, which was declared unsafe for many of its original purposes, and as unworthy of repair.

Mr. Chairman, when the boathouse at the Naval Academy has come to be "unsafe" and "unworthy of repair," the time has certainly come for building a new boathouse. This House ought not to hesitate a moment in authorizing the expenditure.

It appears further by this report of the Superintendent that the main recitation hall is utterly gone—has been torn down. The Superintendent says:

The main recitation hall, which is now being demolished as a menace to life.

Mr. Chairman, all these buildings are dilapidated. Then the Superintendent comes down to cadet quarters. What does he say about them?

Cadets' quarters: This building is a disgrace to the nation and would not be tolerated in any self-respecting municipality—cheap, unsanitary, and in a state of decrepitude.

Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Naval Affairs of this House, headed by the gentleman from Maine, although they knew from this statement of the Superintendent which was before them that the cadet quarters are in a building which is "a disgrace to the nation" and "would not be tolerated in any self-respecting municipality—cheap, unsanitary, and in a state of decrepitude," could not bring in any proposition on this bill for the erection of new buildings there.

Mr. HARTMAN. Probably they had not the consent of "the leading commercial nations of the earth."

Mr. HANDY. Oh, I hardly think we are going to wait for the consent of "the leading commercial nations of the earth." If we can only get the consent of one foreign State—if we can get the consent of the foreign State of Maine, we shall then be permitted to do this necessary work. We shall not await the consent of any other foreign country, save only Maine.

Mr. Chairman, it is necessary for us to meet this question in a generous spirit. For that reason I appeal to the House to substitute my proposition for that of the gentleman from Maryland. The purpose of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MUDD] is right; yet he feared to ask for enough. He feared a point of order, I fancy. He feared there would be a spirit of objection strong enough to overcome him. Mr. Chairman, as a friend of the Academy I would rather see my proposition adopted, even if you cut down the appropriation for this year to \$300,000, with authority to contract for all these buildings, than the proposition of the gentleman from Maryland, which would give \$500,000 this year, with no power to contract for buildings to their completion.

I can not close, Mr. Chairman, without making a reference to one of the remarks of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MCINTIRE]. That gentleman evidently did what he could on this floor to help this amendment. But in effect and in fact he did serious injury to the proposition. Certainly if gentlemen on this side of the Chamber had heard one of his comments—sitting close to him I heard it—it would have done his proposition very serious injury. He attempted to make something of political capital out of this matter. He called attention to the fact that he and his friends in this Congress were very active, while the Congressmen from Maryland in past Congresses, being Democrats, had been less active in this matter.

Mr. MCINTIRE. Will the gentleman permit an interruption just there?

Mr. HANDY. With pleasure.

Mr. MCINTIRE. Let me say that the only proposition I have ever heard of the only effort which was inaugurated and not prosecuted was because of the opposition of a Republican member of Congress.

Mr. HANDY. I did not catch the gentleman's remark. What is that?

Mr. MCINTIRE. I say that the only effort intended in the House seriously to rejuvenate the Academy was stopped by the opposition of a Republican member. That is to show that there is nothing sectional in this matter.

Mr. HANDY. Mr. Chairman, if this proposition passes the House, as I think it will and think it ought, it will be because the Democrats sitting on this side of the House will be animated by a patriotic purpose and will join with those gentlemen on the other side who are in favor of doing justice to this institution. [Applause.]

The members who preceded the gentleman from Maryland on this floor in former Congresses were Democrats and the State of

Maryland need not be ashamed of them or of any of them. The immediate predecessor, I believe, of the gentleman from Maryland who has just addressed the House was the Hon. John K. Cowen, equally as intelligent, as able, and as active as the present Representative from that district. It was therefore a mistake of the gentleman to try to make political capital by throwing a reflection on former Maryland Congressmen. I understand from his remarks now that he did not mean to do that and that such was not his intention.

The truth is, that the Academy has been kept down by the Naval Committee of the House of Representatives, with the gentleman from Maine at the head of it; and it has been kept out of this bill by the Republican members of the Committee on Naval Affairs. The ranking member on the Democratic side of the committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CUMMINGS], was the first to get up on this floor and speak in favor of the Naval Academy. The Democratic members on the committee, so far as I know, are all in favor of improving this institution. The amendment, when it passes the House, as I think it will, will be passed because of the almost solid vote on the Democratic side of the House in favor of this patriotic proposition.

We are ready to treat with absolute impartiality and fairness both the Military Academy at West Point and the Naval Academy at Annapolis. We propose to treat both of them equally well and with due consideration, and to treat both of them just as they should be treated as institutions of this Government, important and necessary. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BELKNAP. Mr. Chairman, I do not regard this question as at all a political one. Gentlemen on both sides of the House have spoken most earnestly in favor of the proposition, or substantially the proposition, that is now pending. It is not a question concerning any particular section of the country, either the North or the South. It refers to and is in the interest of every portion of our common land.

I am heartily in favor of the proposition to make an appropriation for the improvement of the buildings at the Naval Academy at Annapolis. Under present conditions this, in my judgment, is most necessary. It is a disgrace, the condition in which these buildings are permitted to exist at this time.

I am heartily in favor of improving the Navy in every respect possible, and also of increasing the appropriation for our Naval Reserve. It was a surprise and a matter of sincere regret to me that the amendment offered the other day to increase the appropriation for the Naval Reserve from \$60,000 to \$100,000 was defeated on this floor. There is no gentleman who has recently visited the Naval Academy who will not admit the desirability of prompt action in this matter. It is a necessity which all can see.

I had occasion recently to spend a Sunday at the Academy. There is a young man in the institution from Louisiana, a fine young fellow, with whom I am acquainted. I called upon him, and to my extreme regret and surprise he made his appearance with large goggles upon his eyes, showing that he was suffering from an affliction which affected his sight, and I learned then that not only he but that two score more of the young men in that institution were in the same deplorable condition, suffering from inefficient light in which they are compelled to pursue their studies.

One of the old buildings had to be abandoned, as it was about tumbling down. They have erected a temporary building to take its place, but it is a mere barn or shed and a disgrace to the American nation. It would not be tolerated a moment if people could understand the situation. I investigated the matter of the condition of these buildings thoroughly and carefully. I talked with the officers in reference to the same, and they called my attention to one of the larger buildings occupied by the young men, one side of which in winter is kept warm with the greatest difficulty, and as a result many of the students have suffered from pneumonia and other sicknesses; and I have not the slightest doubt that many of the cadets, the flower of our American youth, have contracted diseases there which have resulted in their death.

Gentlemen, no true lover of his country can but be proud of our corps of naval cadets. There is no sincere lover of his country who can but feel pride in the naval history of this nation. At the Naval Academy each man has a fair show. There are found there the sons of poor men and the sons of rich men studying alike side by side; bright, energetic young fellows undergoing a thorough and trying course of instruction, each young man striving to excel, and it is a shame and a source of sorrow that the American nation has been so negligent of the needs of this splendid institution.

I appeal, therefore, to the House—I appeal to both sides of this Chamber, to vote unanimously for a liberal appropriation to start these much-needed improvements at one of the very best schools in all the world. [Applause.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, the future wars of this country will be conflicts with foreign countries, and the Navy will be the arm of the service upon which we must depend.

I am glad and proud to say, Mr. Chairman, that our corps of naval officers, superb, gallant, and efficient, will be found equal to the highest possible expectations of the country. There can be no question but that the naval officers of the United States are very far superior to those of any other nation.

The war of 1861 was very largely internal, and while the Navy did its full duty, the nature of the conflict was such that the Army was brought more prominently before the country and the world. It is very probably owing to this circumstance that since 1861 the attention of Congress has been directed rather more to the military than to the Naval Academy. For many years I was a member of the Military Committee, and it was one of my duties to prepare the annual appropriation bill for the Military Academy.

I have been several times a member of the Board of Visitors, and this, too, tended to familiarize me with the conditions and improvements at that place. It is only of late years that I have visited the Naval Academy, and I have been astonished to see how that important institution has been neglected. Speaking entirely from memory, I recall one appropriation of \$900,000 to erect a new academic building at West Point, and the one torn down to make room for the present magnificent edifice was superior to any now in use at the Naval Academy.

I recall another appropriation of \$125,000 for a gymnasium, another of \$24,000 for bathrooms, \$50,000 to improve the gas works, between \$30,000 and \$40,000 for sewerage, about the same sum for reservoir and waterworks, and nearly every year we appropriated a considerable sum for quarters for officers and soldiers. Never having been on the Naval Committee, I did not know until I looked into it that while these liberal appropriations were being made for the Military Academy, so little was being done for the Naval Academy.

I give below, in parallel columns, the amounts expended for buildings and grounds at the Military Academy and the Naval Academy during the last twelve years. It will be seen that during that time there has been spent for the Military Academy three and a half times the amount spent for the Naval Academy:

Expenditures for public buildings and grounds at the Military Academy and the Naval Academy from 1887 to 1898, inclusive, as prepared by the Department.

Year.	Military Academy.	Naval Academy.
1887	\$140,520.00	\$21,000.00
1888	2,670.00	30,950.51
1889	617,470.20	50,991.87
1890	5,161.96	20,996.57
1891	123,328.00	64,455.41
1892	65,672.70	39,875.83
1893	114,646.00	20,815.17
1894	90,065.69	76,900.75
1895	340,090.23	48,968.71
1896	58,451.25	30,980.00
1897	111,770.00	98,913.35
1898	82,244.00	18,412.00
Total	1,752,088.03	523,260.76

There is no possible reason for this discrimination. The law provides for the appointment of precisely the same number of cadets at the Naval as at the Military Academy. It is true that the vacancies to be filled in the Navy are much fewer than in the Army, and I understand that it was for that reason that the course was extended to include two years' sea service, the effect of which would be to reduce the annual number of graduates to about two-thirds what it would be if the graduation occurred at the end of four years, as it does at the Military Academy.

The necessity of fewer graduates at the Naval Academy justified the officials in exacting a much higher grade of efficiency than is required at the Military Academy. And this, exacting as it does a closer and more intense study, should have caused Congress to increase the comforts and facilities of these young men, rather than the reverse, as has been done. It is these young men, Mr. Chairman, that we are educating to become the defenders of the honor and prestige of this great nation upon the sea.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I can not doubt but that this amendment will receive the favorable consideration of this House. There is no question but what it will meet with the highest approbation of the country. We see the reports of the Secretary of the Navy, the reports of the various Superintendents of the Academy, and the reports of the Boards of Visitors year after year insisting and demanding that this question shall receive the attention of Congress.

Something has been said about the healthfulness of that locality. The only want of healthfulness has been occasioned, as I understand from the medical officer's reports, by the unsanitary buildings and other unsanitary conditions, and in their reports they appeal to Congress to provide for the Naval Academy with the same measure of the generosity and liberality that have been extended to the Military Academy.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I speak of these things from actual observation. I largely contributed to the passage of the measures which placed the Military Academy buildings and grounds in the condition in which they now are; and when I visited the Naval Academy and saw those inferior, unsanitary buildings, I could not conceive how this discrimination had arisen until I recalled the great eclat given to the Army by the war of 1861-1865, which brought it so much more prominently before the country, and I realized that as having enabled the Military Academy to secure the appropriations which have put it in its present superb condition.

I appeal to Congress to vote for this amendment and to give to the Naval Academy that which is essential to the comfort and health of the young men of our land who are sent there by members of Congress, and who, as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BELKNAP] has said, are striving with most commendable zeal and energy to fit themselves to become officers, to defend the honor of our country.

I thank the House for its attention. [Applause.]

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. Mr. Chairman, I do not know whether I ought to make even an effort to speak, after the withering arraignment which the distinguished gentleman from Delaware [Mr. HANDY] delivered, in occupying the time which he solicited of me. I suppose I ought to be sufficiently annihilated to keep quiet, but I want to call attention to just one or two facts. One of the facts is that the gentleman is the first person who has ever brought a sectional charge before this House in connection with the Naval Academy. I attribute a great deal of it to his intense feeling. I did not know that he was so intense a Southerner. As a matter of fact, I did not know he was a Southerner at all. I had an idea that Delaware was sort of betwixt and between. But he has seen fit to arraign me, as chairman of the Naval Committee, as being responsible for permitting the Naval Academy to rot, and he has intimated very strongly that I have done that because I live in Maine and because the Naval Academy is in Annapolis.

Now, I want to give to the gentleman, who is somewhat fresh here [laughter], a little information. I want to inform the gentleman that when he made that charge and put it on a sectional basis he was attempting, in what I regard as not a gentlemanly way, to make an assault upon a present member of the committee, which was just as applicable and more applicable to other gentlemen, concerning whom neither he nor anybody else would ever think of asserting a prejudice against the South. The gentleman probably does not know that during the fifteen years I have been a member of the Naval Committee I have only had the good fortune to be chairman of that committee for five years. Two years of that time that committee was presided over by a very distinguished gentleman now deceased, the Hon. Mr. Cox, of New York, and no man suspects him of having been prejudiced against the South.

For six years of that time that committee was very ably presided over, with my constant and hearty cooperation, by the distinguished gentleman from Alabama, Hon. Hilary A. Herbert, who was never suspected of prejudice against the South. For two years of that time that committee was presided over by the distinguished gentleman from New York, Mr. CUMMINGS, who certainly has never been suspected of prejudice against the South. So I dismiss that whole business as claptrap unworthy of being injected into the discussion of a business matter before this House. I am ready to take the floor, responsible for my action or my inaction.

I am ready to be arraigned by any man on this floor at any time he sees fit on the ground that I am a native, a citizen, and a member from the State of Maine, but I think that there might be some little relevancy to debate on this floor, and that gentlemen might restrain their exuberance somewhere, either within the domain of fact or the domain of argument; and if the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. HANDY] derives any great satisfaction from his explosion in my direction this afternoon, I am glad to say that he has it without my envy.

Mr. NORTON of Ohio. Was that explosion internal or external?

Mr. GAINES. It was from the outside. [Laughter.]

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. Now, Mr. Chairman, this is a very simple business proposition. It was not at all necessary for a gentleman to get up here to demonstrate the fact that the buildings at the Naval Academy are in bad shape. There is no doubt about it. The Naval Committee are in no wise opposed to a proper restoration of the efficiency of those buildings. The only question before this committee is as to what is the best and most effectual way of proceeding. The Committee on Naval Affairs and the subcommittee on the Naval Academy and Marine Corps has pending a comprehensive proposition; and I will state that my colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CUMMINGS], is a member of that subcommittee.

We have pending in that committee a comprehensive proposition for an entire reorganization of the ground plan at Annapolis, involving such a change in the location of the buildings and the reclamation of a portion of the water front as would require the moving of nearly every building at that Academy. Some gentlemen say why have we not acted upon it? The fact that I am

standing here to-day, at the end of nearly a week, in my effort to get through this House the largest, most liberal, and most comprehensive appropriation bill for the Navy in all its departments that has ever been submitted to Congress, ought to convince every member of this committee that my committee has been busily engaged during these exciting times, in which we have been the center of the demand for legislation, and in which we had been at work as no other committee has.

Now, we have before us a measure intended to be taken up and considered as soon as we get this measure out of the way, and one or two others. It is a comprehensive plan, reported upon by several boards of officers and recommended by the Secretary of the Navy, which involves an expenditure mounting up to a million of dollars.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LEWIS of Washington. I ask for five minutes.

Mr. HARTMAN. I ask that the gentleman's time may be extended five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Montana asks unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Maine be extended five minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. I thank the gentleman. I shall not use so much.

As I stated before, the committee have this comprehensive plan before them, but we have not been able to carefully consider it. It seemed to the committee, and it seems now to me, that it would be wise for that committee, or some other committee, if the Naval Committee does not attend to it—but it has not been referred to any other committee—to look over that plan and to come into the House with something like a comprehensive way, at least, of dealing with the suggestion of the Secretary of the Navy in regard to expenditures for the Naval Academy. These propositions stand by themselves. The committee at present do not know just exactly how far they coincide with other plans that have been made. We do not want to appropriate money to tear down some particular building at that Academy and erect upon its site an expensive new building that would have to be removed if we carry out the general plan. That would not be a wise policy.

Now, I want to disclaim any feeling about this amendment whatever. I have no interest in the question at all, as I have said, and it is no matter of pride of our committee. We do not stand upon appropriations in the bill. We are not personally bound by them. They are the recommendations made by the Committee on Naval Affairs, in good faith, after careful consideration—recommendations to this House in the exercise of its wisdom and judgment to determine.

Mr. STEELE. Could not the difficulty be avoided by providing that this money should be expended under the direction of the Secretary of the Navy?

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. I do not think that we would be fully guaranteed on that point. If the gentleman from Indiana means that he thinks it wiser for us to make appropriations and put them in the hands of the Secretary of the Navy for him to expend in pursuance of such plans of general reorganizations that are without limit of extent or cost than it is for Congress to do what it has done in regard to the Military Academy and what the House insists on doing in regard to every public building of the country, that is one thing; but our committee thought, and so far as I know the belief now of that committee is, that Congress in both branches would certainly expect to be consulted in a general reorganization of the building of that Academy.

Mr. HANDY. Will the gentleman permit a suggestion?

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. Certainly.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. HANDY. I wanted to make a suggestion to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Chairman, we can not hear what is said.

Mr. HANDY. I want to suggest to the gentleman from Maine, in response to the difficulty that seems to be in his mind, that the Assistant Secretary of the Navy, Mr. Roosevelt, has written the following. He says:

Accordingly the immediate action recommended—

And that recommendation is embodied in my substitute—

Accordingly the immediate action recommended is to do certain work which it is absolutely indispensable should now be done, but to do it in a way that will make it when done fit into the accompanying general plan for the buildings as a whole. If in the long run Congress rebuilds the Academy in accordance with this general plan, then the work which I propose to have done at once can be regarded simply as the essential first step toward this general plan.

Mr. SOUTHARD. All predicated on this general plan.

Mr. HANDY (reading)—

If the general plan is never adopted, then this first work is simply work which it was imperatively necessary to do anyhow.

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. I thank the gentleman for emphasizing on my mind something with which I was before perfectly

familiar. That does not answer the fact that no general plan has ever been authorized by Congress. The plan to which these gentlemen from the Navy Department refer is a general suggestion that was gotten up by certain gentlemen who manifested a great public interest in it, and who had certain drawings made, and we have them here in a public document. I do not know that that is the best plan that can be adopted; I know that one of the plans has been favored by quite a number of officials who are interested in the Academy, and I know that many modifications have been suggested as necessary. There is no general plan that has been authorized by anybody exercising any power in this Government.

Now, if the House, without knowing what this general plan is, knowing nothing of the suggestions, desires to authorize somebody to spend \$500,000 for carrying out this general plan without knowing just what it is, I have no desire to restrain the action of the House in any direction it sees fit to go. But there is no plan formulated; there has been one sent to our committee and is under consideration there, but it has not been reported on, and up to the present time neither the House nor the Senate nor the public is aware as to what extent that plan goes, what it would involve, or whether at the conclusion of the rebuilding the result would be precisely what it wanted.

Mr. CANNON. May I ask the gentleman from Maine a question?

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. Certainly.

Mr. CUMMINGS. I hope it is not coming out of my time.

Mr. CANNON. Does the gentleman have in contemplation that the committee at an early day will take this subject up and investigate it?

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. It was the intention of the committee to proceed to the consideration of this and one or two other important matters just as soon as we could get rid of the appropriation bills. We shall do so. We are not anxious for the task, and if the House thinks it is wiser to delegate this whole matter to the Navy Department and relieve us of all responsibility in the matter, of course it has the right and the power to do it. I want to disabuse the mind of anybody here of any impression that I or my committee have any particular whim or desire about this matter. We have simply acted in accordance with the ordinary business principles that govern all the committees of the House. We brought our bill in here without this great appropriation because of the reasons I have stated. If the House thinks it is wise and best to put it in, of course it will do so.

Mr. McINTIRE. Will the gentleman yield to me for a question?

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. I will.

Mr. McINTIRE. The gentleman speaks of having a plan in the committee now that is known as the Matthews plan?

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. I am not familiar with it, although I have seen it.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I will say for my colleague that during my service on the committee he has been heartily in favor of action toward the rebuilding of the Naval Academy. The great trouble has been that no action whatever has been taken. For ten years this subject has been mooted in the Naval Committee, and nothing definite has come from it. The rickety buildings are there still, and the defective sewerage and all the buildings are in just as bad order to-day, if not worse—for patching them, I believe, makes them worse—as they were ten years ago. Now, it is true that we have plans in the subcommittee of the Committee on Naval Affairs for the rebuilding of that Academy. But if we formulate a bill and it passes the full committee, we have no assurance whatever that we can get it before the House.

Mr. LENTZ. Mr. Chairman, we would like to hear what the gentleman from New York is saying, and if we can have this Cuban junta near me dissolved, I think we can hear. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. Gentlemen will be in order and please cease conversation.

Mr. CUMMINGS. We have no assurance that we can get such a bill before the House under the rules as they are to-day, and secure a vote upon it. This matter, it seems to me, is imperative. The Secretary of the Navy has undoubtedly considered several plans of improvement. He undoubtedly has some systematic plan within his mind to-day. I do not know but that he has sent such plans to our committee; but for one, I am willing to trust John D. Long. [Applause.] I have served in this House with him, and I know him to be an honest and conscientious public officer, of good judgment, and one whom of all others I would choose to select a plan to reconstruct this Academy.

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. How can the gentleman think so when Mr. Long comes from way down in Massachusetts, where, as the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. HANDY] thinks, there is such hostility to the Academy and the South?

Mr. CUMMINGS. I know no section in this country. [Applause.] I love Louisiana and I love Massachusetts. The injury

of one is the concern of all, and I stand by the country every time, without reference to States. [Applause.] I do say that this House has before it now a practical proposition. If it fails to take advantage of this opportunity, it is my opinion, expressed after careful consideration, that it will be at least five years before you do anything for the Naval Academy at Annapolis.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. To which proposition does the gentleman refer?

Mr. CUMMINGS. To the proposition of the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. SOUTHARD. Mr. Chairman, this amendment as it now stands involves an appropriation, an immediate appropriation, of \$850,000. This appropriation is not based upon the recommendation of the Secretary of the Navy. It is based upon a suggestion of the Secretary of the Navy, predicated on the carrying out of certain plans embodied in what is known as the Matthews report.

In 1895 the Board of Visitors at the Naval Academy adopted a resolution and suggested certain plans for the entire remodeling and rebuilding of the Naval Academy at Annapolis. It involved more than the rebuilding. It involved an expenditure of several hundred thousand dollars in reshaping the grounds and dredging, making a basin for the reception of torpedo boats, etc. This new plan was in accordance with a previous suggestion of the Secretary of the Navy, one that has been repeated from time to time. The same suggestion, I think, is found in the report of the Secretary of the Navy for this year. This is the language:

Attention is invited to the unanimous resolution of the Board of Visitors of the Naval Academy—

And I wish to say that this suggestion involving this plan was made so late as 1895. The plan has not been under consideration or advisement for any great length of time. It was reported in 1896, less than two years ago.

Attention is invited to the unanimous resolution of the Board of Visitors of the Naval Academy, in which the board calls attention to the obvious fact that the irregular methods of constructing buildings upon the Academy grounds have been wasteful and unsatisfactory, and recommends that in future different construction obtain here, especially in conformity with a general plan previously adopted.

This plan, as I understand it, involves the expenditure of a large amount of money—I do not know exactly how much, but I have been told not less than \$6,000,000. Now, I venture to say that all the buildings upon the grounds of any one of our older educational institutions—I do not care which one you select—from its very inception until the present hour never cost anything like \$6,000,000. This is a large expenditure of money. A plan of that kind should be well considered before it is adopted. And I do not believe that Congress desires to place this matter in the hands of the Secretary of the Navy or anybody else without some previous instruction.

Mr. McINTIRE. Does the gentleman believe there can be more capable hands than those of the Secretary of the Navy?

Mr. SOUTHARD. I am not going to decide that question, and am not going to express any belief on the subject. I believe it will be the desire of Congress to have something to say about any comprehensive plan that may be adopted for the entire rebuilding of this important institution.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have said that the preliminary work of this improvement, before the buildings are commenced—

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. LEWIS of Washington. I ask that the gentleman be granted three minutes additional.

There was no objection.

Mr. SOUTHARD. The preliminary work of this improvement, before any buildings are commenced, involves an expenditure of about \$400,000, according to these plans. And I want to call the attention of the House to the suggestion of the Secretary of the Navy in an official communication he made to the committee on the 27th of last December. He calls attention to what ought to be done in the first instance. This is only in the nature of a suggestion and is coupled with an "if"—"if these plans shall be adopted."

What we need at once is an appropriation as follows: \$150,000 to construct the line of sea wall on the river side and for dredging and filling in as necessary. The use of the material dredged to fill in will provide necessary extension of the parade ground, etc.

Mr. McINTIRE. Does the Navy Department ever demand anything? Does it not simply "suggest" all the way through?

Mr. SOUTHARD. I do not say the Department has demanded anything; I do not say it has recommended anything. I say it has not done so. I say these are merely suggestions predicated upon the adoption by Congress of the plan which was submitted by the Board of Visitors.

Now, in a communication from the Secretary of the Navy to the committee, he says, after reciting that some improvements there are absolutely necessary, which we all admit:

In order to place the matter in such form that it may be directly considered and acted upon if approved by the committee, I have caused to be drawn

and inclose herewith, a draft of a clause suitable for insertion in the pending naval appropriation bill providing for certain of the appropriations which are most urgently needed if—

Observe the "if"—

if the plans proposed shall be adopted.

It will thus be seen that the recommendation of the Department is predicated entirely upon the adoption of this comprehensive plan looking to the rebuilding of this whole institution. Previous to that the ground must be reshaped and prepared for the construction of those buildings. There are a large number of buildings proposed—I think not less than twenty-five; I have a list of them here. They are all mentioned and located upon the plan sent in with the report. I wish I had time to read a list of them.

This work involves a large expenditure of money. Probably a good deal more than \$6,000,000 will be necessary in order to carry out these recommendations.

And now, Mr. Chairman, we propose, simply on a suggestion of the Secretary of the Navy, to make an immediate appropriation of \$850,000, which he must assume is to be expended in the direction which has been previously suggested.

Farther on he says:

This appropriation, if authorized, will provide for the construction of three new buildings—an armory, a boathouse, and a power house.

No quarters are provided for the officers or for the students; nothing of the kind is contemplated, apparently.

Mr. MCINTIRE. If the gentleman will permit me, I do not want to do injustice to him, and I am sure he does not want to do injustice to himself. Will he allow me an interruption?

Mr. SOUTHARD. Certainly.

Mr. MCINTIRE. Does not this same Secretary say that this should be done in accordance with the plans, and he asks immediate action in that regard?

Mr. SOUTHARD. Certainly; I have not disputed that.

Mr. MCINTIRE. That is right. There is no "if" about that. There is no quibbling, nothing uncertain, but a positive and direct statement as to the necessities of the institution.

Mr. SOUTHARD. The only plan suggested is a comprehensive one involving the expenditure of money—an expenditure embracing many millions of dollars.

But, as I have just read, Secretary Long, as I have said, recommends the construction of the armory, a boathouse, and a power house. Then he goes on to make suggestions that if the plan be adopted further appropriations should be made to extend the buildings as they may be needed hereafter.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SOUTHARD. I ask a few moments longer.

Mr. LEWIS of Washington. I move that the gentleman have another minute, if that will enable him to conclude.

There was no objection.

Mr. SOUTHARD. The Secretary proposes an armory to cost not over \$300,000, a boathouse to cost not to exceed \$300,000, and a power house—all of these being important buildings, Mr. Chairman—to be constructed in accordance with the plans, involving the appropriation which has been already suggested, and the preparation of the ground at a great expense.

Now, it seems to me, and I wish to say in this connection that I have no objection to any amount of appropriation that may be suggested for carrying out any plans which may be devised by Congress for rebuilding the institution, but it seems to me a sensible way for us to pursue is to proceed in an orderly, systematic, and businesslike manner. That is the only course we should undertake to pursue. Let us first have a plan on which to proceed and then make reasonable appropriations to carry that plan into effect.

[Here the hammer fell.]

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and the Speaker having taken the chair, a message from the Senate, by Mr. PLATT, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles; in which the concurrence of the House was requested:

S. 3720. An act authorizing cities and towns in the Indian Territory to secure, by condemnation or otherwise, lands necessary for public improvements; and

S. 3729. An act making further provision for a civil government for Alaska.

The message also announced that the Senate had disagreed to the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 439) granting a pension to Mrs. Hannah Letcher Stevenson, widow of the late Brig. Gen. John D. Stevenson, had asked a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. KYLE, Mr. VEST, and Mr. BAKER as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment the bill (H. R. 1181) granting an increase of pension to Carrie F. Bissell, of Pueblo, Colo.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the

amendments of the House of Representatives to bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 73. An act granting a pension to William L. Grigsby, of Belvidere, in the county of Thayer, Nebr.;

S. 178. An act granting a pension to Susan A. Paddock;

S. 431. An act granting a pension to Ann M. Madden;

S. 655. An act granting a pension to Harriet R. Matlack;

S. 1181. An act to increase the pension of Ann E. Botsford, widow of Eli W. Botsford, late of Seventeenth Regiment Ohio Volunteers;

S. 1825. An act granting an increase of pension to Robert P. Wild;

S. 2299. An act granting a pension to Caroline A. Slocum; and

S. 3178. An act granting a pension to Olevia S. Washburn.

NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. LEWIS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, before proceeding I desire to ask that the committee may allow me five minutes in addition to the five to which I am entitled under the rule.

Mr. SIMPSON. I ask that the gentleman from Washington be permitted to occupy the floor for ten minutes at this time.

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. Speaking to the amendment.

Mr. LEWIS of Washington. My remarks, Mr. Chairman, will not be altogether foreign to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. LEWIS of Washington. The gentleman from Maine can rest in my discretion in that matter, I think.

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. I will trust the gentleman not to abuse the privilege of the committee.

Mr. SIMPSON. He will not do that.

Mr. LEWIS of Washington. But, Mr. Chairman, I can not have the honorable chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs to assume that my remarks are to be within such lines as he would regard as altogether appropriate and fitting to the occasion. But it is no intention of mine to abuse the courtesy of the committee; and if I shall transgress what the gentleman from Maine thinks the proper line within the consent which has been given to me, it is his duty, his privilege, to make the point of order against me, for I do not want any favors extended to me. I seek only my rights on this floor.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment has for its purpose the increasing of the facilities by which a certain class of the youth of this country may be educated and the lessons of patriotism instilled within them.

There has never been a civilized nation in the history of the world where there was not an effort made, wherein schools of this character were not only encouraged, but always supported with the most prodigal generosity. We have it symbolized in the accredited history of ancient Greece that even after Æschines was banished from home and took up his residence in Rhodes the first lecture delivered by him was upon the patriotism of the student. We recall that the student, in the Arcadian groves of Greece, watching the sunlight on the statue of Mennon, murmured upon his lips the closing words of the oration of Demosthenes against Philip—"my country must be saved if I shall live."

It is then not inappropriate at this moment that I ask this honorable committee if we are not surrounded with conditions that make it not only appropriate but most onerous upon us that we do something to instill a patriotism into the youth of this country, when we behold how the youth grown up in the past generation have become so debased, so lacking in patriotism, so lacking in decency that one of them, calling himself a banker, should address a letter to the President of the United States—our President, irrespective of our party—calling upon him for an answer as to "why should the mere loss of 250 lives be of consequence enough for him to unsettle all the stable values of this country by irritating Spain to conflict." [Cries of "Oh!" "Oh!"]

When we, sir, keep in view that the public press brings us from a credible source that there have been here in Washington a flock of these vultures wheeling around the head of the President, biding their time to feed upon his patriotism; when we shudder at their offense in an hour when he sought to take matters in his hands as the Chief Executive to come to the rescue of the immediate necessities of the country whose destinies we desire to espouse, that these "patriots" dared to confront the honorable President with the threat on Sunday night that if he took drastic action which would affect their securities they would present their obligations against the Government payable in gold and take \$50,000,000 of gold out of the Treasury in one day, thus weakening the financial vertebrae of the nation, that wriggling she would fall.

These creatures who say they are patriots are "neither men nor women, neither brutes nor human; they are ghouls." [Applause on the Democratic side.] Added to this, this banditti of bankers have assumed that in a crisis like this they may impose upon the susceptibility of charity or the weakness of an emergency and now demand that the honorable President of the United States

shall sell the liberties of the Island of Cuba to them for \$200,000,000 and allow these men a mortgage upon the tax facilities of Cuba, and in order to guarantee and indemnify them for the fund they shall pay this nation is to pledge to them its credit and honor. God forbid that these men who would coin dollars from the breath of a dying nation and distill interest percentages from its dripping blood should ever succeed in our country in an hour like this. [Applause.]

I do not know, Mr. Chairman, what attitude the honorable President of the United States shall take upon this matter. I hear from his friends—for it is not my honor to know him personally—that he is a Christian man. If that be so, as I hope it is, he is not the man who would mortgage these prostrate people, with their outstretched hands beseeching our aid, their faces drenched in tears, their bedraggled garments bespattered with their sacrificed blood. Surely the President is not the man who would put these people in bondage, into the hands of those who would hold them as a ransom and use them for the purpose of increasing dollars to private fortunes. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I then rise to say that the substitute to this amendment becomes appropriate in an hour like this, when it becomes the duty of this great American House to instill patriotism where we see it is both waning and debased. I do not know how far, gentlemen of this House, these men may come; but, as God helps me, if one of these harpies dares come within the portals of this building to lure by their familiar arts or influence any man in this House to their nefarious and dastardly schemes, I will brand him where he stands and demand that he be kicked from the portals of the Capitol. [Applause.] He shall not proceed here as long as I am in this House; and I pledge you, my friends, I am coming back to execute my promise. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the courtesy of the gentleman in allowing this expression. I remarked a moment ago, sir, that I did not know what attitude would be taken by the President or his followers. I do not; but if it shall ever come that in a weak moment we shall ever yield to conditions such as I am told are now being considered, patriotism is dead, statesmanship a thing of the past, the grandeur of our nation worse than "the glory that was Rome and the grandeur that was Greece," because there will be none to sing her songs, save in a requiem to disgrace and dishonor. [Applause.] I do not know whether the question is before you now or not, gentlemen, but if it is, as heaven shall witness, you have thrown at your feet to-day, in the twentieth century, the same question that was thrown at the feet of the first, "Will you take Barabbas or Christ?" If it shall be the thief, I myself say it shall be the thief crucified and not glorified by this American House of Representatives. [Loud applause.]

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. Mr. Chairman, I move to close all debate on this paragraph and amendments.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. I should like five minutes.

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. I move, if possible, to close debate in five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maine moves, pending the recognition of the gentleman from Indiana, that debate on this paragraph and amendments be closed in five minutes.

Mr. HARTMAN. I move as an amendment ten minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. I do not care for ten minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Montana moves as an amendment that debate be closed in ten minutes.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Debate on the pending paragraph and amendment will be closed in ten minutes. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JOHNSON] is recognized.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I wish to say that I am not surprised at the remarkable exhibition given by the gentleman who has just taken his seat. His evident desire for notoriety has not failed to impress both sides of this Chamber. He has seized upon some wild rumor, one of the thousand of wild rumors that are now being circulated, and made it the text for a foolish and unnecessary speech. This is not the first time that the gentleman has intruded himself upon the House, and sought to intrude himself upon the country. [Laughter.] He is one of those irrepressible patriots who seem to be determined to have gore.

Now, I suggest that this whole Spanish problem is very easy of solution. There is no necessity for this House voting \$50,000,000 to carry on war. It is all folly to be scouring the markets of the world to find battle ships and equip them to enter upon a conflict with Spain. There is a much easier and much safer way—except for the Spanish people—of bringing the entire matter to a triumphant conclusion. I suggest, and I do it with all seriousness, that the best way to make an end of this whole affair is to harness up the gentleman from Washington and turn him loose upon Spain. [Great laughter.]

Mr. BRUCKER. Do it with a million umbrellas.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. I venture to predict that if we do

this thing the Spanish flag will be wiped out of existence on the Western Hemisphere in a much shorter space of time than by the exercise of all the military and naval power of the Federal Government. [Laughter.] There is no need of any umbrellas. All we need in the world is the gentleman from Washington, and he will not require any help in an undertaking of this character. There is, however, an objection to this plan. There is one consideration that should restrain us. We are a Christian nation. We should not engage in a war of absolute extermination. [Great laughter.]

Imagine, Mr. Chairman, what an awful condition we would be in if, having "cried havoc and let slip the dogs of war," we should then find it impossible to choke off the ferocious gentleman from Washington, and he should persist in his warfare until the Spanish nation should be blotted entirely off of the face of the earth. [Great laughter.]

Now, sir, in all seriousness, I utterly deprecate and despise this cry for war which we have heard on that side of the Chamber. Do gentlemen stop to reflect for a moment what it means if we should enter upon hostilities?

Mr. KELLEY. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. I can not yield, as I have only five minutes.

Mr. KELLEY. The gentleman has had his time extended to ten minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. I want to call the attention of this House to the fact that if war comes with Spain it will be an unnecessary war [hisses in the gallery]—a war which we could have averted.

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. Mr. Chairman, I demand order in the galleries.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. If the hot-headedness of men in public life shall force the President of the United States to put Spain into an embarrassing position by an imperious demand for instant concessions which her proud spirit will not permit her to accede to, they, and not the President, will have to bear the responsibility. If public men in Congress would simply restrain their impetuous natures and keep their hands off the President, he would be able to accomplish in a very short space of time by the arts of diplomacy and without a conflict the independence of Cuba.

Spain started out, sir, with the idea of the absolute subjugation of Cuba, without qualifications or conditions. This Government made firm and diplomatic representations to Spain until she withdrew Weyler and offered a system of autonomy, and she has continued to yield to the diplomatic representations of this country until she has absolutely given up everything except the independence of the island. Indeed, sir, her last proposition shows you that she would give what would be absolute independence, with the sole reservation that her flag shall fly over the island and that she shall be permitted to appoint its Captain-General. What is this but practical independence, with merely nominal control by the Spanish authority?

Now, on the other hand, the Cuban insurgents started in with the cry of independence or death. They refused to accept any compromise whatever. Nobody is more anxious, sir, to see the Cubans independent of the Spaniard than I, but I would regret if we should have to sacrifice American lives in order to achieve that result. Now we hear, however, that the Cuban junta in New York say that the insurgents are willing to raise and can raise \$100,000,000 in order to purchase their independence. It appears, therefore, that we have brought these two antagonistic forces thus far together by the exercise of the judgment, the diplomacy, and the exalted patriotism of the statesman in the White House. [Applause.] And I believe if we will give him a fair opportunity to carry out his purposes—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LEWIS of Washington. I ask that the gentleman have five minutes more.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana (continuing). He will bring us to a triumphant conclusion without shedding an ounce of American blood. [Great applause.]

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. I hope we will now have a vote on the amendment.

Mr. NORTON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I regret sincerely that I have been limited to the time given me, for I hope to speak sincerely upon this question. For I say to you that no man in all this land has his heart more deeply interested in the Naval Academy than I. To-day almost the hope of my life is centered in the Navy of the United States. I regret and I blush for shame that I am compelled to digress from the interests of that Naval Academy and reply for one single instant to the man upon that side of the House that voices the language of the President, coming as his adviser, to speak in the language of Spain.

I believe, sir—and I am proud to know that there is a little patriotism left on the other side of the House—that when the hour

shall come, they will resent the insults to the party of Americans represented on the other side. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Chairman, I desire to speak on the subject of this bill alone and its necessities. Twice in every year for more than fourteen years I have been upon the naval grounds, and the state of facts I have seen there was such a disgrace and a shame to the flag of my country that I could scarcely contain myself from violating the confidence placed in me by the men in charge and letting the world know the condition of affairs there.

Out of that Naval Academy have come the brightest men, the greatest geniuses, the bravest men, the truest patriots that God ever gave to any flag. To-day they stand between you and the menace to the nation. The men confined within the walls of that Academy are now being, by the negligence of the Naval Committee, permitted to breathe the noisome air and to die, to become diseased and brought on the retired list even before they graduate, solely because of the absolute imbecile negligence of that committee.

I challenge the chairman of that committee to say that he has ever presented any plan for the reorganization of that institution. I appeal to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CUMMINGS], and I challenge him to say if he has ever even put his eyes upon it. You and I know that that plan has never been considered and never will be, under the rule and management of the committee as it is constituted, until Gabriel shall blow his trumpet.

Mr. CUMMINGS. The gentleman is entirely and utterly mistaken. The Naval Committee six years ago were considering plans for the rehabilitation of that Academy. What I complain of is that they never fructify, they never produce fruit, and here is an opportunity to do it without the committee.

Mr. NORTON of Ohio. I am glad to know that they have been for six years engaging the attention of the committee. They will be six years more, under the rules of this House. You know you can not bring a bill in here; you know you can not get it considered. The occupant of the chair is opposed to this; he is from the State of Maine, and by the nod of his head or the movement of his hand no bill making an appropriation can ever see the light of day.

Now, gentlemen, here is an opportunity. If you have any patriotism left on that side of the House, you will join with us and let us do this thing. Wait! You have been pursuing a waiting policy, your President is waiting, you are waiting now, while the worst flotilla that ever started out under the flag of any nation is pushing its nose toward the city of New York, and may throw their shells into New Orleans.

Wait in your imbecility; wait in cowardice; wait in that humility, and in obedience to greed and avarice; wait with the blush of shame indelibly stamped on your brows forever. To-day, here is your opportunity. The man who refuses to vote for this appropriation does not deserve to stand on the floor of this House; the man who refuses to act and splits hairs upon this occasion would split hairs upon the nation's honor and wait until the doom of the nation's death. [Applause.]

I regret more than words can express that the limit of time stifles my voice upon this question.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute offered by the gentleman from Delaware to the amendment. The Clerk will report the substitute again for the information of the committee.

The Clerk again read the substitute.

Mr. DINGLEY. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman. Is this a substitute for the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MUDD]?

The CHAIRMAN. It is. The gentleman has properly stated it. The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HANDY) there were—ayes 82, noes 98.

Mr. HANDY. Tellers, Mr. Chairman.

Tellers were ordered; and the Chair appointed Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine and Mr. HANDY.

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. I ask, Mr. Chairman, that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MUDD] will be substituted in my place as one of the tellers.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 82, noes 108.

So the substitute to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is upon agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MUDD].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HANDY) there were—ayes 89, noes 56.

So the amendment was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

The committee informally rose; and the Speaker having taken the chair, a message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House of Representatives by Mr. PRUDEN, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House of

Representatives that the President had approved and signed bills of the following titles:

On March 23, 1898:

H. R. 7541. An act to require certain writs to be directed to and executed by the marshal of the District of Columbia;

H. R. 7344. An act granting a right of way through the naval station, New London, in the State of Connecticut, to the Norwich and Worcester Railroad Company;

H. R. 101. An act to correct the naval record of and grant an honorable discharge to Thomas H. Holden, of Pawtucket, R. I.; and

H. R. 2477. An act to relieve John McCarthy from the charge of desertion.

On March 25, 1898:

H. R. 4698. An act for the relief of W. E. Judkins, executor of Lewis McKenzie.

On March 26, 1898:

H. R. 6542. An act for the relief of Eldred G. Davis.

On March 29, 1898:

H. R. 6079. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the Denison and Northern Railway Company to construct and operate a railway through the Indian Territory, and for other purposes."

On March 30, 1898:

H. R. 8618. An act for the relief of the sufferers by the destruction of the U. S. S. *Maine* in the harbor of Havana, Cuba; and

H. R. 6358. An act authorizing the Nebraska, Kansas and Gulf Railway Company to construct and operate a railway through the Indian Territory, and for other purposes.

On March 31, 1898:

H. R. 3737. An act granting an increase of pension to Orlando J. Hopkins.

NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

The Clerk read as follows:

MARINE CORPS.

Pay, Marine Corps: For pay of officers on the active list: For 1 colonel commandant, 1 colonel, 2 lieutenant-colonels, 1 paymaster, 1 quartermaster, 1 adjutant and inspector, 4 majors, 2 assistant quartermasters, 20 captains, 30 first lieutenants, and 13 second lieutenants, \$180,860.

Mr. LEWIS of Washington. I move to amend by striking out the last word. Mr. Chairman, having had during my past service in this House nothing apparently but the kindest and most courteous associations with the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JOHNSON], I was somewhat at a loss to understand what particular motive animated him in his effort to create an excitation of the risibilities of this House by making me the special subject of his most elastic, reverberating, and perplexing remarks. [Applause.]

The gentleman took occasion to observe that if one desired to come to the rescue of Spain, far from appropriating \$50,000,000, he would advise that the gentleman from Washington be substituted. To that extent it will be admitted that "the gentleman from Washington" at least has the qualification of firing his own gun at his own pleasure and whenever he sees the enemy in sight. Unfortunately for the gentleman from Indiana, if Spain has been casting her eye to his record or the record of the other side of the House, she would certainly not expect him to come to her rescue, but rather, in her charity, seek that he should declare first his own independence. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

From day to day, Mr. Chairman, we have watched that singular restlessness with which the gentleman, like a caged lion, would pace up and down the aisle in front of the Speaker, each day coming to our side and promising that in the next hour he would no longer chafe beneath the yoke of the Speaker of the House, but would rise in his might and dispatch him with an army of words. [Laughter.] But for some reason when the Speaker would cast his ferocious eye at the gentleman, he would wilt like a leaf in the summer heat. [Laughter and applause.]

Day after day, I have never a doubt, his beseeching constituents have been trying to persuade him to take the muzzle from his mouth and the shackles from his limbs; but fearing, Mr. Chairman, to move in the direction that common decency, justice, and independence would require, he thought it would be an appropriate thing to turn upon a gentleman who never offended him, trusting that he might infuse into the House some sense of spontaneous humor and be known hereafter as a wit. [Laughter.]

I do not know, Mr. Chairman, whether the President of the United States has selected the gentleman as his fidus Achates, as his good friend and defender on this floor, but certainly if such is the case, then, as an humble adviser of the President, I would suggest that he join in the prayer of Caesar to be delivered from his friends. [Laughter and applause.] If it should come to pass that the President should receive, as some people in certain quarters hope and others fear, his political death, then those who may write his obituary, if the gentleman from Indiana continues in the course he has been pursuing, may content themselves with the elegy, "Too Much JOHNSON." [Loud and continued laughter and applause.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana obtained the floor.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair regrets to be compelled again to call the attention of visitors in the galleries and the officers in charge there to the fact that manifestations of applause or disapproval on the part of occupants of the gallery are not in order. The Chair hopes he may not have occasion again to call attention to this subject. The committee will be in order. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JOHNSON] has been recognized.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. LEWIS] on this occasion, as on all others, has served simply to amuse the House rather than to instruct it. It has not heretofore, nor do I apprehend that it has on this occasion, fallen within his province to utter anything worthy of more than a cursory and passing notice. There are some men who get into political power not so much because they have any of those sterling qualities which make it proper to invest them with such power, as because of a to them happy combination of circumstances which serve only to show one of the weaknesses of our republican form of government. [Applause.]

Mr. LEWIS of Washington. The gentleman may withdraw his plea of guilty.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. The gentleman from Washington on this occasion, as on all others, has absolutely failed to rise to its height, and if there is any man on this floor who might be expected to insult a great public crisis by injecting into it as he did in his first speech a lot of blind and claptrap matter, tending to darken rather than illumine the situation, one would naturally suppose that the gentleman from Washington would be that man.

Now, it is hardly necessary for me to deny any accusation made against me by the gentleman from Washington. Therefore I pay myself, I admit, no very high compliment by undertaking to repel certain things which he has attributed to me. But his intimation that I have paced the floor of this House with a pent-up feeling for war—

Mr. LEWIS of Washington. Not against Spain.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Liable at any time to explode, is as far from the truth as any other thing that the gentleman has stated on this subject. I have realized, sir, from the start that the danger to the nation was in the hot-headedness of those men who never stop to reflect into what they are liable to precipitate the country. I have never had the least desire for hostilities. My voice has been and still is for peace; not for peace at any price, but for honorable peace, and for exhausting the last reasonable alternative before embarking in war. Whether my views were popular or not I have not stopped to inquire.

I have had no hesitancy in recognizing in the person of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. LEWIS] one of those ferocious statesmen who are determined to have war, no difference what may be the cost or what may be the result. His intimation that I have ever been laboring under the yoke of the Speaker of this House, or of any other man, is so entirely foreign to my nature, as known to my colleagues upon this floor, that it refutes itself without any answer from me.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, with grace and thankfulness to any yoke, whether imposed by the White House, by that Chair, or by my own conscience, that leads me to stop in these troublous times and calmly think before I take any step in a perilous crisis. The intimation that I have ever said that I would ally myself with the explosive element on this floor which, regardless of consequences, would precipitate a conflict that would result in the shedding of precious American blood is absolutely and unqualifiedly false.

The mere fact that it has been stated in a spirit of levity or ribaldry, of which the gentleman alone is capable, will not prevent me from giving it a flat denial. I am opposed to war—war with its disastrous consequences, war which involves a vast expenditure of public money, which involves burdens of taxation to be paid by the people, which involves the issuing of paper money, which involves a period of wild speculation—

Mr. KELLEY. What is the matter with the gold standard?

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. War which, while it affords opportunities for exalted patriotism and heroic devotion to the flag, at the same time opens up an arena for the cormorants who always prey upon the Government and seek to take advantage of its necessity. I am opposed to that condition of affairs which would sacrifice the flower of American manhood, which would put women into garments of mourning, and which would torture our unhappy ears with the wail of the orphan. I am opposed to war not only because of that which accompanies it, but because of that which follows and succeeds it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine, Mr. HARTMAN, and Mr. LEWIS of Washington asked that the time of Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana be extended five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maine [Mr. BOUTELLE] asks unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Indiana be extended five minutes.

Mr. LEWIS of Washington. I made the request, or joined in it.

Several MEMBERS. Make it ten minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. The time of the gentleman from Indiana is extended five minutes in accordance with the request of the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. I am opposed to war, because I know that its evils follow it, and that it is always succeeded by a season of depression and reaction. The bubble of speculation must burst; the currency must be contracted; the debts that have been incurred must be paid, and during all this period of time those great administrative and legislative reforms in government, by the passage of which alone can the happiness and prosperity of my countrymen best be secured, are to be postponed and held in abeyance.

I infinitely prefer peace. I make bold, sir, to avow it. I will say here to-day that I believe in going to the extremes of magnanimity before precipitating the country into war. The nation is powerful enough, it is great enough, to afford to do this thing. I would go to war only as a last resort, as a dire necessity, when every expedient to avert its horrors has been tried and has failed. I would not sacrifice American blood except our quarrel should be a just one.

I should want to go into the conflict conscious that we had done everything we possibly could to avert it, knowing that the sound of the first gun would bring every American citizen, North, South, East, and West, regardless of party, color, or religion, to the support of the flag; that our action would carry with it the moral support of the civilized world, for he who believes, sir, that the moral support of the world is to be ignored in a conflict between two great nations advertises himself to humanity as a man who knows nothing of those influences which, in a time of international conflict, tend powerfully toward victory.

When I sat down a short while ago, Mr. Chairman, I was attempting to make before this House and the country, if indeed the country will heed a voice so feeble as my own, a statement of the fact that by the steady policy of diplomacy, the sensible, honest, patriotic course of the President of the United States, we were gradually bringing these two antagonistic elements together; that Spain had come down to the point where she was willing to abandon possession of Cuba upon a mere nominal consideration, and that the Cuban junta, authorized, I doubt not, to act for the insurgents, had declared that they could and would raise a hundred million dollars in order to purchase their independence.

I was attempting to enforce upon the House that these were concessions, harbingers of a settlement, and that it would be better to allow the President, conscious of our continued support, to move firmly and steadily forward, never backward, until by the process of diplomatic art he could make apparent to Spain without danger of incurring her resentment or rejection the demands of the American people, and that thus she would decide to yield independence to Cuba.

I insist, sir, that we have forced the Executive to precipitate action just at this time. I fear that the ultimatum has been too abruptly presented at Madrid. I dread Spanish refusal and consequent hostilities.

I believe, too, that if this House had been as patient of late as it has been heretofore, and if the Senate had been as reasonable as heretofore, and if we had all given to the President ample time to press our views upon Spain along such lines as would enable her to accept them without subjecting her to too great mortification, that thirty days from this time would not have elapsed until Cuba would have been an independent state. Spain knows she can not conquer the insurgents. Her unfortunate experience has amply satisfied her of this. She fully realizes that if she persists in her efforts to do so it will be likely to involve her in war with this nation.

The leading nations of the earth also recognize these facts. If the President was given time he would be able to bring upon Spain the earnest and powerful advice of most of these nations to submit to the inevitable without further war. Gentlemen may talk about the influence of the bankers and of the monetary and business interests of the world as bitterly as they please. They may, if they desire, stigmatize those who desire to maintain peace as being animated solely by a regard for commercial interests.

Before God, sir, I will not arraign upon this floor any influence, monetary or otherwise, that can make for honorable peace at this critical juncture of our affairs. If those who are interested in Spanish bonds, whether here or abroad, can prevail upon the Spanish Government to yield peacefully, I shall not reproach them with the statement that they are actuated by selfish motives in so doing.

I say again, that if the President has sent an ultimatum to Spain, and if that ultimatum is a demand that she shall instantly evacuate Cuba, you will excite the Spanish pride, you will increase the Spanish resentment, you will leave Sagasta in a condition where he is not able to make the concession. The chances are that you will have war. You will shed American blood.

You will expend millions of money. True, you will achieve

Cuban independence, but at what a cost. Stop and reflect a minute, and do not, I beg you, longer hamper or interfere with the President in the wise and patriotic course he would still pursue. Do not be too impetuous, too abrupt. Spain can reach by an incline the height which she can not and will not attain at one bound.

The gentleman intimates that I am speaking as a representative of the President. That is not true. I was not in favor of his nomination. I would not favor it again under similar circumstances.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. I should like to have five minutes more.

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. I am not his mouthpiece. I am not even in his confidence. No man on this floor has greater reason to feel unkindly toward him than I have. Why, he is quite well aware. But this is not a personal matter. It is a subject which concerns the country, and I hesitate not to declare that his whole conduct throughout has been marked by the exercise of that good judgment and exalted patriotism which entitle him to the confidence and respect of the people—North, South, East, and West—without regard to party ties. He should not now be abandoned. We should rather continue to give him our earnest and undivided support.

Shame on any man on the other side of this Chamber who dares to make party capital out of this matter, as the gentleman from Washington attempted to do, as will plainly appear when he allows his remarks to go to the country as he made them.

Mr. OGDEN. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. I hope the gentleman will not interrupt me.

Mr. OGDEN. I want to know—

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. If the gentleman will pardon me.

Mr. OGDEN. I want to know whether the proposition is that this Government shall force the Cubans to pay \$100,000,000 for their independence?

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. I will answer the gentleman that this Government had better allow the Cubans to pay \$200,000,000 to acquire their independence than that one drop of American blood should be unnecessarily shed. [Applause on the Republican side and hisses in the gallery.]

Mr. OGDEN. We stand by the old declaration, "Millions for defense, but not one cent for tribute."

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. I say to gentlemen who have hissed the remarks that I have uttered—

Mr. LEWIS of Washington. No gentleman on the floor did so. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Indiana yield to the gentleman from Washington?

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Yes.

Mr. LEWIS of Washington. I desire to inform the honorable gentleman from Indiana that no hisses were from the floor.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. It does not make any difference to me whether I am hissed or whether I am not hissed by the galleries. It is not personally a matter of importance to me whether my course is approved, nor is my reelection a matter of concern. I declare my convictions, whether my views are approved or disapproved in this House. I believe before God that they are right, and I only wish that I had declared them here on an earlier occasion, when it might have arrested the attention of the country, instead of deferring it to this time. I delayed speaking in hope that some more conspicuous gentleman would say as much as I now say.

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Indiana yield to the gentleman from Maine?

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Yes.

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. I rise to say that if it is true, as the gentleman from Washington stated, that the hisses were from the galleries, that a repetition of the offense ought to be the occasion of clearing the galleries.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair desires to state that while the present occupant of the chair is in the chair he does not propose that the galleries shall hiss any member on the floor, no matter of what party he is or upon what subject he is speaking.

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. Or cheer, either. We have had cheers from the galleries for a week, and I object to it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I shall not be deflected from my course either by manifestations of approval or disapproval. My judgment is not infallible, I admit, but I endeavor always to reach a judgment that is right, and once having reached a conclusion which I believe to be just, I am not in the habit of consulting the expediencies in making it known. I believe we are standing on the verge of a volcano, and I sincerely hope that the ultimatum of the President will not strike so suddenly that it will arouse such a resentment as to provoke a war,

thus making it impossible to secure the independence of Cuba by further diplomatic and peaceful agencies.

But if war does come, every beat of my heart, every impulse of my nature, every effort of which I am capable will be thrown into the scale in behalf of a speedy and vigorous prosecution and a victorious conclusion of that war. If it turns out that the President's ultimatum is indeed rejected by Spain, I hope to God that the Representatives of the American people on this floor, the Senators who represent the sovereign States at the other end of the Capitol, will pause and see where we are tending; will see the necessity of upholding the arms of the President if he sees fit to still further proceed in the matter upon the counter proposals which it is said Spain may proffer to him.

I am told by those who have consulted with him that he is anxious and concerned; that he has declared that he feels it is a solemn duty he owes to the country to avert war.

Let no man mistake the temperament of the American people. They are not all for war. The unthinking, the unreflecting, favor it. Many men of good sense and judgment appear also to think it advisable, but there is a great conservative sentiment in the country that is opposed to hostilities except as a last resort. They desire Cuban independence, but they believe in the President and are at his back. I warn gentlemen that it is not the temporary applause of the multitude that they should seek. They should rather endeavor to deserve the calm and deliberate approval of our countrymen, which is certain to be conferred, when the war cloud has passed away and the danger is gone, upon those who fearlessly perform their duty at this time.

I appeal, sir, from the jeers with which my remarks have been greeted; I appeal from the hisses of the gallery, where I do not look for inspiration, and whose occupants can not be relied upon to do the fighting if war ensues, to the cooler, calmer, more impartial judgment which my countrymen will pass upon my utterances when the time for retrospection and the making up of their ultimate verdict shall arrive.

That time, sir, will assuredly come, and garlands will be placed upon the brows alone of those who have been willing to stand inexorably against the sentiment that would precipitate a bloody conflict before patiently and earnestly exhausting every expedient to avoid it.

Mr. Chairman, I trust that the solidity of the Democratic party and the Populist party upon this floor in support of the Administration, an exhibition of patriotism that has not been paralleled in the last quarter of a century, may be continued unto the end.

I trust the resolution offered the other day by the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. BAILEY] will not be construed by the country as a pure effort at party advantage. I trust that it was not intended as a party measure. The matters here involved are beyond all consideration of party. The Democratic members and the Populist members have stood patriotically for the country. They have stood by the President. They have been taken into his councils and have manifested and exhibited a spirit of genuine Americanism. Why should they abandon him now? Do they not prefer peace to war? Do they want to—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. I move to close debate on this paragraph, so that we may make some progress with the bill. Gentlemen understand that the five-minute discussion can go right on upon the next paragraph.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I think the gentleman's proposition is not a fair one, in view of the time which has been occupied on the other side. I move to amend the motion of the gentleman so as to provide that debate be closed on the pending paragraph in twenty minutes.

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. I ask unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph may be considered as closed.

Several members objected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is upon the amendment of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] to the motion of the gentleman from Maine [Mr. BOUTELLE].

The amendment of Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi was agreed to; and the motion of Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine as amended was adopted.

Mr. BAILEY and Mr. LEWIS of Washington addressed the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BAILEY] is recognized.

Mr. BAILEY. The gentleman from Washington can proceed now, and I will follow him.

Mr. LEWIS of Washington. I am perfectly willing to yield to the gentleman from Texas, but by his graciousness I will proceed now.

Mr. BAILEY. Very well.

Mr. LEWIS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, it is needless for me to say that I have listened with much gratification to the very eloquent remarks of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JOHNSON]. If that distinguished gentleman fancies for a moment, as I gathered from his remarks he did, that any assertions I made were

intended to be purely personal to him, to that extent I certainly disavow them.

But the gentleman from Indiana will admit that in the brief remarks which preceded his first speech I made not the slightest reference to him—delightful as might have been that occupation under other circumstances. In his reply to me he abandons his personal assault, and has found it agreeable—to satisfy what inclination or to gratify what purpose I know not—to forsake the pleasant ribaldry passing between us and to turn the discussion to one of more serious import. I am not inclined to depart from his precedent, nor shall I violate the serious dignity of the House, which demands that a question so momentous and portentous should be confronted and disposed of with a gravity becoming our high position in a nation and according to the great trust which has been reposed in us.

Mr. Chairman, there is but one remark of the distinguished gentleman which I feel the slightest necessity of adverting to. He has seen fit—upon what authority I can not conjure or devise—to assert on the floor of this House that I am for war irrespective of the causes and indifferent to the justification. I dispute the distinguished gentleman's assertion. I deny that any remark that has ever fallen from me on this floor can justify a statement of that sort. It is born of the gentleman's desire to calumniate now when it is wholly unnecessary.

I do assert, Mr. Chairman, that the only attitude I have ever occupied here, one which I feel has been consistent with right and honor and justice—one which in the future I can with satisfaction and confidence occupy—is one that demands universal justice and universal freedom. [Applause.] I have never uttered a word inconsistent with this position. No one can join more heartily than myself with the distinguished gentleman in his glowing recitation of the monologue of Aristides which I observe he has paraphrased from Homer.

I realize as well as he that the barbarous cruelties which are born of war far surpass the depiction of any man's tongue or the delineation of any man's pen. But there is an hour in which God comes to the earth through His humble servants, crying out through His ambassadors and demanding universal justice to His children [applause]; and while all of us deprecate and abhor the cruelties of war, yet if an hour should come to this country in which the honor of the nation is to be preserved, the salvation of her citizens wrought out, the glory of her past to be maintained, and if this can be done only by war, then there is no alternative left us if we are a brave and honorable people. [Applause.]

I for one deplore any such necessity. I say heartily to the gentleman from Indiana that if there are any measures on foot looking to a peaceful solution of this question, measures that shall give to Cuba liberty and to this nation honor, I am ready to cooperate in such measures. I deny, however, that I have at any time undertaken to make a party question of this issue, or that there has fallen from my lips any utterance which any just man can attribute to such a purpose. I do not know what object the distinguished gentleman from Indiana has had in making that charge.

In conclusion I will say, before yielding the floor to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. BAILEY], that I am for peace when peace can come with liberty and with the blessing of God; that I am not for a peace which means the sacrifice of any humble and dependent human being, the disgrace of my people, the dishonor of my country, or the humiliation of her flag. [Loud applause.]

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, with the personal controversy between the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JOHNSON] and the gentleman from Washington [Mr. LEWIS] I have nothing whatever to do. The House knows each of these gentlemen well enough to know that each is worthy of any foeman's steel. I know too the standing of the gentleman from Indiana in the counsels of his own party and before the country well enough to know that what he has spoken has been spoken with deliberation and is entitled to be considered almost as authoritative. When he stands here and says that the President of the United States is trying to reconcile the misunderstanding between this nation and the Spanish Government upon a basis which will compel the Island of Cuba to buy its liberty from the butchers of Spain, we are justified in supposing that it is for that purpose that the House has been denied an opportunity to vote on a resolution which declared that the Cuban patriots have fairly won their independence. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Will the gentleman permit me? I know he does not want to do me an injustice.

Mr. BAILEY. Assuredly not.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. The gentleman from Texas will remember that I stated positively I did not speak by the authority of the President of the United States; and the gentleman is equally mistaken in saying that "I knew" or "believed" that there was a proposition pending to purchase the liberties of the Cuban people.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I was very guarded in the state-

ment I made. I said that the gentleman from Indiana, standing high in the counsels of his party, was in a position to talk upon this subject in such way as to entitle his statement to very great weight on this floor, and that when he made the declaration that the President of the United States was about to adjust the differences between the two nations, we were justified in believing that he spoke with a knowledge of the facts; and I know that the gentleman from Indiana does not speak as possessing personal knowledge when he is ignorant upon any subject. He is not in the habit of doing that.

I believed on yesterday, and I know to-day, that the policy of that side of the House is to delay a decision of this question in the hope that the rich and powerful interests of this and other nations will compel the struggling patriots of Cuba to buy the freedom that they have fairly won with their courage and by their sword. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I owe the Republican party no kindly offices; but I will venture to warn it that if its leaders agree, and it sanctions an agreement, to compel any people under the sun to buy that liberty which God has given to them, it will never outlive the odium which will be fastened upon it by the outraged sentiment of the American people. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Chairman, liberty is not a purchasable commodity. [Renewed applause.] There was a time in this Republic when no man in high station would have suggested that one nation could sell it, or that another should be compelled to buy it. [Applause on the Democratic side.] It is a birthright of men; and it is their duty to assert it, though war be necessary to its assertion. [Prolonged applause on the Democratic side.]

I am myself, Mr. Chairman, as averse to war as any gentleman who occupies a seat on that side of the Chamber. We know, and you know, that a war will benefit the party in power, and yet, knowing this, we have twice during the present session of Congress, walked up to the altar of our country and made a willing sacrifice of our political advancement.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I ask that the gentleman from Texas be permitted to control the remaining ten minutes on this side of the discussion.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the extension of the time of the gentleman from Texas for ten minutes?

There was no objection.

Mr. BAILEY. And yet, Mr. Chairman, with a knowledge that we were pursuing a policy to the advantage of our political opponents, and to the injury of ourselves, we have done all you have asked us to do; and we have asked you to do more than you are willing to do. In all the history of this Republic, no party has ever acted more patriotically or more unselfishly than the Democratic party has acted during this crisis! [Applause on the Democratic side.]

This war could have been avoided. Six months ago, if you had done as we urged you to do, as we entreated you to do, if you had recognized the right of those struggling patriots to fight for the independence of their own country, there would have been no war, and the Republic of Cuba would to-day be an established fact in the history of the world. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

A MEMBER. And the battle ship *Maine*, with all the accompanying lives of American seamen, would not have been sacrificed.

Mr. BAILEY (continuing). And that unfortunate disaster, which has horrified humanity and humiliated the American people would never have occurred. [Applause.] The great battle ship which bore the name of a sovereign State of this Union would still be upon the high seas, flying the flag of this great Republic; and the more than 250 brave seamen, many of whom now sleep fathoms deep beneath Cuban waters, would have been wearing the uniform of the nation which they honored with their courage and sought to defend with their lives. [Prolonged applause.]

You refused to act, and the progress of events has simply intensified the situation. The longer you postpone doing the right thing, the more certain it is that war, and war alone, will extricate you. In trying to allow Spain to complete her reconquest of Cuba, you will make it absolutely necessary that you shall intervene in the cause of freedom. There may be time still to avert a war. Within the last forty-eight hours a representative of the Cuban Republic has said to me that they do not desire us to engage in war with Spain; they only ask us to recognize their independence, and thus give them the credit and standing to which they are entitled among the nations of the earth, and with their own strong arms and their own brave hearts they will achieve their own independence. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

They prefer that course, and I sympathize with the spirit which prompts them to prefer it. Any people worthy to be free desire to achieve their own freedom, and if the Cuban people sought their freedom through American intervention, I should doubt their ability to maintain it when it was given to them. They hope to have a national history. They hope to have national heroes. They hope to teach their children, who, in turn, will teach their

children and their children's children, how Cuban patriots wrought out the problem of Cuban freedom. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Is there a man who does not sympathize with that lofty sentiment? A representative of the Cuban Republic said to me, with great frankness and feeling:

We do not seek to involve the United States in a war with Spain. It is unnecessary. Give us a recognition of our independence, so that we can obtain arms and heavy artillery, and in thirty days we will put an army of a hundred thousand Cuban patriots in the field, and in thirty days more the flag of Spain will be trailing in the dust of Cuba.

[Applause on the Democratic side.]

That is their spirit. Why do we not meet them in it?

War! You invite it with all its horrors, which I know as well as the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JOHNSON] does. I was raised in a section that witnessed its desolation. My father and my kinsmen came back from the battlefields rendered historic by the courage of those who wore the blue as well as of those who wore the gray. When they turned from Appomattox, where they had left everything except their honor, on every hand they witnessed the horrors and desolations of war.

Where they had left happy homes they found charred and blackened ruins. What had once been a peaceful dwelling where a busy housewife plied her daily care, where little children trained its vines and played in peace, there were only ashes. They came back to find their social system subverted, their industrial condition changed, their fortunes gone, and many of their bravest and best had fallen in that unhappy strife. They remember all this, but it has not conquered their resentment against wrong and injustice. A one-armed Confederate veteran manifested their spirit when he said to me a few days ago, "I had rather take this other arm and lay it by the side of one that fertilizes the battlefield of Shiloh than to see my country insulted or the freedom of a brave people denied." [Applause on the Democratic side.] We do not want war. We have twice offered you the opportunity to avoid it. But, Mr. Chairman, we might as well be bold. If it takes a war to free the Island of Cuba, my voice, and the voice of those with whom I have the honor to act, is for war. Our motto is: "Cuba free, without a war if possible; Cuba free, with a war if necessary." [Prolonged applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. GROW. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Debate upon this amendment is exhausted by order of the House. If there be no objection, the informal amendment will be considered as withdrawn. The Chair hears no objection. The Clerk will read the next section.

The Clerk read as follows:

Pay of noncommissioned officers, musicians, and privates: For 1 sergeant major, 1 quartermaster-sergeant, 1 leader of the band, 1 drum-major, 50 first sergeants, 150 sergeants, 220 corporals, 30 musicians, 120 drummers and fifers, and 2,499 privates, and the number of enlisted men authorized as above for the Marine Corps shall be exclusive of those undergoing imprisonment with sentence of dishonorable discharge from the service at expiration of such confinement, and for the expenses of clerks of the United States Marine Corps traveling under orders, \$569,888.

Mr. GROW. Mr. Chairman, I am induced to trespass upon the attention of the committee for a few minutes by the remark of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BAILEY] that if Congress had recognized the Cuban patriots as belligerents this war would have ended long since. This prediction of what might have happened if something had been done that was not done leads me to claim the attention of the House briefly.

Belligerency means what? That the Government recognizes two parties in a contest as engaged in a war for supremacy. That would not relieve this Government from its obligation of strict neutrality between them. It would have to maintain it the same as it has been doing. Not a gun, not a man could go to help the Cuban patriots under belligerency that can not go to-day. They could have had no aid nor assistance more than they have had during this time that the Government has been watching these movements.

This Government made England pay over \$15,000,000 for not observing strict neutrality after she had recognized the belligerent rights of the Confederates in our civil war, and we should have involved ourselves in the danger of a war long before this had belligerency been recognized. Spain would stop an American vessel to overhaul it to see if it had contraband of war, and the doctrine of this Government, proclaimed and maintained in the second war of independence, was that the flag protected all over which it floated and no right of search could be permitted to any nation.

A chance shot would have opened all the bloody drama of a war long ago, in my judgment; and my prediction is just as good as the prediction of the gentleman from Texas that the war would have been ended.

Belligerency, therefore, would have been of no advantage to the patriots on the Island of Cuba. I have regarded this question from the first, Mr. Chairman, as simply resolving itself into one thing in the end.

When the day should come when this Government would feel

justified in its own right and position on this hemisphere, in view of the public sentiment of the Christian world, to recognize the independence of Cuba, then it would become our duty as American citizens, our duty to the country and to the common cause of liberty and the rights of humanity, to maintain and declare the independence of the patriots of Cuba; and that would be a warning to Spain that she must withdraw her control over Cuba, and if it was not done it might then be the duty of this Government to intervene with military force.

There was a time when the Spanish flag floated over more of this hemisphere than the flags of all other nations, and she had on this continent more territory than any other nation. But she has lost it all. Cuba and Puerto Rico is all of this mighty possession that is left under her flag. The day is soon to come when Cuba must be free; and it is only a question of time. I would say to gentlemen you can have war any day. That question will keep. No danger of losing the opportunity. [Laughter.]

That seems to be the trouble with our impatient friends on the other side, that they are afraid of losing a chance for war. [Laughter and applause.] Mr. Chairman, when the time comes for the recognition of the independence of Cuba, and I think it is near, if war must come as a result, I think a little delay of the war would be better. If we are to begin the war in the rainy season in Cuba, what would be the effect? The men sent to Cuba, not acclimated, would, most of them, find a grave in the island in the rainy season, the same as the Spanish soldier.

The climate has killed more Spanish soldiers than the arms of the patriots, and will continue to do so. God Almighty is on the side of the patriots in Cuba, and their salvation will soon come through the aid of climatic influences. It is impossible for a nation to bring soldiers enough 3,000 miles over the ocean to conquer a brave people, though they may be comparatively few in numbers as our fathers proved in the Revolution. From reliable information from two hundred and fifty to sixty thousand Spanish soldiers have been sent to Cuba.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. GROW. If the House will indulge me for a couple of minutes, I shall be through.

There was no objection.

Mr. GROW. Spain has sent of her sons already 250,000 or 260,000 to Cuba, and to-day, by the best information that can be obtained, there are probably not to exceed 30,000 fit to take the field. How long would it take her to conquer Cuba?

The climate has done its work and will continue to do its work; and when the rainy season is over this year, Spain must send reinforcements again, as she has done every year heretofore, or abandon the contest. In view of that state of things, the executive department of our Government can, by negotiation, settle the question in a short time, so that Cuba shall be an independent nation, and the great Republic will welcome the patriots of Cuba as a sister republic.

In the war between England and Spain, before our Revolution, England attempted to wrest Cuba from Spain, and then of the men from Connecticut and Massachusetts who under the British flag attempted to take Cuba, of all who landed upon the island, only a small remnant returned to their homes. The climate did for them what the climate has done for the Spanish soldier and would do for ours in the rainy season.

In conclusion, I think the time is near at hand when this Government should recognize the independence of this people as a sister republic struggling as did our fathers for the great principles of our own Declaration of Independence. When that is done, this Government must be ready to see to it that recognition secures the independence of this people. [Loud applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Chairman, I did not intend to answer the argument of the gentleman from Texas, but I feel a very strong degree of sympathy for him. When a man has been for nearly a year trying to play a game of small politics on the question of war and has failed every time, and has finally made an exhibition of himself in a futile effort in that direction unparalleled in the history of this body, it is a matter that becomes pathetic. I rose to point out one or two absurd statements constantly repeated in the newspapers and which found an echo in the voice of the gentleman from Texas.

He warns this side of the House that if the President attempts to force the Cubans to buy their freedom, hell will break loose in about fifteen seconds on the Democratic side. [Laughter on the Republican side.] Nobody proposes to force the Cubans to buy their independence. It is like "a tale told by the idiots, full of sound and fury, and signifying nothing." There is no such opposition by, to, or from the Administration, and the whole idle tattle of this character in the newspapers has been just so much folly and nonsense, and yet statesmen, leaders of a great division upon this floor, rise and solemnly warn the Republican side of this House that if the President drives Cuba to buy her independence, they will go to work to prevent it!

Nobody has attempted it. It is an idle dream of somebody and talk in the newspapers. Again, what does the gentleman know about how far matters have progressed between the United States as the intermediary source of diplomacy and Spain and Cuba on the other side? The gentleman says he is in close touch with the Cuban junta; he says he has their confidence, and I am glad to hear it.

Mr. BAILEY. I am not in close touch.

Mr. GROSVENOR. That is what the gentleman said.

Mr. BAILEY. I invite them to come to my house, and I would do it one hundred times.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I am delighted to hear it. I am as anxious as the gentleman from Texas that Cuba shall be free. Has any man connected with the Cuban junta intimated that the President of the United States has interposed any condition that Cuba shall pay—

Mr. BAILEY. The gentleman from Ohio speaks of the "Cuban junta." I know nothing about it. I have conferred with the representatives of the Cuban Republic in my house.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Has the gentleman heard from "the representatives of the Cuban Republic in my house" that the President was trying to force them to pay for their independence?

Mr. BAILEY. I said nothing of the kind.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Then what was there in what the gentleman did say—

Mr. BAILEY. You asked me a question. Now let me finish my answer. Every man knows, and the gentleman from Ohio knows, that I did not pretend that they had told me that or that the President of the United States had told me that. I took the statement from the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Then the gentleman drew a very erroneous impression from my remarks.

Mr. GROSVENOR. The gentleman from Indiana said nothing of the kind. The gentleman said something to the effect that the Cubans had a right to be allowed to buy their independence.

Mr. NORTHWAY. The gentleman from Texas said yesterday that he believed that it was so, and says he knows it to-day.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I understand that the gentleman from Texas did say that yesterday he believed the President of the United States was trying to force it upon the Cubans, and to-day he said he knew it. Now, I rose simply to say that the gentleman is wholly mistaken. If he had such information from an authoritative source, he ought to make it public. The time has come in this country when misunderstanding of what is going on is doing more harm than the views of people who do understand.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Will the gentleman from Ohio yield for a question?

Mr. GROSVENOR. Yes; if it is a question.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Will the gentleman state that he believes from what he knows that it is not in contemplation by the President of the United States in the negotiations now going on to treat of a money consideration for the freedom of Cuba?

Mr. GROSVENOR. It is too contemptible to answer. There never was such a thought ever entered into the head of any man connected with the Administration.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Is not there an intimation of that kind in the negotiations at Madrid?

Mr. GROSVENOR. What have we to do with the negotiations at Madrid? I say the purchase of Cuba by the Government or the suggestion of its approval is a story told by "an idiot, full of sound and fury, signifying nothing." There never was anything in it, and this is only done to fan anew the flame that seeks for political advantage upon this floor by springing so-called questions of privilege that make the author of them ridiculous in the sight of common humanity.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER. I ask that the gentleman's time be extended ten minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. LENTZ. Will the gentleman from Ohio permit me a question?

Mr. GROSVENOR. Yes.

Mr. LENTZ. I see in the newspaper that forty-five members on that side of the House met two or three evenings ago and held a caucus, intending to vote for a resolution for the independence of Cuba. Were they seeking our political advantage or their own political advantage?

Mr. GROSVENOR. I heard something of that kind; but I heard something better than that. Yesterday, when the scheme to promote a political advantage was sprung here, with the awkwardness of a Fourth of July boy burning firecrackers, I noticed 178 gentlemen put their names down on the right side of the organization of party and party concord. [Applause.]

Mr. LENTZ. Will the gentleman answer about the 37 members who did not vote on that side?

Mr. GROSVENOR. How many on that side of the House did not vote?

Mr. LENTZ and several others. Not one.

Mr. GROSVENOR. There were only two gentlemen on this side who did not vote, and those two gentlemen had a good right to vote as they pleased. We were able to defeat the machinations that sought to stampee this House into disorganization. [Applause.] Now, let me close what I have to say on this subject. The exact fact is, that two Republicans refused to vote to sustain the Speaker, and every other man on this side who was present and not voting was paired. That is the exact fact. Two men, answering to their own consciences—and they had as good a right in that respect as I had—declined to vote to uphold the Speaker. How many gentlemen on the other side voted to override the Speaker, confessing at the same time that he had ruled according to law? How many?

A MEMBER (on the Republican side). Every one.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I could name a good many of them myself.

Now, in conclusion, the Administration of this Government to-day is as anxious for the freedom and independence of Cuba as any gentleman on the other side of the House. [Applause.] There is not one man, from the President down to the humblest member on this floor, who will ever, without the consent of the Cuban insurgents, ratify, agree to, or approve any settlement of the Cuban question that does not involve absolute independence for Cuba [applause]; and there is not a gentleman on the other side of the House who knows this fact better or from a more direct source of information than does the gentleman from Texas, because he has had the fullest opportunity to learn the fact; and he knows it is unjust to the President to intimate that he to-day knows that the President is trying to force Cuba to buy her independence.

Mr. Chairman, this movement will go forward. The Republicans of this House, the Republicans of the Senate, and the loyal people of the United States, Republicans and Democrats, are in favor of the independence of Cuba. But they are in favor of avoiding war if it can possibly be done consistently with the honor, dignity, and glory of the American name. [Applause.]

Do you think that this great party in power to-day is going to be unfaithful to a trust which, as the gentleman from Texas intimates, will, if properly discharged, bring glory to the Administration? Will the Administration now in power run away from the most brilliant opportunity that any Administration since the days of Abraham Lincoln has had to establish itself and its party in the praise and honor and glory of a mighty people? [Applause.] Any gentleman who thinks so does not understand the man at the head of affairs. He may be persistent in his purpose, because he understands that purpose. He may be going more slowly than many of us think he ought to go.

I sympathize to a great extent in that feeling myself, but he is going in the right direction. Nothing has been lost to this country. The journals of the civilized world this morning have spoken with stronger terms of indorsement than ever before of the attitude and action of the people of the United States, and in that connection one and all of the English-speaking journals put it forward as the cardinal idea that Cuba must be free, and that we would make her free. [Applause.]

As the gentleman from Pennsylvania has said "war will keep." Diplomacy may go slower than we think it ought to go; but when we know it is going in the right direction, guided by the right sort of hands, inspired by the right sort of hearts, there is no danger that the people of this country are to be betrayed by their rulers.

Let us stand together and cease this attempt at political capital. [Applause.] It is unworthy of a great political party; it is unworthy of any gentleman who wants to be the leader in this House or the next. He can not climb the ladder by attempting to go up a rope of that character loosely suspended from the top.

There is something more than temporary political advantage to be considered in this matter. There is statesmanship, there is honor, there is integrity. There is glory in the right direction. Cuba will be free, and Cuba will be free by the intervention of the United States. I would not give one cent for a declaration of independence unaccompanied by a further declaration. What nonsense it would be to declare the Island of Cuba independent and then let her starve to death!

What sense would there be in declaring a nation independent that has not a gun-making shop, has not a ship, has not a piece of artillery, so far as I know? The thing to do in the case of Cuba is to exhaust all that honest diplomacy can do to achieve her liberty and independence, and, failing in that, stop not at the halfway house that the gentleman from Texas is talking about—not only declare that Cuba is independent and shall be free, but accompany that declaration with an army and a navy to make our declaration worth something. [Applause.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. CUMMINGS obtained the floor.

Mr. BRUMM. I ask that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] have five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has recognized the gentleman from New York [Mr. CUMMINGS]. Will the gentleman from New York permit the Chair to put the request for unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio have five minutes additional?

Mr. CUMMINGS. Certainly.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to extending the time of the gentleman from Ohio for five minutes?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Chairman, this mighty demonstration and organization of war—what does it mean?

Mr. GRIGGS. Will the gentleman allow me to interrupt him for a question?

Mr. GROSVENOR. Certainly.

Mr. GRIGGS. I desire to ask the gentleman, would not the recognition of the independence of Cuba, followed by the enforcement of the Monroe doctrine, be sufficient?

Mr. GROSVENOR. Why, does the gentleman ask that question in earnest? [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. GRIGGS. Yes, sir.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Because the Monroe doctrine has no application whatever in a case like that. So I beg the gentleman will not trifle with the subject with which I am dealing. What is the Monroe doctrine? What means the mighty demonstration of war that is being made in this country? What does it mean when every arsenal of whatever kind or shape, when every navy-yard and every appliance in the country is working by night and by day, irrespective of price, to forge the engines of war?

What does it mean, I ask the gentleman? What is the United States going to do? Is it going to make a "shilly-shally" declaration that the Cubans are free, and then let them go to the devil, in the clutch of the Spanish nation? [Applause on the Republican side.] Is that the idea of gentlemen?

Let me tell the gentleman that behind the efforts of the Administration, that knows what it is talking about, behind the mighty demonstration of loyalty that comes up from the people of this country, behind the mighty impulse of the people, who know what they are doing, and they are ready—they are preparing now—to carry into force the declaration they made, the declaration that may be demanded from us, not only that Cuba is free and independent, but that we have been charged with her defense, and propose to see that she shall be forever free hereafter. [Prolonged applause on the Republican side.]

What does it mean that we have abandoned our own shipyards and have gone abroad to buy, with a profusion of expenditure, the ships of war of other nations? What does it mean that every preparation that can be determined upon as rapidly as possible is being made, and being pushed forward with expedition?

My countrymen, you have not been betrayed by your Administration or deceived by it. [Applause on the Republican side.] That Administration is in touch with the highest inspiration and the best motives of patriotic citizens throughout the whole land; and if the people—with the help of the Democratic party if we can get it, or without its help if we can not get it, but we will get it—I say with the help of the Democratic party, without their engineering and paltry, demagogical speeches on the floor of this House, in due time—at an early time, too—the people of this country will shout in praise of a Republican Administration which will carry into execution the power, the will, and the edicts of the American people. [Prolonged applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. I would ask if it is possible, by unanimous consent, or by any other process, to obtain an armistice long enough on this question in order to enable us to proceed with business on this bill?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks that is hardly a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. There seem to be a great many men on the floor who are more desirous of declaring war than of getting ready to declare war. I suppose they want to declare it with their voices, and if it were done now, we certainly would be able to present a strong front on this floor. [Cries of "Regular order!"]

Mr. BAILEY. Let the "stormy petrel" from Maine rage for a while and then we will get on with the bill.

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. I wish to give notice that at the conclusion of these remarks I shall ask the committee to go on with the bill. [Hisses on the Democratic side.] Let gentlemen hiss if they desire to. I enjoy it just as much as I do their cheers or applause.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will be in order.

Mr. OGDEN. Everybody is in order but the gentleman from Maine.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does not think that the gentleman's remark is in order.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. GROSVENOR, generally observes the decencies of life in debate, but on this occasion he has failed to do so.

Mr. QUIGG. I call the attention of the gentleman from Texas to the fact that the gentleman from Ohio has just left his seat. I am sure that he would prefer the gentleman from Ohio to be in his seat, to hear what the gentleman is about to say.

Mr. BAILEY. I will take great pleasure in waiting, for I want him to hear this.

Mr. QUIGG. I was sure the gentleman would prefer that course.

Mr. BAILEY. And until the gentleman from Ohio returns I will allow the gentleman from New York to proceed.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, it affords me great pleasure to note the fact that gentlemen on this side of the Chamber have voted to recognize the independence of Cuba. It gives me additional pleasure, sir, to be assured by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] that the other side of the Chamber favor the recognition of the independence of the people of Cuba. There ought to be no politics in such a crisis. "A plague on both your houses." Behind you stand the American people. They are not asking you as Republicans whether you will recognize the independence of Cuba, nor are they asking the Democratic party on this floor whether they are in favor of it. They ask your action as Americans without regard to party, appealing, as they have a right to appeal, as American citizens to an American Congress. They point, sir, to the fact that with every day of delay thousands of little children, thousands of women and other reconcentrados of Cuba are dying of starvation. Every day hundreds of deaths are heaped upon the heads of this Congress because of its policy of inaction.

I said yesterday that Weyler's order was still in force. If the newspapers are to be believed, Blanco is about to revoke it. But while I speak it is still in force, Mr. Chairman. This order includes not only Cubans, but American citizens as well. I saw in Matanzas an American citizen who, two years ago, was worth \$200,000. He had an estate 6 miles up the Matanzas River. He married his wife in Amherst, Mass. When Weyler's order was issued his plantation was destroyed and he was driven within the trocha of Matanzas with the other reconcentrados. Ah, sir, here was the initial step for intervention by the American Government. It was at that time that not only a protest but a peremptory order should have been given to Spain. She should have been told, "You can drive your own people into these pens if you see fit, but keep your hands off from American citizens." [Applause.]

These American citizens were driven into this pen. The consul at Matanzas, Mr. Brice, told me with his own lips that he had reported this to the State Department, where the report has remained buried to the present hour. This American citizen and his family are still penned in at Matanzas, and are saved from starvation by the \$50,000 Congressional appropriation.

At Sagua, sir, Consul Barker told me of an American citizen who, refusing to obey the order of Weyler, was murdered, his plantation destroyed, his cattle killed. The consul sent to the State Department the affidavits of seven eyewitnesses of the murder, and that report has remained buried in the State Department out of sight of the light of day.

Mr. Chairman, I repeat, the American people want no politics here in Congress on this question. [Applause.] They demand action as Americans. They demand the action of an American Congress; and so far as I am concerned, Mr. Chairman, I shall vote with any party and with every party that will support a proposition to end this war and give freedom and independence to Cuba. [Applause.]

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. You will not do as they did yesterday—vote against a resolution because it comes from the other side.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CUMMINGS. One word more, Mr. Chairman. If this is not done, and a dishonorable course is taken, let the Navy Department paint its ships in black, let the Almighty drape the heavens, and let the American people sit down in sackcloth and ashes, for there is one thing worse than war, and that is national cowardice. [Prolonged applause.]

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is recognized on a motion to strike out the last two words.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, when my attention was called to the fact that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] was absent from the Chamber, I had proceeded so far as to say that he generally observed the decencies of debate, but that he had signally failed to do so to-day.

The theory is that we are all equals here, and no man with a proper respect for himself or a proper respect for this forum will permit himself to stigmatize the statements of his fellow-members

as "jargon and the gabble of an idiot." Perhaps I do not repeat the gentleman's exact words. I do recall, however, his use of the familiar quotation from Shakespeare that "it is a tale told by an idiot, full of sound and fury, signifying nothing."

Mr. GROSVENOR. Not quite that, if the gentleman will allow me. I used the proper quotation, and not what the gentleman is saying. The quotation is "Like" or "as a tale told by an idiot;" not that it is a tale told by an idiot.

Mr. BAILEY—

And why should all this difference be
"Twixt tweedledum and tweedledee?"

[Laughter.]

Now, Mr. Chairman, if it is a tale told by an idiot, I refer that respectfully to the gentleman from Indiana, who—

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. BAILEY. Let me finish my statement—whose reputation for fairness, in spite of his partisanship, is as much above the reputation of the gentleman from Ohio as an eagle is above a glow-worm. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield to the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. BAILEY. I do.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. While the gentleman smiles, it is as one who would twist a knife under my ribs. The gentleman must not misquote me.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman not only said it once, but he repeated it; he declared in commendation of the President that he had brought the parties to this dispute so far toward an amicable understanding that the Cuban junta had agreed to pay a hundred million dollars and Spain was about ready to accept it. Do I state him correctly?

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Substantially correctly, but there was no intimation with it, if the gentleman pleases—

Mr. BAILEY. I should like the reporter's notes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. The gentleman must take my remarks in their entirety. That is the way to get at my true meaning. There was no intimation at all on my part that the President had forced or compelled anybody to offer anything for Cuban independence.

Mr. BAILEY. Did the gentleman use the words "that the President had brought them to it?"

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Possibly; but if you will take my remarks entire, you will find, as I said, that it was simply by virtue of negotiations—

Mr. BAILEY. If the gentleman explains that very much more, it will not be worth talking about—

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. That it was in the spirit of compromise.

Mr. BAILEY (continuing). Because the very point of what he said was that the President, great and wise—and I have made no criticism against the President up to this time—that the President, great and wise, in the exercise of his patience and his forbearance, had almost solved this question, or at least had proceeded so far in the solution of it that the Cuban junta had offered to buy the freedom of the island and the Spanish Government was entertaining the offer. And if the gentleman did not assert that as being to the credit of the Administration, then I am totally mistaken in my position.

But the gentleman says I am substantially correct. Then what I quote him as saying is, that the President has brought the high contending parties in this bloody drama to the south of us almost to an understanding.

But the gentleman from Ohio says that the proposition that Cuba is to buy its independence of Spain "is a tale told by an idiot, full of sound and fury." I commend his quotation, with my compliments, to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JOHNSON]. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

If there is an idiot here, it is not on this side of the Chamber, but on that, and I suspect that the idiot is not the member from Indiana, but the member from Ohio. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.] Now, Mr. Chairman, how carefully did the gentleman from Ohio protect himself. He declared that there had never been any such proposition, and yet a little further on he says that it is absurd to say that the President or any man on that side of the Chamber will ever consent to a proposition for the purchase of Cuba that does not involve its independence. How do you know, if it has not been discussed among you?

Mr. GROSVENOR. We are all intelligent enough, I think, to know. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. BAILEY. Did the gentleman use the word "honest"?

Mr. GROSVENOR. Yes. [Laughter.]

Mr. BAILEY. There was a tribe in the biblical days that stood upon the corners of the streets declaring their honesty and thanking God that they were not as other men were, and yet that same tribe are to-day more despised than any people of whom the Bible tells us.

The most dishonest man is he who boasts of his honesty and stands in sore need of a testimonial in favor of it. But the gentleman from Ohio then proceeded a little further to reveal the attitude of his party. Of course the President of the United States will not negotiate the purchase. Of course Congress will not be asked to ratify it. But if, after this Government has withheld first the recognition of belligerency and then of independence, the Cuban patriots are driven to make terms with their Spanish oppressors, Congress will be told that the representatives of the Cuban Republic have made to the representatives of the Spanish Government a proposition which has been accepted and that the whole matter then has passed from our hands.

It then becomes a closed incident, and nothing remains except, I presume, to arbitrate the destruction of the *Maine*, and that bloody deed, the most disgraceful in American history, will be closed by arbitrating the murder of our sailors and the destruction of our ship. Is that your policy?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BAILEY. I ask a moment more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks unanimous consent that he may be allowed to continue his remarks five minutes more.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Ten minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi asks unanimous consent that the gentleman may be allowed to continue his remarks ten minutes more. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Before the gentleman proceeds, may I ask him a question?

Mr. BAILEY. Certainly.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. I want to get at the gentleman's real position. Of the two alternatives, which would you prefer—a voluntary purchase of their independence of Spain by the Cubans, or their independence obtained through war by the United States?

Mr. BAILEY. I have no objection to answering. Mr. Chairman, I never will compel or agree that the Cuban people shall pay one dollar for their liberty to a nation which has starved their wives and children. [Applause on the floor and in the galleries.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Just answer my question. How far will the gentleman go in order to prevent the Cubans obtaining their independence from Spain by voluntary purchase?

Mr. BAILEY. I did not hear the gentleman exactly.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. To what extent did the gentleman say he would go in order to prevent negotiations for the voluntary purchase by the Cubans of their independence from Spain?

Mr. BAILEY. The gentleman states his question adroitly, but not fairly. My answer is this: If you will recognize the independence of Cuba, there is no power on earth that can compel them to negotiate with Spain for the purchase of their freedom.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. That is not an answer to my question. You have said as between two alternatives you would not permit Cuba to purchase her liberty of Spain. Now, how would the United States Government prevent Cuba purchasing her own liberty if she desires to do so?

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I have answered that question, and my time is running. [Cries of "Oh!" on the Republican side.]

Mr. Chairman, I have always tried to be respectful to my political opponents; but for the last two or three weeks I have never taken this floor to make a statement but gentlemen on that side have tried to drown my voice. I have believed that their sense of justice and common decency would restrain them from doing so; but it has not done so, and yesterday I felt provoked to call them the Speaker's "servants," and I now think I ought to have said I believed them to be the Speaker's "menials." [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Since I have been a member of this House I have never interrupted any man by a jeer or any attempt to drown his voice, and I think that in common decency and fairness I ought to be exempt from the interruptions that I have been subjected to whenever I have attempted to occupy the floor within the last three weeks.

To return to my controversy with the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JOHNSON], I have here his exact statement, which I will read:

When I sat down a short while ago, I was attempting to make before this House and the country, if indeed the country will heed one voice so feeble as my own, a statement of the fact that by the steady policy of diplomacy, the honest, patriotic course of the President of the United States, we were gradually bringing these two antagonistic elements together, that Spain had come down to the point that she was willing to abandon possession of Cuba upon a mere nominal consideration, and that the Cuban junta, authorized, I doubt not, to act for the insurgents, had agreed that they could and would raise \$100,000,000 in order to purchase their independence.

Now, I want to call the attention of the House to a speech delivered on the 20th day of May, 1897, almost a year ago, by the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR], in which he plead then, as he pleads to-day, for time; time for the Republican party to solve this question. Almost a year ago! How much more time do you want, while the spirits of the starving men, women, and children are revisiting their wasted places? How

much longer must we wait while the Cuban patriot looks into the pale and hungry faces of his wife and children, and then looks toward our own great and free land and on his bended knees begs the God of nations to send him relief?

How much longer must these patriots, who are struggling as our forefathers more than one hundred years ago were compelled to struggle, wait before the American Congress will send them a message recognizing that their heroic struggle has attracted the attention and commands the approval of a liberty-loving and free people at their very doors? [Applause.] I shall ask the Clerk to read what the gentleman from Ohio said one year ago. It sounds so much like what he said to-day that it will be the best answer that I can make.

The CHAIRMAN. If there is no objection, the Clerk will read.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. I would like to have the gentleman from Texas, when he gets through, answer the last question that I put to him.

The Clerk read as follows:

Let me say to the gentleman that the Republicans of the United States were born and raised in sympathy with Cuba—free Cuba. It was a Republican President who, against the protest of the Democratic party, sought to relieve Cuba of her troubles long ago. And it is the Republicans on this floor who feel a genuine and honest sympathy for Cuba. And when the right time comes, in the right order of things and upon their own motion, they will be found voting not only for belligerent rights to Cuba, but they will be found demanding liberty and national independence for the men of Cuba who have suffered. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. BAILEY. They applaud. Will a man stand up and say that you have ever voted for the recognition of belligerency? And yet General GROSVENOR said you would do it. Is there a man among you that ever voted for Cuban independence? And yet General GROSVENOR said you would do it. While the Republican party has been waiting and praying for wisdom to solve this momentous problem, 300,000 men, women, and children have starved to death in this unhappy island. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

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

Mr. BAILEY. Yes.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Is it not a fact that even prior to that speech every Republican on this floor had voted to recognize the rights of belligerency for the people of Cuba, and did not your Democratic President refuse to execute the orders of Congress? And did the gentleman from Texas introduce any resolution to drive forward that scheme of liberty and justice?

Mr. BAILEY. My answer is that every Democrat, with a very few exceptions, voted for that resolution when there was a so-called Democratic President; they voted for it then and they have voted for it every time since. How is it with your side? You voted for it when you did not have the President, and you vote against it when you happen to have the President. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The gentleman from Ohio boasts of a united party. Are you united? If so, what meant that caucus of reconcentrados that assembled in the Library building yesterday afternoon? [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the gentleman's time be extended five minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. I ask that it be unlimited. I hope the gentleman will not forget my last question before he sits down.

The CHAIRMAN. Unanimous consent is asked that the gentleman's time be extended five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana rose.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas yield to the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. BAILEY. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. I asked the gentleman a bit ago which alternative he would prefer, that the Cubans should voluntarily purchase their independence of Spain, or that they should achieve it through war with the United States. His answer was that he would not permit the Cubans to purchase their independence—that was the substance. Now, I ask him how far he wants the Government of the United States to go in order to prevent the Cubans from voluntarily purchasing their liberty of Spain?

Mr. BAILEY. An examination of the reporter's notes will show that I have answered that question twice; the third time would not make the answer any more emphatic, and I desire to occupy the brief time I have by recalling the fact that when we were making provision for the starving inhabitants of Cuba less than a year ago, the gentlemen on that side told us that war could wait, but famine would not; that we must first relieve the hunger, and then we would take up the question of independence.

We tried to force this House to couple with its provision a recognition of the right of this people to fight for their own independence. We believed then as we believe now that if our policy had prevailed Cuba would be free and the grave crisis that now

threatens the peace of two nations would have been averted. But a practically united Republican majority taunted us with opprobrious epithets. They declared that we were disregarding the appeals of humanity and the cries of famine; that we were delaying the sending of provisions to men who starved while we played the many-sided game of politics. They promised that when the starvation had been relieved they would meet and would decide the question of belligerency and independence.

There is your record. There are the words and the promises of the gentleman who assumes to speak for this Administration. You need not answer me; but you must answer the exasperated people of this country. Have you kept your promise? Have you voted for belligerency? Have you voted for independence? Perhaps many of you have been anxious to do it. I have been told that a large number of you held a caucus yesterday afternoon. I am told that you appointed a committee to wait upon the President.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BAILEY. I will not ask the House to indulge me further. I leave that committee to make its report from the President to the next Republican caucus of reconcentrados. [Laughter.]

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. I move that all debate on the pending paragraph and amendments thereto be now closed, if all the arguments in favor of and opposed to the pending amendment have been exhausted.

The motion to close debate was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. If there be no objection, the informal amendment will be considered as withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mileage: For mileage of officers traveling under orders without troops, \$8,000.

Mr. LENTZ. I move to amend by striking out the last word. Mr. Chairman, several remarks have been made which I think ought to be taken up, and I begin by taking a remark of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JOHNSON] that we ought to hold up the hands—or the arms, rather—of the President at this time. I submit to all fair-minded men that the arms of the President of the United States can not be held up, because they are now tied behind his back by the money power. [Applause on the Democratic side, and derisive cries on the Republican side.]

I thank you for that derision, gentlemen on the other side. I will answer you by the words of my friend from Ohio, General GROSVENOR. You have already had an answer from the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BAILEY] to your groaning in answer to his most eloquent plea for Cuba. You on the opposite side are playing and singing a different tune to-day from what you did on the 6th of January last. On that day my friend General GROSVENOR was for war, and now he, too, is saying, "Wait, wait, wait." On that day he condemned his own party and read to you from the St. Louis platform of June, 1896, on the Cuban question. We are now well along in 1898.

General GROSVENOR was twitted for having abandoned the St. Louis platform on the civil service, and he answered you then and defended himself with sneers and taunts as to your record on the Cuban question. He read to you the declaration of the St. Louis platform on that subject, and I repeat it, reading from his speech of the 6th of January, when he stood before you and asked you how you liked it.

From the hour of achieving their independence the people of the United States have regarded with sympathy the struggles of other American peoples to free themselves from European domination. We watch with deep and abiding interest the heroic battle of the Cuban patriots against cruelty and oppression, and our best hopes go out for the full success of their determined contest for liberty.

The Government of Spain having lost control of Cuba—

In June, 1896, gentlemen, you said the Government of Spain had lost control of Cuba—

and being unable to protect the property or lives of resident Americans—

You said that, too, in June, 1896—

or to comply with its treaty obligations—

You said that, too, in June, 1896—

We believe that the Government of the United States should actively use its influence and good offices to restore peace and give independence to the island.

You said that, too, in June, 1896.

Yet when our friend from Texas [Mr. BAILEY] introduced his resolution yesterday, you spent half a day in technical quibbles against the recognition of the independence of Cuba. Talk about taunts and sneers on this side! I want to say to you, gentlemen of the opposition, that the truth is not in any plank of the St. Louis platform. "Actions speak louder than words."

If you meant what you said in 1896, why did you not prove it yesterday by your votes for the independence of Cuba? Almost two years ago you put before the people that solemn declaration I have just read. You, above all men, gentlemen, ought to have honor enough to defend your President, to whose loyal support we came by joining with you in giving into his hands \$50,000,000 of the

money of the people—a thing unprecedented in the history of this country. We gave it to him with our godspeed, that he might use it like a thunderbolt to strike the chains of oppression from the bleeding limbs of starving Cubans, who have suffered more at the hands of Spain than did any pioneer at the burning stake of fiend or savage. We helped you to put into force and effect your St. Louis platform on Cuban independence and the protection of the lives and property of American citizens, but you have not been manly or candid enough to accept our aid.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. I move that all debate on this paragraph be now closed.

Mr. BAILEY. I hope that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LENTZ] may be allowed to proceed for five minutes further.

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. If the gentleman from Ohio desires to go on for five minutes more in explanation of his amendment, I am willing.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Maine move to close debate at the expiration of five minutes?

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. Yes; I modify my motion in that way.

The motion of Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine as modified was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. If there be no objection, the Chair will again recognize the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LENTZ] for five minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. LENTZ. Mr. Chairman and my friends on the other side of the House, let me remind you of another factor which ought to make your Americanism blush, if you had any Americanism left in your composition. The chief representative of that effete and barbarous Government called Spain stood in your capital city by virtue of your courtesy, and in a confidential communication to his Government said that the Chief Executive of 75,000,000 American people was nothing but a "low politician!"

Following that, when you sent your flag on a battle ship—the *Maine*—smiling with friendship into the harbor of Havana, what did the Spaniards do? They received and placed a generous, patient, and charitable visitor, bearing the olive branch of peace, in a position which was designated by themselves and best suited for the cowardly crime of the assassin. Did they receive and place our battle ship in a position such as we provided for the *Viscaya* at New York, or in such a position as the one in which they would have placed one of their own great war ships? No; not at all. They are not the men to do a thing of that kind.

What are the circumstances in the case? They are well known to our people, and the country will demand full reparation for it. Those who have investigated the condition of the wreck tell us that they found a certain wire "which looked as if it did not belong to the ship." They were not able to trace it from under the wreck of the *Maine*, or to follow it to the shore of the harbor, but you can place your own interpretation on the testimony upon that point. What is the indication? It indicates the connecting link between Moro Castle, under the control of Spanish arms, and the mine under the bow of the steamer *Maine* which destroyed that great vessel.

Is it not very peculiar, Mr. Chairman, that this particular wire, which was entirely under the control of the Spanish authorities, should be the one to connect the submarine mine under the *Maine* with the mainland? They have many other wires to other mines, but the evidence shows that this was the only one that seems to have been touched. I say it was a very plain case of design and treachery such as no civilized nation has ever perpetrated in the history of the world. Aye, sirs, the annals of barbarism and the cruel traditions of savagery may now be destroyed and forgotten, for they have all been surpassed. On such evidence as that embodied in the report in regard to the destruction of the *Maine* there is no court in this land that would not have found the accused guilty of the foul crime of assassination and condemned him to be hung as a murderer in the first degree, the vilest and lowest degree of infamy.

They say it was an "accident!" They say it was not murder! Ah, Mr. Chairman, it was the foul act of a miserable assassin that blew into eternity the lives of 266 American seamen. "Wait," "Wait," "Wait," they say. "Let us take the matter coolly and considerately," they say. We are to wait, according to this theory, until the last Cuban patriot is starved to death. I say that your policy of waiting is a policy of stupidity. It is a policy of cowardice.

It is about time that this country, with its 75,000,000 people, should be heard once for all in defense of American citizenship, once for all for American patriotism, once for all for national honor. With an area equal to all of Europe, with more gold, with more silver, with more coal, with more iron, with more corn, and more wheat, and more of everything that goes to make riches, and more of all these rich and great conditions of life than all of Russia, Germany, France, England, Spain, Italy, Austria, and all other European nations combined, shall we be heard or shall we

remain impotent? Some of you on that side of the House say that this country is not great enough and powerful enough to demand justice for the struggling Cubans; but I say, and every one of my associates whose creed is the Chicago platform, declares that they shall be free and independent as a people who have so fairly won their liberty by their own exertions. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The Cubans request us to take but one step—they request us to acknowledge their independence; and if, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania says, it will do no good, it certainly can do no harm to recognize them and their independence. If Spain wants to declare war for that, let her make the most of it. In the name of the American manhood which fought and won in every war in which the American people have ever engaged, let us now, when we are three, ten, and fifteen times as strong, engage, if need be, in another war and avenge the lives of the American patriots who now sleep a restless sleep in Cuban soil. Cuba must be free. Those 266 American citizens can not and shall not sleep their eternal sleep in the land of tyrants. The money power shall not dictate the policy of American manhood. I protest against it in behalf of ninety-nine out of every hundred of the Democrats, as well as the Republicans, in the great State of Ohio. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. If there be no objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

For commutation of quarters to officers on duty without troops where there are no public quarters, \$4,000.

Mr. BELFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The question of liberal, aye, bounteous, appropriations for the increase of the United States Navy is one that addresses itself to every dictate of sound judgment and every impulse of lofty patriotism. Under the complex conditions of modern civilization and international intercourse it seems that the necessary condition of peace is a thorough and adequate equipment for war; and under circumstances such as those that now confront us, and in the solemn and momentous situation in which we find ourselves to-day, the voice of everyone, irrespective of political lines or political affinities, must favor the placing of the American Navy on such a footing as will enable it to successfully cope with any navy upon the broad expanse of the ocean. And it is probable that this proposition has never been more forcibly emphasized nor the attention of the country more sharply directed to this truth than at the present hour.

Conditions are such now with reference to our relations to the Government of Spain that at any moment we may either choose or be forced to make a test of our naval strength upon the high seas. But it must prove a source of universal gratification, Mr. Chairman, to the hearts of American people to know that if we do so choose, or are thus forced, it will be in one of the most righteous causes upon which the smile of God has ever rested. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The history of Cuba for fifty years has been the history of a people vainly struggling for freedom. I say to you, Mr. Chairman, that the hour is now here when Cuba must be free. [Applause.] The pledge of the American people, the will of God, decree this. [Applause.] You can no longer forestall this conclusion, gentlemen. And while I have been highly edified at the exalted exhibition of virtue and courage upon that side of the Chamber, I want to reassure you, gentlemen, as to the attitude of this side so far as I am individually concerned. You will see this question settled, see it settled by the Republican party, voicing the highest aspirations of the American people, see it settled as honor dictates, see it settled as the highest dictates of conscience and of manhood demand. [Applause.]

And in my humble judgment, Mr. Chairman, Cuba must be free, not by purchase, not by the payment of two hundred millions, or less or more, in gold, but free by the diviner right of having purchased her freedom by a higher price than gold—the blood of her patriotic sons, shed in the most cruel, the most inhuman, the most infamous war that has ever befouled the pages of history. If these results can be accomplished by peaceful negotiations, well and good; but accomplished they must be, or the voice of the American people go unheeded. And if to accomplish them there must be an appeal to the most solemn and terrible of all tribunals, as Longfellow sings of the Building of the Ship, so will the undivided voice of the American people say to our noble President and to our gallant Navy which he shall thus commission:

Our hearts, our hopes, are all with thee,—
Our hearts, our hopes, our prayers, our tears,
Our faith triumphant o'er our fears,
Are all with thee,—are all with thee!

[Applause.]

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Through the action of Americans.

[Here the hammer fell.]

The Clerk began the reading of the next section.

Mr. DOCKERY. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Missouri desire to address the committee?

Mr. DOCKERY. No; I was just going to indulge the hope that we could now proceed with the consideration of the bill.

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. I thank my friend.

Mr. DOCKERY. There is a probability that in the near future we may have graver matters to consider even than this.

Mr. LACEY. I call the gentleman from Missouri to order. He has no right to insist on going on with the bill. [Laughter.]

Mr. HANDY. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Delaware rises to a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HANDY. Where is the Clerk reading in the bill?

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk is reading line 14, page 47. The Clerk will proceed.

The Clerk read as follows:

In the office of the adjutant and inspector: One chief clerk, at \$1,540.80; one clerk, at \$1,496.52;

Mr. GRIGGS. Mr. Chairman, a few moments ago I asked a question of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR]. I asked it respectfully and in all seriousness and candor. I will read the question and the reply:

Mr. GRIGGS. I desire to ask the gentleman, Would not the recognition of the independence of Cuba, followed by the enforcement of the Monroe doctrine, be sufficient?

Mr. GROSVENOR. Why, does the gentleman ask that question in earnest?

Mr. GRIGGS. Yes, sir.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Because the Monroe doctrine has no application whatever in a case like that. So, I beg the gentleman will not trifle with the subject with which I am dealing. What is the Monroe doctrine?

Had not the gentleman intimated that I was trifling with the serious subject which he was discussing, I should have nothing to say in reply. But I desire, Mr. Chairman, now to inform the all-wise gentleman from Ohio what the Monroe doctrine is, in the exact language of the President who first declared it, and thereby acquit myself of the charge of trifling with this question.

Mr. Monroe said:

We owe it therefore to candor and to the amicable relations existing between the United States and those powers to declare that we should consider any attempt on their part to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety. With the existing colonies or dependencies of any European power we have not interfered and shall not interfere, but with the governments who have declared their independence and maintained it, and whose independence we have on great consideration and just principles acknowledged, we could not view any interposition for the purpose of oppressing them or of controlling in any manner their destiny by any European power in any other light than as a manifestation of an unfriendly disposition toward the United States.

[Applause.]

That is the Monroe doctrine willingly furnished by the humble gentleman from Georgia to the omniscient gentleman from Ohio.

The gentleman from Ohio is a lawyer, and he ought to know that the language of Mr. Monroe, "and whose independence we have on great consideration and just principles acknowledged," has direct application to the situation which would follow the recognition by us of Cuba as an independent State. This is the reply of the gentleman from Georgia to the question of the gentleman from Ohio, and if the gentleman from Ohio is satisfied the gentleman from Georgia is. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. I appeal to the committee. There has been exceedingly wide latitude, and I hope we will be able to make a little progress with the reading of the bill.

Mr. DRIGGS. I hope so, myself.

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. I know this is very much more useful than the naval bill!

[Mr. SKINNER addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. It is obvious that this committee has no particular business duty toward the United States, and I move that the committee do now rise.

The CHAIRMAN. If there be no objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The motion that the committee rise was then agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SHERMAN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill making appropriations for the naval establishment and had come to no resolution thereon.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED.

Under clause 2, Rule XXIX, Senate bills of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and referred to their appropriate committees as indicated below:

S. 3720. An act authorizing cities and towns in the Indian Territory to secure, by condemnation or otherwise, lands necessary for public improvements—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

S. 3729. An act making further provision for a civil government for Alaska—to the Committee on the Territories.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the following titles:

S. 1462. An act granting an increase of pension to Enoch G. Adams;

S. 1837. An act granting a pension to Sarah E. Cotton;

S. 1820. An act granting a pension to Sophia J. Chilcott; and

S. 1521. An act granting a pension to Sarah M. Spyker.

SUGAR-BEET INDUSTRY.

The SPEAKER laid before the House a message from the President of the United States, transmitting for the information of Congress a communication from the Secretary of Agriculture, covering a detailed report showing the present condition of the beet-sugar industry in this country and the results of experiments made by the Department of Agriculture in the production of sugar from beets in the United States during the past year; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture, and ordered to be printed.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

By unanimous consent, leave was granted to Mr. SOUTHWICK to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, papers in the case of John McNeil.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. WHITE of North Carolina for four days, on account of urgent business.

On motion of Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine (at 4 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following executive and other communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of Howell L. Moore, administrator of William Moore, deceased, against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Supervising Surgeon-General of the Marine-Hospital Service submitting an additional estimate of deficiency in appropriation for the quarantine service—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Secretary of the Navy submitting an estimate of appropriation for repairing and improving the telephone line from the Navy Department and navy-yard to the naval proving ground—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, Mr. MARSH, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 9338) to restore to the State of New York the flag carried by the One hundred and fourth New York Volunteer Infantry, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 915); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

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

Mr. DAVISON of Kentucky, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 8969) for the relief of the First Baptist Church, of Crab Orchard, Ky., reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 893); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. JETT, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 3991) for the relief of Henry J. Fleming, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 894); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HENRY of Connecticut, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 7802) granting a pension to Emily A. Hausner, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 896); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BARBER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 5776) for the relief of Sidney J. Hare, late private in Company C, Ninety-sixth Regiment of New York Volunteers, reported the same with amendment,

accompanied by a report (No. 897); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. NORTON of Ohio, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 1467) granting a pension to Adolphine Krez, widow of Conrad Krez, late colonel Twenty-seventh Wisconsin Infantry and brevet brigadier-general of volunteers, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 898); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. WARNER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 4961) to pension George W. Osborn, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 899); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. RAY of New York, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 157) to increase the pension of Gen. James W. McMillan, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 900); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 487) granting a pension to Delia Gilman, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 901); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. GIBSON, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 1345) granting an increase of pension to Sarah Brumm, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 902); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CASTLE, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 2497) to increase the pension of James E. Eaton, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 903); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MIERS of Indiana, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 603) granting a pension to Clarissa E. Hobbs, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 904); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 99) granting a pension to Ira Ingraham, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 905); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 2318) for the relief of John T. Brewster, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 906); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. GIBSON, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 1450) granting a pension to Catherine Leary, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 907); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MIERS of Indiana, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 499) granting a pension to Sarah R. Frary, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 908); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 7554) granting a pension to William Iott, of Gowen, Mich., reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 909); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. GIBSON, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 116) granting a pension to W. L. Faxon, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 910); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 4691) to increase the pension of Charles Hoffman, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 911); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HENRY of Connecticut, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 497) granting an increase of pension to Betsey B. Olin, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 912); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BARBER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 1541) granting a pension to "Itewayaka" or "One-armed Jim," reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 913); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. KERR, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 6785) restoring Julia L. Roberts, late Julia L. Doty, to the pension roll, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 914); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS INTRODUCED.

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

By Mr. GUNN: A bill (H. R. 9637) to ratify an agreement with the Indians of the Fort Hall Indian Reservation, in Idaho, and making appropriations to carry the same into effect—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. HULL: A bill (H. R. 9638) to increase the number of surgeons in the United States Army—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WHEELER of Alabama: A bill (H. R. 9639) for the relief of the starving Cubans—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. McCLELLAN: A bill (H. R. 9640) to authorize the President of the United States to confer brevet rank upon Louis P. DiCasnola, late colonel Fourth New York Cavalry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HULL: A memorial of the legislature of the State of Iowa, relative to making Fort Arthur a subport of entry—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED.

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

By Mr. BARLOW: A bill (H. R. 9641) for the relief of Mrs. Anna McNamara—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BELDEN: A bill (H. R. 9642) granting an increase of pension to Michael Mahoney—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BINGHAM: A bill (H. R. 9643) to increase the pension of Charlotte L. Carmody—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CARMACK: A bill (H. R. 9644) for the relief of Charles C. Burke, administrator of Elizabeth Burke, deceased, late of Shelby County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9645) for the relief of Mrs. Clara E. Bryant, Shelby County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CHICKERING: A bill (H. R. 9646) to amend the military record of Frank Ehart, late a private in Company D, One hundred and forty-seventh and Fifteenth New York Cavalry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9647) for the relief of De Estang Shepard—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CURTIS of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 9648) for the relief of Capt. George A. Armes—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DALZELL: A bill (H. R. 9649) for the relief of the heirs of George W. Welsh—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. DANFORD: A bill (H. R. 9650) for the pensioning of Mrs. S. Amanda Mansfield—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FENTON: A bill (H. R. 9651) to correct the military record of Charles K. Dawson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK: A bill (H. R. 9652) for the relief of William Webb, of Alphoretta, Ky.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9653) removing charge of desertion from military record of Jesse Dennis—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GRIFFITH: A bill (H. R. 9654) for the removal of charge of desertion standing against Herman F. Schafer, late of Company K, Third and Forty-fifth Indiana—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LEWIS of Georgia: A bill (H. R. 9655) granting a pension to Adaline Simons—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LINNEY: A bill (H. R. 9656) granting a pension to Hesehiah A. Wood—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9657) granting a pension to Gillomiel L. Smoot—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9658) granting a pension to Mrs. Jane Lyon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9659) granting a pension to Mrs. Rhoda Harris—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McCULLOCH: A bill (H. R. 9660) for the relief of the estate of Jamerson W. Rice—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MERCER: A bill (H. R. 9661) granting a pension to Maj. W. W. Lowe—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RIDGELY: A bill (H. R. 9662) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of John McIntosh—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9663) granting a pension to W. J. Tims—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHERMAN: A bill (H. R. 9664) to remove charge of desertion standing against Ramsom Brodock—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Arizona: A bill (H. R. 9665) to remove the

charge of desertion from the military record of John Tayhen—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9666) directing the issue of a duplicate lost check drawn by C. C. Sniffen, major, United States Army, in favor of Fourth National Bank, New York City—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9667) for the relief of Charles Delahaye—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STARK: A bill (H. R. 9668) granting a pension to Emma M. Wilcott—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SUTHERLAND: A bill (H. R. 9669) to correct the military record of Patrick Dunphy—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BROWNLOW: A bill (H. R. 9670) to restore Nancy Simmons to the pension roll—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GARDNER: A bill (H. R. 9671) for the relief of John H. Anderson—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. McDOWELL: A bill (H. R. 9672) to remove the charge of desertion against John G. Frost—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9673) to muster Henry Knisely as a member of Company L, Eighth Regiment Ohio Volunteers, and to grant him an honorable discharge—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9674) to remove the charge of desertion against George Webb—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MILLS: A joint resolution (H. Res. 216) to restore the status of the Chicago Dragoons—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

By Mr. ADAMS: Petition of the representatives of the Society of Friends for Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Delaware, respecting the controversy between the United States and Spain—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Philadelphia Board of Trade, favoring the passage of Senate bill No. 3027 and House bill No. 6705, for pure flour—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ARNOLD: Petition of Glen Richey Lodge, No. 383, Knights of Pythias, of Glen Richey, Pa., indorsing House bill No. 6468, praying for a lease of public land from the Government for the establishment of a national Pythian sanitarium—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. BARBER: Petition of Grace Chapter, Epworth League, Washington, D. C., favoring the passage of a bill to protect State anti-cigarette laws by providing that cigarettes imported in original packages on entering any State shall become subject to its laws—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Methodist Protestant Church and Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Girdletree, Md., asking for the passage of a bill to forbid the sale of intoxicating beverages in all Government buildings—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, petition of the Methodist Protestant Church and Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Girdletree, Md., praying for the enactment of a Sunday-rest law for the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARNEY: Resolutions of the Wisconsin State Federation of Labor, the central bodies of Wisconsin, and the local unions of Eau Claire, Wis., urging the passage of sundry bills pending for the protection of labor—to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. BARTLETT: Petition of J. C. Beauchamp, J. W. Williamson and other citizens, James S. Boynton, R. L. Allen and others, W. H. Beck and others, all of Williamson, Ga.; L. F. Blalock, W. T. Glover, T. J. Mitchell and others, of Fayetteville, Ga., favoring the passage of the anti-scalping bill—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BELDEN: Petition of citizens of Nelson, N. Y., asking for the passage of a bill to raise the age of protection for girls to 18 years in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BELFORD: Petition of the representatives of the Religious Society of Friends for Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Delaware, respecting the controversy between the United States and Spain—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolutions of the National Wholesale Lumber Dealers' Association of New York, in favor of the Indianapolis monetary commission bill and the maintenance of the gold standard—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Central Islip, N. Y., in favor of legislation to protect State anti-cigarette laws by providing that cigarettes imported in original packages on entering any State shall become subject to its laws—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURLEIGH: Petition of citizens of Waterville, Me., in

favor of the passage of the so-called anti-scalping ticket bill—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of A. F. Gerald and 19 other citizens of the State of Maine, in opposition to the so-called anti-scalping bill or any similar measure—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Anson Grange, No. 88, Patrons of Husbandry, of Maine, praying for the enactment of legislation prohibiting the sale of intoxicating liquors in all Government buildings—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, petition of Anson Grange, No. 88, Patrons of Husbandry, and Woman's Christian Temperance Union of North Anson, Me., favoring the passage of a bill to protect State anti-cigarette laws by providing that cigarettes imported in original packages on entering any State shall become subject to its laws—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUTLER: Resolutions of Spring City Lodge, No. 91, Knights of Pythias, of Spring City, Pa., in favor of House bill No. 6468, granting land at Hot Springs, Ark., for the purpose of erecting and maintaining a sanitarium thereon—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. CARMACK: Two petitions of citizens of Moscow, Tenn., favoring the anti-scalping bill—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CHICKERING: Petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Palermo, N. Y., favoring legislation providing that cigarettes imported in original packages on entering any State shall become subject to its laws—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLARKE of New Hampshire: Petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Wilton, N. H., asking for the passage of bills to raise the age of protection for girls to 18 years in the District of Columbia, to protect State anti-cigarette laws, and to forbid the transmission of lottery messages by telegraph—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Wilton, N. H., for the passage of a bill prohibiting the sale of intoxicating liquors in the Capitol building and grounds—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. CODDING: Petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance unions of New Albany, Factoryville, Canton, Tunkhannock, Columbia Crossroads, and Bradford County, and the Baptist Church of Hawley, all in the State of Pennsylvania, favoring legislation providing that cigarettes imported in original packages on entering any State shall become subject to its laws, to forbid interstate transmission of lottery messages by telegraph, and to raise the age of protection for girls to 18 years—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of various societies of Scranton, Brooklyn, Tunkhannock, Columbia Crossroads, New Albany, Standing Stone, and Factoryville, and the Baptist Church of Hawley, all in the State of Pennsylvania, favoring the bill which forbids the sale of alcoholic liquors in Government buildings—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, petition of Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Tunkhannock, Pa., favoring a bill to establish a Sabbath law for the national capital—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of members of the bar of Wayne County, Pa., favoring an amendment to the bill creating a new Federal district in Pennsylvania—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Tunkhannock, Pa., favoring a bill to appoint a commission to investigate problems of labor and capital—to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of Tunkhannock Lodge, No. 254, Knights of Pythias, of Tunkhannock, Pa., favoring House bill No. 6468, to erect a national Knights of Pythias hospital and sanitarium at Hot Springs, Ark.—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, petition of Union Hose Company, of Athens, Pa., against Senate bill No. 2736, regulating insurance—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of A. L. Rowland and others, of Wayne County, Pa., and Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Tunkhannock, Pa., for the passage of a bill to prevent the admission of illiterate, pauper, and criminal classes to the United States—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. CUMMINGS: Petition of Hamilton R. Squier and 5 citizens of New York City, in favor of the passage of the so-called anti-scalping bill—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CURTIS of Iowa: Resolutions of Building and Trades Union of St. Louis, Mo., in support of the right of franchise in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. DOVENER: Paper to accompany House bill for the relief of Benjamin F. Harrison, granting him an honorable discharge—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: Resolutions of the Boston Chamber of

Commerce, indorsing whatever action the President or Congress may take in behalf of Cuba, and extending to the suffering people of Cuba sympathy in their distress—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolutions of the Boston Boot and Shoe Club, in favor of the monetary commission bill and a sound currency—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, petition of the Merchants' Association and Paint and Oil Club of New England, all of Boston, Mass., favoring the passage of the anti-scalping bill—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK: Papers to accompany House bill relating to the claim of William Webb—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. GARDNER: Petitions of Woman's Christian Temperance unions of Beverly and Burlington, N. J.; the Methodist Episcopal Church, the Baptist Church, the Presbyterian Church, and the Mount Pleasant Methodist Protestant Church, of Pleasantville, N. J., and the Epworth League of Brigantine, N. J., praying for the enactment of legislation to protect State anti-cigarette laws by providing that cigarettes imported in original packages on entering any State shall become subject to its laws—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of certain churches and societies of Burlington and Brigantine, N. J., praying for the enactment of legislation raising the age of protection for girls to 18 years in the District of Columbia and the Territories—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of certain churches and societies of Burlington and Brigantine, N. J., for the passage of a bill to forbid interstate transmission of lottery and other gambling matter by telegraph—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of certain churches and societies of Columbus, Beverly, and Brigantine, N. J., in favor of the passage of a bill to prohibit the sale of liquors in Government buildings—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Columbus, N. J., asking for legislation that will allow women to participate in and vote at election for officers who regulate the sale of intoxicating liquors—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

Also, resolution of State Firemen's Relief Association of New Jersey, in opposition to Senate bill No. 2736, to establish a Government insurance department—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, resolution of Mercer Lodge, No. 239, of Trenton, N. J., favoring the passage of the anti-scalping bill—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, resolutions of Washington Camp, No. 6, of Trenton, N. J., Patriotic Order Sons of America, favoring the passage by Congress of the Lodge immigration bill—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. GRIFFITH: Petition of Herman F. Schaefer, late of Company K, Third Indiana Cavalry, and Forty-fifth Regiment Indiana Volunteers, to accompany House bill for the removal of the charge of desertion—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GROSVENOR: Petitions of the Methodist Episcopal Church and Young People's Society, of Nelsonville, Ohio, for the passage of a bill to prohibit the sale of liquors in Government buildings—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. GROUT: Petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Boston, Mass., asking for the passage of House bill No. 6705, to prevent the adulteration of flour—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Hiram Hyde and 91 citizens of Strafford, Vt., and vicinity, in favor of legislation to more effectually restrict immigration and prevent the admission of illiterate, pauper, and criminal classes to the United States—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. HAY: Three petitions of citizens of the State of Virginia, in favor of legislation abolishing ticket brokerage—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petitions of the Baptist Young People's Union and the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Singerglen, Va., in favor of the passage of a bill to prohibit the sale of liquors in Government buildings—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HENDERSON: Memorial of representatives of the Religious Society of Friends for Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Delaware, respecting the controversy between the United States and Spain—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petitions of C. E. Ebbeson and 18 citizens of Carpenter, Iowa; E. L. Merrifield and other citizens of New York City, and resolutions of Eagle Grove Division, No. 164, of Eagle Grove, Iowa, Order of Railway Conductors, urging the early passage of the anti-scalping bill—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HENRY of Connecticut: Petition of Woman's Christian Temperance Union of New Britain, Conn., to forbid the transmission of lottery messages by telegraph—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HILBORN: Petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of West Oakland and Benicia, Cal., and Mothers' Meetings of Benicia, favoring the passage of bills providing that cigarettes imported in original packages on entering any State shall become subject to its laws, and to raise the age of protection for girls to 18 years in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of West Oakland and Benicia, and Mothers' Meetings of Benicia, Cal., for the passage of a bill which forbids the sale of alcoholic liquors in Government buildings—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HILL: Petitions of the Disciples Church of Danbury, Conn., and Congregational Church of Bethel, Conn., to forbid the sale of intoxicating beverages in Government buildings—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, petition of the Second Advent Church of Danbury, Conn., for the passage of a bill to forbid interstate transmission of lottery and other gambling matter by telegraph—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HITT: Memorial of representatives of the Religious Society of Friends for Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Delaware, respecting the controversy between the United States and Spain—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petitions of the Free Methodist Church, the Baptist Young People's Union of the South Baptist Church, Methodist Episcopal Church, Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Epworth League, German Evangelical Church, Baptist Young People's Union of the First Baptist Church, Christian Endeavor Society of the Presbyterian Church, and North Belvidere Woman's Christian Temperance Union, all of Belvidere, Ill., in favor of the passage of a bill to prohibit the sale of liquors in Government buildings—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, petitions of various churches and societies of Belvidere, Ill., in favor of the passage of a bill to substitute voluntary arbitration for railway strikes—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of various churches and societies of Belvidere, Ill., in favor of the passage of a bill to prohibit the interstate and mail circulation of extended newspaper descriptions of prize fights—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions from various churches and societies of Belvidere, Ill., praying for the enactment of a Sunday-rest law for the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petitions of various churches and societies of Belvidere, Ill., for the bill forbidding the interstate transmission of lottery messages by telegraph, etc.—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of various churches and societies of Belvidere, Ill., praying for the enactment of legislation prohibiting kinetoscope reproductions of prize fights in the District of Columbia and the Territories—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of various churches and societies of Belvidere, Ill., praying for the enactment of legislation raising the age of protection for girls to 18 years in the District of Columbia and the Territories—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of various churches and societies of Belvidere, Ill., favoring legislation providing that cigarettes imported in original packages on entering any State shall become subject to its laws—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of citizens of Polo, Ill., praying for the passage of the anti-scalping bill—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HULL: Petitions of the Congregational Church, Methodist Episcopal Church, and Mitchellville Lodge, No. 109, Independent Order of Good Templars, all of Mitchellville, Iowa, to raise the age of protection for girls to 18 years in the District of Columbia and the Territories, to protect State anti-cigarette laws, and to forbid the interstate transmission of lottery messages by telegraph—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Mitchellville, Iowa, asking for the passage of a bill to forbid the sale of intoxicating beverages in all Government buildings—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. JOHNSON of North Dakota: Petition of the First Baptist Church, Baptist Young People's Union, and Luther League of Fargo, N. Dak.; Methodist Episcopal Church, Congregational Church, Ladies' Aid Society, Woman's Christian Temperance Union, and Independent Order of Good Templars of Hope, N. Dak.; Woman's Christian Temperance unions of Durbin and Harlem; Young People's Society of Christian Endeavor of the Presbyterian Church of Grand Forks, and mass meeting of citizens of Kelso, N. Dak., for a law to regulate the interstate commerce of cigarettes and to prohibit the interstate transmission of

lottery messages and other gambling matter by telegraph—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petitions of certain churches and religious societies in the State of North Dakota, praying for the enactment of legislation raising the age of protection for girls to 18 years in the District of Columbia and the Territories—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petitions of certain churches and religious societies of Fargo, Durbin, Harlem, Elliott, Lakota, and Maza, N. Dak., favoring the passage of a bill to prohibit the sale of liquors in the Capitol and all Government buildings, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, petition of the Methodist Church of Drayton, N. Dak., for the passage of a bill to further protect the first day of the week in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. JOY: Petition of the Hargadine McKittrick Dry Goods Company and 28 other firms in St. Louis, Mo., in favor of the passage of the anti-scalping bill—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Young People's Society of Christian Endeavor and Hyde Park Congregational Church, of St. Louis, Mo., for the passage of a bill to protect State anti-cigarette laws by providing that cigarettes imported in original packages on entering any State shall become subject to its laws—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KITCHIN: Resolution of the board of directors of North Carolina penitentiary asking for the permanent location of the Federal prison for the South in the North Carolina penitentiary—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Guilford College, N. C., asking for the passage of a bill to forbid the sale of intoxicating beverages in all Government buildings—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Guilford College, N. C., for the passage of the bills to raise the age of protection for girls to 18 years, to protect State anti-cigarette laws, and to forbid the interstate transmission of lottery messages—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEWIS of Georgia (by request): Petitions of citizens of Fort Valley and Hawkinsville, Ga., praying for the passage of the anti-scalping bill—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LEWIS of Washington: Petitions of Christian Sunday School, Christian Church, Congregational Sunday School, and citizens of Olympia; Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Methodist Episcopal Church, First Presbyterian Church of Everett; Methodist Episcopal Church, and Society of Christian Endeavor of Church of Christ of Garfield; Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Goldendale; First Methodist Episcopal Church of Tacoma, and citizens, all of the State of Washington, for the passage of bills to protect State anti-cigarette laws, to forbid the interstate transmission of gambling matter by telegraph, and to raise the age of protection for girls—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of various churches and societies of Goldendale, Garfield, Tacoma, Olympia, and citizens of the State of Washington, for the bill which forbids the sale of alcoholic liquors in Government buildings—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, petitions of various societies of Goldendale and Garfield, Wash., favoring the passage of a bill to forbid interstate gambling by telegraph or telephone—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of various societies of Goldendale and Garfield, Wash., to raise the age of protection for girls to 18 years in the District of Columbia and the Territories—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of citizens of Toledo and other places, State of Washington, urging the enactment of legislation which will more effectually restrict immigration and prevent the admission of illiterate, pauper, and criminal classes to the United States—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, resolutions of Spokane Division, No. 285, and Tacoma Division, No. 249, State of Washington, favoring the passage of the anti-scalping bill—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Seattle Chamber of Commerce, State of Washington, favoring the annexation of Hawaii—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petitions of Columbia County Council, Patrons of Husbandry, State of Washington, favoring postal savings banks, pure food, and free rural mail delivery—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. LIVINGSTON: Two petitions of citizens of Atlanta, Ga., in favor of the passage of the so-called anti-scalping ticket bill—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LOUD: Petitions of the Congregational Church and the Young People's Society of Christian Endeavor of Saratoga, Cal.,

for the passage of bills to protect State anti-cigarette laws, to raise the age of protection for girls to 18 years, and to forbid interstate transmission of lottery messages by telegraph, etc.—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of the Congregational Church and the Young People's Society of Christian Endeavor of Saratoga, Cal., favoring the bill which forbids the sale of alcoholic liquors in Government buildings—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. LOUDENSLAGER: Petition of Charles Waters and 3 other citizens of Camden, N. J., praying Congress to investigate and correct abuses in the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of the First Presbyterian Church of Merchantsville, N. J., to forbid the sale of intoxicating liquors within 200 feet of a church, schoolhouse, or charitable institution—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of the First Presbyterian Church of Merchantsville, N. J.; Young People's Society of Christian Endeavor of Bridgeton, and Landis Township Teachers' Association, of Vineland, N. J., in favor of the passage of a bill to prohibit the sale of liquors in Government buildings—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, petitions of the Landis Township Teachers' Association, of Vineland, N. J., and the First Presbyterian Church of Merchantsville, N. J., in favor of the passage of bills to forbid interstate transmission of lottery messages by telegraph and to protect State anti-cigarette laws—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCLEARY: Petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union and citizens of Jasper, Minn., favoring the passage of bills to protect State anti-cigarette laws, to forbid the transmission of lottery messages by telegraph, and to raise the age of protection for girls—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Jasper, Minn., praying for the enactment of legislation prohibiting the sale of intoxicating liquors in all Government buildings—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. McCLELLAN: Petition of 7 citizens of New York City, favoring the passage of the anti-scalping bill—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McCORMICK: Paper to accompany House bill to correct the military record of James W. Johnson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, paper to accompany House bill to correct the military record of John Kirkpatrick—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McDOWELL: Papers to accompany House bill to remove the charge of desertion against George Webb—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McINTIRE: Resolution of the Merchants and Manufacturers' Association of Baltimore, Md., expressing sympathy for the suffering people of Cuba, pledging support to whatever course the President and Congress may take for their assistance, and affirming that war is the last remedy to which as a people we should have recourse—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MAHON: Petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Selinsgrove, Pa., praying for the enactment of legislation to protect State anti-cigarette laws, to forbid the interstate transmission of lottery messages by telegraph, and to raise the age of protection for girls to 18 years in the District of Columbia and the Territories—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Baptist Church of Union City, Pa., favoring the bill to raise the age of protection for girls to 18 years in the District of Columbia and the Territories—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Selinsgrove, Pa., and Christian Endeavor Union of Hartleton, Pa., asking for the passage of a bill to forbid the sale of intoxicating beverages in all Government buildings—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. MANN: Petitions of Marie Methodist Episcopal Chapel congregation, of Chicago, Ill., favoring the passage of a bill to prohibit the sale of liquors in the Capitol and all Government buildings, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, petition of the Marie Methodist Episcopal Chapel congregation, of Chicago, Ill., praying for the enactment of legislation to protect State anti-cigarette laws, to forbid the interstate transmission of messages by telegraph, and to raise the age of protection for girls to 18 years in the District of Columbia and the Territories—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAXWELL: Petition of 275 citizens of Neligh, Nebr., praying that the age of protection for girls be raised to 18 years in the District of Columbia and the Territories—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MEYER of Louisiana (by request): Petition of the heirs of Barry Hayes, deceased, late of New Orleans, La., praying that his war claim be referred to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MINOR: Two petitions of citizens of Stevens Point,

Wis., in favor of legislation to more effectually restrict immigration and prevent the admission of illiterate, pauper, and criminal classes to the United States—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petitions of Woman's Christian Temperance unions of Pine Grove and Baldwins Mills, Wis., favoring the passage of a bill to protect State anti-cigarette laws by providing that cigarettes imported in original packages on entering any State shall become subject to its laws—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Methodist Episcopal Church, and citizens of Sturgeon Bay, Wis., praying for the enactment of legislation to forbid the interstate transmission of lottery messages by telegraph and to raise the age of protection for girls to 18 years—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of citizens of Green Bay, Wis., praying for the passage of the anti-scalping bill—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petitions of Hope Congregational Church, Methodist Episcopal Church, and numerous citizens of Sturgeon Bay, Wis., asking for the passage of a bill to forbid the sale of intoxicating beverages in all Government buildings—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. MOON (by request): Petitions of D. L. Lloyd and 18 others, William E. Seitz and 19 others, of Washington, D. C.; Otto W. Geisendufner and 18 others, Frank S. Browne and 18 others, James Smith and 17 others, William W. Wright and 19 others, Dr. Frederick Hoffa and 18 others, of the District of Columbia and other places, in opposition to the so-called anti-scalping bill or any similar measure—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. OTEY: Petition of 200 citizens of the State of Virginia, in opposition to the so-called anti-scalping bill or any similar measure—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PAYNE: Petitions of W. H. Seward and 5 others, George R. Peck and 3 others, A. W. Lanton and 3 others, E. H. Any and 4 others, Charles Hoskins and 3 others, Charles F. Rattigan and 3 others, R. A. Dyer and 3 others, George C. Mills and 4 others, George W. Clooth and 3 others, A. R. Knox and 3 others, E. H. Townsend and 3 others, Henry L. Stork and 3 others, W. H. Hudson and 3 others, E. J. Jewhurst and 3 others, H. J. Knapp and 3 others, H. F. Horton and 3 others, W. R. Laird, M. D., and 5 others, A. G. Culom and 4 others, of Auburn; W. J. Donsick and 5 others, M. J. Hirschfield and 5 others, M. J. Dillon and 5 others, John C. Jager and 6 others, of Geneva; Edward D. Martin and 5 others, Milo Bruhan and 6 others, of Chapinville; Fred T. Nester and 6 others, of Geneva and Watkins; John Sutton and 6 others, of Hopewell Center and Chapinville; Nelson W. Elrod and 6 others, of Auburn and Union Springs; N. B. Remick and 6 others, of Geneva, Seneca Falls, and Clifton Springs; Charles White and 2 others, of Fleming and Amelins; Amos O. Lee and 2 others, of Averellus, all of the State of New York, favoring the anti-scalping bill—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the members of the First Methodist Episcopal Church of Penn Yan, N. Y., favoring the bill to raise the age of protection for girls to 18 years in the District of Columbia and the Territories—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the members of the First Methodist Episcopal Church of Penn Yan, N. Y., remonstrating against the sale of intoxicating liquors in all Government buildings—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, petition of the members of the First Methodist Episcopal Church of Penn Yan, N. Y., for the passage of a bill to prohibit the interstate transmission of gambling matter by telegraph—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIDGELY: Petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance unions of Niotaze, Parsons, and Winfield, Kans., Presbyterian Church of Osage, Gospel Temperance Meeting of Mound Valley, and Presbyterian, Methodist Episcopal, Christian, and Baptist churches of Girard, Kans., praying for the enactment of legislation to protect State anti-cigarette laws, to raise the age of protection for girls, and to forbid the transmission of lottery messages by telegraph, etc.—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Winfield, Kans., favoring the passage of a bill to substitute voluntary arbitration for railway strikes—to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Winfield, Kans., praying for the enactment of legislation prohibiting kinetoscope reproductions of prize fights in the District of Columbia and the Territories—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Coopers' International Union, of Kansas City, Kans., in opposition to the so-called anti-scalping bill or any similar measure—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROBBINS: Resolutions of Westmoreland Lodge, No. 415, Knights of Pythias, of Irwin, Pa., in support of House bill

No. 6468, granting land at Hot Springs, Ark., for the purpose of erecting and maintaining a sanitarium thereon—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, memorial of the representatives of the Religious Society of Friends for Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Delaware, respecting the controversy between the United States and Spain—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RUSSELL: Petitions of the Baptist Church of Norwich and Congregational Church of Hanover, Conn., favoring the enactment of legislation to protect State anti-cigarette laws by providing that cigarettes imported in original packages on entering any State shall become subject to its laws, and to forbid the interstate transmission of lottery messages by telegraph—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petitions of Congregational Church of Hanover and Baptist Church of Norwich, Conn., asking for the passage of a bill to raise the age of protection for girls—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petitions of the Baptist Church of Norwich and Congregational Church of Hanover, Conn., favoring the bill which forbids the sale of alcoholic liquors in Government buildings—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SHAFROTH: Petitions of citizens of Fort Lupton, Colo., favoring legislation providing that cigarettes imported in original packages on entering any State shall become subject to its laws, to forbid interstate transmission of lottery messages by telegraph, and to raise the age of protection for girls to 18 years—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of citizens of Fort Lupton, Colo., in favor of the passage of a bill to prohibit the sale of liquors in Government buildings—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, petition of Grand Junction Division, No. 325, of Grand Junction, and Denver Division, No. 44, of Denver, Colo., Order of Railway Conductors, in favor of the anti-scalping bill—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SHERMAN: Papers to accompany House bill to remove the charge of desertion against Ransom Brodock—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SPERRY: Petitions of the Congregational Church and Endeavor Society of East Haven, Conn., favoring the bill to raise the age of protection for girls to 18 years in the District of Columbia and the Territories—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of the Congregational Church and Endeavor Society of East Haven, Conn., in favor of the passage of a bill to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors in all Government buildings—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, petitions of the Congregational Church and Endeavor Society of East Haven, Conn., for the passage of a bill to forbid interstate transmission of lottery and other gambling matter by telegraph—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STEWART of Wisconsin: Resolution of the American Federation of Labor and Cigar Makers' Union No. 85, of Eau Claire, Wis., in favor of House bills Nos. 6092 and 7389 and Senate bills Nos. 35 and 95, in the interests of labor—to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of Pioneer Grange No. 538, Patrons of Husbandry, of Medford, Wis., asking for the passage of a bill to prevent the adulteration of food—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of 40 citizens of Ashland, Wis., favoring the passage of the anti-scalping bill—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Military Order of the Loyal Legion of the United States, Commandery of the State of Wisconsin, for an appropriation for the erection of permanent monuments of lines of battle, etc., at Gettysburg, Pa.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CHARLES W. STONE: Memorial of the Evangelical Lutheran Church of Kane, Pa., in favor of certain measures to promote public morality—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SUTHERLAND: Petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union and Christian Endeavor of Roseland, Nebr., to raise the age of protection for girls to 18 years, and to prohibit the interstate transmission of lottery messages and other gambling matter by telegraph—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Christian Endeavor and Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Roseland, Nebr., for the passage of a bill prohibiting the sale of intoxicating liquors in the Capitol building and grounds—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. TONGUE: Petition of the First United Evangelical Church of Portland, Ore., asking for the passage of the bill to raise the age of protection for girls to 18 years in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of the First Baptist Church and Friends' Church of Newburg, Ore., and citizens of the State of Oregon, praying for the enactment of legislation prohibiting the sale of intoxicating liquors in all Government buildings—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. VEHS�AGE: Three petitions of citizens of New York City, in favor of the passage of House bill No. 7130, known as the anti-scalping ticket bill—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. VINCENT: Petition of the Northwest Kansas Annual Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Minneapolis, Kans., praying for the enactment of legislation to protect State anti-cigarette laws by providing that cigarettes imported in original packages on entering any State shall become subject to its laws, and to forbid interstate transmission of lottery messages by telegraph—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Northwest Kansas Annual Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, of Minneapolis, Kans., asking for the passage of a bill to forbid the sale of intoxicating beverages in all Government buildings—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, petition of the Northwest Kansas Annual Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, of Minneapolis, Kans., favoring the passage of a Sabbath law for the national capital—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. WADSWORTH: Petitions of George S. Gooding and 8 others, F. E. Hine and 7 others, T. T. Feeley and 8 others, John R. Earl and 6 others, E. R. Gailer and 6 others, L. W. Kurgley and 4 others, John E. Pound and 5 others, of Lockport; Arthur Schoellkopf and 6 others, J. W. Cutler and 5 others, Charles N. Owens and 6 others, William Pool and 6 others, P. Porter and 7 others, of Niagara Falls; W. F. Beswick and 4 others, C. Freedman and 5 others, H. C. Cotter and 2 others, of Bergen; A. H. Latz and 6 others, W. H. Barber and 6 others, of Sanborn; F. E. Mooers and 6 others, of Alexander, all of the State of New York, favoring the anti-scalping bill—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WANGER: Petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Wrightstown, Pa., praying for the enactment of legislation to protect State anti-cigarette laws and to forbid the interstate transmission of lottery messages by telegraph, etc.—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Wrightstown, Pa., asking for the passage of the bill to raise the age of protection for girls to 18 years in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WARD: Petition of C. E. Storey and other citizens of Mount Vernon, N. Y., in favor of the so-called anti-scalping bill—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Pennsylvania: Resolution of the Trades League of Philadelphia, in favor of House bill No. 8066, for an appropriation for a national exposition of American products and manufactures in Philadelphia, Pa.—to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, resolutions of Radiant Star Lodge, No. 178, of Plymouth, Pa., Knights of Pythias, in support of House bill No. 6468, granting land at Hot Springs, Ark., for the purpose of erecting and maintaining a sanitarium thereon—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, memorial and resolutions of the Trades League of Philadelphia, Pa., asking that the words "with intent to rob" be stricken out of the title and body of House bill No. 8057, relating to train wreckage—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of John R. Pope, president Masonic Board of Relief, New York, favoring the passage of House bill No. 7130, a bill to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate commerce"—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, resolutions of the Lincoln Club (colored), of Luzerne County, Pa., deploring the sad fate of the battle ship *Maine*, commending the course of the President and Congress, and offering support in case of conflict with any foreign power—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

SENATE.

FRIDAY, April 1, 1898.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

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

THE BEET-SUGAR INDUSTRY.

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

To the Congress:

I transmit herewith, for the information of Congress, a communication from the Secretary of Agriculture covering a detailed report showing the present condition of the beet-sugar industry in this country and the results of

experiments made by the Department of Agriculture in the production of sugar from beets in the United States during the past year.

WILLIAM MCKINLEY.

EXECUTIVE MANSION, March 31, 1898.

NOTE.—Accompanying papers are sent with message to House of Representatives.

ANTIETAM BATTLEFIELD.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a letter from the Secretary of War, submitting an estimate of appropriation for care and preservation of monuments, tablets, roads, etc., at the Antietam battlefield, \$3,000; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. SEWELL presented petitions of the Young People's Society of Christian Endeavor of the Central Methodist Episcopal Church, of Bridgeton; of the congregations of the First Baptist Church of Salem; the Broadway Methodist Church, of Salem, and the First Methodist Episcopal Church of Salem, all in the State of New Jersey, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors in all Government buildings; which were referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also presented a petition of the congregations of the First Baptist Church, the Broadway Methodist Church, and the First Methodist Episcopal Church, all of Salem, in the State of New Jersey, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the interstate transmission of lottery messages and other gambling matter by telegraph; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the congregations of the First Baptist Church, the Broadway Methodist Church, and the First Methodist Episcopal Church, all of Salem, in the State of New Jersey, praying for the enactment of legislation to raise the age of protection for girls to 18 years in the District of Columbia and the Territories; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. MITCHELL. I present a brief telegram, signed by a large number of solid citizens of Milwaukee. I ask that it be read and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

There being no objection, the telegram was read, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

[Telegram.]

MILWAUKEE, WIS., March 31, 1898.

HON. JOHN L. MITCHELL, Washington, D. C.:

The business people and conservative elements of the country at large are in favor of peace if same can be maintained with honor to our flag, and believe that overt acts or expressions of hostility on the part of the United States should be avoided. If Spain should force war upon us, the situation would of course be entirely changed, but war should be deprecated except as a last resort after all diplomatic efforts have failed. Any reasonable concessions on the part of Spain should be met in a conciliatory spirit.

Fredk. Pabst, Gen. F. C. Winkler, Edw. P. Vilas, James G. Flanders, Wm. P. McLaren, August Uihlein, Frank R. Falk, Charles Best, Fredk. Kasten, Ernest Borchert, C. W. Henning, Wm. Bigelow, H. H. Camp, Henry Uihlein, Albert Blatz, E. P. Matthews, Charles E. Dyer, Chas. Ray, Robert Hill, John Johnston, Frederick Layton, Washington Becker, William L. Jones, Wilford M. Patton, John S. George, Gustav Wollaeger.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut presented a petition of Lodge No. 284, Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen, of Elm City, Conn., praying for the passage of the so-called anti-scalping ticket bill; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the Endeavor Society of the Congregational Church of East Haven, Conn., and a petition of the congregation of the Congregational Church of East Haven, Conn., praying for the enactment of legislation to raise the age of protection for girls to 18 years in the District of Columbia and the Territories; which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the Endeavor Society of the Congregational Church of East Haven, Conn., and a petition of the congregation of the Congregational Church of East Haven, Conn., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors in all Government buildings; which were referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also presented a petition of the Endeavor Society of the Congregational Church of East Haven, Conn., and a petition of the congregation of the Congregational Church of East Haven, Conn., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the interstate transmission of lottery messages and other gambling matter by telegraph; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. WELLINGTON. I present a petition from the committee on philanthropic labor of the Religious Society of Friends, which I ask may be read and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

There being no objection, the petition was read, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

BALTIMORE, March 31, 1898.

To the Senate of the United States:

The committee on philanthropic labor of the Religious Society of Friends (Park avenue), representing 3,000 persons living in Pennsylvania, Maryland, Virginia, and the District of Columbia, would respectfully petition that