

## POSTMASTERS.

R. S. Smith, to be postmaster at St. Elmo, in the county of Hamilton and State of Tennessee.

James Ross, to be postmaster at New Rochelle, in the county of Westchester and State of New York.

Thomas S. Matthews, to be postmaster at Athens, in the county of McMinn and State of Tennessee.

Albert C. Krog, to be postmaster at Washington, in the county of Franklin and State of Missouri.

F. E. Payne, to be postmaster at Clinton, in the county of Oneida and State of New York.

Hiram A. David, to be postmaster at Wolfe City, in the county of Hunt and State of Texas.

Lewis Otto, to be postmaster at Key West, in the county of Monroe and State of Florida.

Stith Bolling, to be postmaster at Petersburg, in the county of Dinwiddie and State of Virginia.

## REJECTIONS.

*Executive nominations rejected by the Senate April 12, 1898.*

## REGISTER OF THE LAND OFFICE.

Harvey N. McGrew, of Salt Lake City, Utah, to be register of the land office at Salt Lake City, Utah.

## POSTMASTER.

Robert S. Houssels, to be postmaster at Vernon, in the county of Wilbarger and State of Texas.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

*TUESDAY, April 12, 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.

## NAVAL BATTALION, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. HILBORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the table Senate bill No. 1316, to provide for organizing a naval battalion in the District of Columbia, and ask for its immediate consideration.

Mr. LEWIS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I have a privileged resolution—

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will proceed with the reading of the bill indicated by the gentleman from California, after which the Chair will ask if there be objection.

The bill was read at length.

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

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like an explanation of this bill. But in the first place, I should like to ask the gentleman from California this question: Does this bill propose to permanently increase the naval force of the United States?

Mr. HILBORN. As the bill is reported it does to the extent of these three companies forming this battalion of naval militia in the District. It will increase the general militia force of the District, of course, to that extent.

Mr. BAILEY. If it increases it, I shall object.

There was a bill pending before that committee affecting some organization of a naval battalion here which I agreed I would not object to, provided it was organized as a part of the militia force of the District now allowed by law.

Mr. HILBORN. An amendment of that character would effect the purpose of the gentleman.

Mr. BAILEY. Does the gentleman propose to offer that amendment?

Mr. HILBORN. Of course, if that will remove the gentleman's objection, I shall ask the adoption of such an amendment.

Mr. BAILEY. I have no objection in the world to making it a part of the militia force now allowed by law for the District; but I will object unless the amendment is adopted to conform to that view.

Mr. HILBORN. I did not know that there was any such stipulation, but if the gentleman insists upon that amendment going in—

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, there was at least a stipulation on my part. I objected to this proposition once before, in the last Congress, and I agreed that I would not object to it at this time, if it was amended in the way I suggest.

Mr. DINGLEY. I want to ask if this is not a Senate bill, with a House bill similar?

Mr. HILBORN. Yes.

Mr. DALZELL. And this is on the Speaker's table, and privileged.

Mr. BAILEY. It will have to go to the Committee of the Whole, then.

Mr. HILBORN. The Senate bill which is under consideration is identical with House bill 1152, introduced into this House by myself. The same bill was introduced in the Senate by Mr. HALE. The House bill was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs, and has been reported favorably, and is now on the Calendar. The Senate bill came over here and is on the Speaker's table. Now, I call up the Senate bill.

Mr. BAILEY. I make the point of order that this bill must be first considered in Committee of the Whole, and that it can not be called up as a matter of privilege in this way.

Mr. DINGLEY. Is the House bill on the House Calendar?

Mr. HILBORN. Yes; the bill is on the House Calendar.

The SPEAKER. The House bill is on the House Calendar, but if it is wrongfully there the point of order would be good. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Texas on the point of order.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, it does not appear to me that the point of order need to be more than stated. The bill creates three companies in addition to those now allowed by law. If this kind of a bill could be considered in the House without reference to the Committee of the Whole, then a bill creating any number of offices could be so considered. Yet the practice has been uniform that any bill creating additional offices or providing for the appointment of additional officers or that makes any charge upon the public Treasury, must be first considered in the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry. I wish to inquire whether this Senate bill is identical with the House bill?

Mr. HILBORN. It is.

Mr. DINGLEY. Then the question is whether the House bill is on the wrong Calendar.

The SPEAKER. The question is whether this involves an appropriation.

Mr. DINGLEY. I took it for granted, the House bill being on the House Calendar, that it did not involve an appropriation. I did not know what the terms of the bill were.

The SPEAKER. It requires certain officers to be appointed. Whether there is any general law giving them pay or not does not appear.

Mr. DINGLEY. The point of order would be good, then, if that is the case.

Mr. BAILEY. The gentleman concedes that the point of order is well taken.

The SPEAKER. The question, then, is one for unanimous consent.

Mr. BAILEY. I hope the gentleman from California [Mr. HILBORN] will agree to offer the amendment and support it. I will say frankly to the gentleman that I should prefer these companies to be naval, rather than a part of the military establishment of the Government, and I have absolutely no objection to making them naval instead of military companies; but I do object to creating new naval companies and still leaving the military companies to be provided, as the law now allows.

Mr. DINGLEY. Will not the gentleman from Texas consent that this bill may come up, and then that such an amendment may be offered as he suggests? In view of the situation of the country it seems to me that we ought to be considering bills of this kind.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I should like to ask the gentleman from California—

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York.

Mr. BENNETT. During the Fifty-fourth Congress I presented a bill for the establishment of a naval militia in the District of Columbia, and I can see no objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas. I hope the gentleman from California will consent to have the amendment offered.

Mr. DINGLEY. Will the gentleman from California ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of this bill? Then any amendment can be offered that may be suggested.

Mr. BAILEY. I am willing to have the matter go over until we can have a report from the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and thus determine exactly what is the situation of the country.

Mr. DINGLEY. I think the situation is of a character that we need no report to intensify it.

Mr. BAILEY. Unless there is a better foundation for that opinion than there was for the opinion last Monday that the President's message was likely to create a riot in Havana, I am not willing to accept it. [Applause and laughter on the Democratic side.] It might have created a riot in Cuba, but it would not have been among the Spaniards in the cities. It would have been among the insurgents in the interior. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. PAYNE. I did not suppose this discussion was in order, but

I have not objected, because it seems to amuse the gentleman from Texas and his friends on the other side.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California desires to submit a request for unanimous consent. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill S. 1316.

Mr. BAILEY. I object, unless the gentleman agrees to that amendment.

Mr. HILBORN. Very well; I am very anxious to get this bill passed. I consent, then, to the amendment.

Mr. McMILLIN. Mr. Speaker, let us have the bill reported again.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will again report the bill, if there be no objection.

The bill was again reported.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker—

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

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I should like to ask the gentleman from California a question.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, what further need have we of an army or navy, anyhow? [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER. That is not a parliamentary inquiry. [Renewed laughter.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I would like to ask the gentleman a question. Are the companies now in the District militia not now up to the full force allowed by the law?

Mr. HILBORN. I understand that is not so. There is room for these.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I did not hear the gentleman.

Mr. HILBORN. I understand that is not so. There is room for these three companies, and they have already been organized, and have been for a year or more.

Mr. SAYERS. Mr. Speaker, before we go to the consideration of this bill, I want to know of the gentleman from California whether or not this measure, if it should become law, would involve an expense upon the District of Columbia; and if so, how much?

Mr. HILBORN. No; if this proposed amendment prevails, it will not be an addition, but would be a part of the regular force of the District of Columbia.

Mr. SAYERS. The gentleman does not answer my question, Mr. Speaker. I want to know from the gentleman from California whether, if this measure should become law, it would involve an expense upon the District of Columbia?

Mr. HILBORN. No additional expense.

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

Mr. RIDGELY. I object, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Objection is made by the gentleman from Kansas.

#### LEAVE TO SIT DURING SESSIONS OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I am instructed by the Committee on Foreign Affairs to ask permission of the House to sit during sessions.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks the consent of the House that the Committee on Foreign Affairs may sit during sessions of the House. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

#### BRIDGE ACROSS THE YALOBUSHA RIVER, MISSISSIPPI.

Mr. FOX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill H. R. 8569.

The bill was read, as follows:

A bill (H. R. 8569) providing for the construction of a bridge across the Yalobusha River, between Leflore and Carroll counties, in the State of Mississippi.

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Yazoo and Mississippi Valley Railroad Company, a corporation created and existing under and by virtue of the laws of the State of Mississippi, be, and is hereby, authorized to construct and maintain a railway bridge across the Yalobusha River at or near the railroad station known as Dodds Ferry, in Carroll County, Miss., the said bridge to be so constructed as not to unreasonably interfere with the navigation of said river and to be provided with a suitable draw: *Provided,* That a bridge constructed under this act and according to its limitations shall be a lawful structure, and shall be known and recognized as a post route, and the same is hereby declared to be a post route; and the United States shall have the right of way for a postal telegraph across said bridge.

SEC. 2. That the bridge authorized to be constructed under this act shall be located and built under and subject to such regulations for the security of the navigation of said river as the Secretary of War shall prescribe; and to secure that object the said company or corporation shall submit to the Secretary of War for his examination and approval a design and drawings of the proposed bridge and a map of the location giving, for the space of 2 miles above and 2 miles below the proposed location, the high and low water lines upon the banks of the river, the direction and strength of the currents at all stages of the water, with the soundings, accurately showing the bed of the stream and the location of any other bridge or bridges, such map to be sufficiently in detail to enable the Secretary of War to judge of the proper location of said bridge, and shall furnish such other information as may be required for a full and satisfactory understanding of the subject, and until the said plan and location of the bridge are approved by the Secretary of War

no work upon the bridge shall be commenced; and should any change be made in the plan of said bridge during the progress of construction, such change shall be subject to the approval of the Secretary of War.

SEC. 3. That Congress reserves the right to alter or amend this act at any time; and if at any time navigation of the said river shall in any manner be obstructed or impaired by the said bridge, the Secretary of War shall have authority, and it shall be his duty, to require the said bridge company to alter and change the said bridge, at its own expense, in such manner as may be proper to secure free from unreasonable obstructions the navigation of said river, and if, upon reasonable notice to said bridge company to make such change or improvements, the said company fails to do so, the Secretary of War shall have authority to make the same at the expense of said company; and Congress shall have power to do any and all things necessary to secure the free navigation of the river free from unreasonable obstructions.

SEC. 4. That said company shall be permitted to charge and take such rates of toll for crossing said bridge as may be reasonable, subject to the approval of the Secretary of War.

SEC. 5. That the draw provided for the bridge herein authorized to be constructed shall be opened promptly upon reasonable signal for the passing of boats, and said company or corporation shall maintain, at its own expense, from sunset to sunrise, such lights or other signals on said bridge as the Light-House Board shall prescribe.

SEC. 6. That all telephone and telegraph companies shall be granted equal rights and privileges in the construction and operation of their lines across said bridge; and if actual construction of the bridge herein authorized shall not be commenced on or before the 1st day of September, 1898, and be completed by the 31st day of December, 1899, the rights and privileges hereby granted shall cease and be determined.

SEC. 7. That all railroad companies desiring the use of said bridge shall have and be entitled to equal rights and privileges relative to the passage of railway trains over the same and over the approaches thereto upon payment of a reasonable compensation for such use; and in case the owner or owners of said bridge and the several railroad companies, or any one of them desiring such use, shall fail to agree upon the sum or sums to be paid and upon rules and conditions to which each shall conform in using said bridge, all matters at issue between them shall be decided by the Secretary of War upon a hearing of the allegations and proofs of the parties.

SEC. 8. That the said company may associate or join with themselves in the construction, maintenance, and operation of said bridge the Illinois Central Railroad Company, or any other railway company duly incorporated under the laws of the State of Mississippi.

The amendments recommended by the committee were read, as follows:

On page 3, line 4, after the word "alter," insert a comma and strike out the word "or."

On page 3, line 5, after the word "amend," insert a comma and the words "or repeal."

On page 3, line 10, after the word "secure," insert the words "the reasonably."

On page 3, line 11, after the word "free," strike out the words "from unreasonable obstructions, the" and insert the words "and unobstructed."

On page 3, line 12, after the word "river," strike out balance of section 3.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. FOX. I ask for the adoption of the amendments recommended by the committee.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

On motion of Mr. FOX, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

#### SURVEY OF ELK RIVER, IN TENNESSEE AND ALABAMA.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 7748) to provide for a survey of Elk River, in Tennessee and Alabama.

The bill was read, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of War be and is directed to cause a survey to be made of Elk River, in Tennessee and Alabama, and that a report be made as early as practicable showing the probable cost of improving the river so as to make it available for light-draft steamers.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I ask for the consideration of the bill with the further amendment which I have sent up:

Amend by adding the words:

"The Secretary of War is also directed to report to Congress his opinion as to the advisability of the contemplated survey."

Mr. PAYNE. I would like to ask if that bill has been reported by a committee?

Mr. RICHARDSON. It has been reported. The report is in the hands of the Clerk.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill as amended? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

On motion of Mr. RICHARDSON, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

#### GAME BIRDS AND OTHER WILD BIRDS.

Mr. LACEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 3589) to extend the powers and duties of the Commission of Fish and Fisheries to include game birds and other wild birds useful to man.

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the United States Commission of Fish and Fisheries shall hereafter be known and designated as the United States Commission of Fish, Fisheries, and Birds. The duties and powers of said commission are hereby enlarged so as to include the propagation, distribution, transportation, introduction, and restoration of game birds and other wild birds useful



to man. For such purposes they may purchase, or cause to be captured, such game birds and other wild birds as they may require therefor, subject, however, to the laws of the various States and Territories in which they may conduct such operations.

The object and purpose of this act is to aid in the restoration of such birds in those parts of the United States adapted thereto, where the same have become scarce or extinct, and also to aid in the introduction of new and valuable varieties or species of American or foreign birds in localities where they have not heretofore existed.

Said commission shall from time to time collect and publish useful information as to the propagation, uses, and preservation of such birds.

And the said commission shall make and publish all needful rules and regulations for carrying out the purposes of this act, and shall expend for said purposes such sums as Congress may appropriate therefor.

Mr. McMILLIN. Mr. Speaker, I think that there is something more important in these war times than hatching ducks and goslings; and I therefore object to the consideration of this bill. [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER. Objection is made.

WASHINGTON AND GLEN ECHO RAILROAD COMPANY.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the bill (S. 924) to authorize the Washington and Glen Echo Railroad Company to obtain a right of way and construct tracks into the District of Columbia 600 feet, with House amendments disagreed to by the Senate.

The bill was read, as follows:

A bill (S. 924) to authorize the Washington and Glen Echo Railroad Company to obtain a right of way and construct tracks into the District of Columbia 600 feet.

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Washington and Glen Echo Railroad Company, a corporation organized under the laws of the State of Maryland and operating a street railway in said State, the eastern terminus being at or near the northern boundary of the District of Columbia in Chevy Chase, be, and said corporation is hereby, authorized and empowered to obtain a right of way and construct its road and lay double tracks thereon into the District of Columbia a distance of 600 feet, and no farther, from the point in the boundary line of the District where said railway extended crosses the boundary line of the District and from said point to a point on the west line of Connecticut avenue extended, on a route to be approved by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, said corporation to have full power and authority to operate cars upon said road for the purpose of its traffic; said corporation to use electric motive power in propelling its cars: *Provided*, That no fares shall be charged or collected within the District of Columbia: *And provided further*, That unless the extension herein provided for shall be completed within six months from the date of the approval of this act, then this act shall be null and void.

SEC. 2. That Congress reserves the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act.

The House amendments were read, as follows:

SEC. 2. That said railway company shall be constructed in a substantial and durable manner, and all rails, electrical appliances, etc., shall be approved by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

SEC. 3. That if the said company in the construction of the extension herein authorized shall cross any public road or highway, the space between its tracks and rails and 2 feet exterior thereto shall be kept by it at all times in proper repair, to the satisfaction of said Commissioners of the District of Columbia. Should the said company fail to keep said space in repair to the satisfaction of said Commissioners, the work will be done by the District, and the cost thereof shall be collected from said company, as provided in section 5 of the act entitled "An act providing a permanent form of government for the District of Columbia," approved June 11, 1878.

SEC. 4. That the said company shall furnish and maintain passenger houses, with suitable conveniences for the public, as required by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and shall use first-class cars on said railway, with all modern improvements for the convenience, comfort, and safety of passengers, and shall run cars as often as the public convenience may require, in accordance with a time-table approved by the Commissioners of said District. Every failure to comply with the conditions of this section shall render said company liable to a fine of \$50, to be recovered in any court of competent jurisdiction at the suit of the Commissioners of said District.

SEC. 5. That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall make such regulations as to rate of speed and mode of use of tracks as in their judgment the interest and convenience of the public may require. Should the servants or agents of said company willfully or negligently violate such an ordinance or regulation, said company shall be liable to the District of Columbia for a penalty not exceeding \$500.

SEC. 6. That all articles of value that may be inadvertently left in any of the cars or other vehicles of said company shall be taken to its principal depot and entered in a record book of unclaimed goods, which book shall be open to the inspection of the public at all reasonable hours of business.

SEC. 7. That such portion of said road as lies within the District of Columbia shall be deemed real estate, and, together with other real property and such personal property as is within the said District, shall be liable to taxation as other real and personal property in the District of Columbia.

Mr. BABCOCK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of this bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin moves that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill which has just been reported to the House.

The question was taken; and the motion was agreed to.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, Mr. HOPKINS in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the present consideration of the House amendments to the bill which has just been reported, disagreed to by the Senate.

Mr. BABCOCK. Mr. Chairman, this bill (S. 924) has been before Congress—

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia will state it.

Mr. BARTLETT. I desire to know what bill we are considering; the Chair has not stated, and some of us do not know.

The CHAIRMAN. It is Senate bill 924, and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BABCOCK] has the floor and is about to give the committee full information in regard to it.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have the bill reported again to the Committee of the Whole, so we can know what it contains. There are a good many masked batteries in some of these bills and we want them read.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will again read the bill.

The bill was again read.

Mr. HENDERSON. Now, Mr. Chairman, I would like the gentleman in charge of the bill to explain this fully to the committee, and give us a full idea of where this is to operate, and why.

Mr. FOOTE. I should like to inquire how much time the gentleman from Wisconsin has at his disposal?

Mr. PAYNE. An hour.

Mr. BABCOCK. Mr. Chairman, I am willing to agree upon the time for the discussion of the bill in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. PAYNE. Does the gentleman want his time extended beyond the hour? I suppose he has an hour.

Mr. BABCOCK. Mr. Chairman, this is a bill that has been considered not only by the Fifty-fifth, but by the Fifty-fourth Congress. It passed both Houses in the Fifty-fourth Congress, but failed to secure the signature of the President.

Mr. PAYNE. Why?

Mr. BABCOCK. I am informed that the President had not the time to give it consideration. It is a very important matter. It extends 600 feet into the District of Columbia. And further, the committee will observe by a careful consideration of the bill that the railroad company is not allowed to collect any fares. All that ride on this portion of the road ride free.

Mr. HENDERSON. That is a very suspicious circumstance. Why is that? [Laughter.]

Mr. BABCOCK. I ask for order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will please be in order.

Mr. BABCOCK. This connection is made at Chevy Chase circle, and this bill permits this road to construct a track 600 feet into the District of Columbia and make a connection with the Capital Traction Company. It also permits them to build depots and other necessary buildings and improvements for the necessary operation of the road. The House Committee on the District of Columbia offered several amendments to the bill.

Mr. HENDERSON. Before the gentleman passes from that point, I would like to ask him a question. Do I understand that it is a new company that is to build this 600 feet of road?

Mr. BABCOCK. No, sir.

Mr. HENDERSON. Suppose I buy a ticket from here to Chevy Chase, does that ticket permit me to ride over this 600 feet?

Mr. BABCOCK. I think not; but the gentleman can ride over the 600 feet without buying any other additional ticket, and can ride over it without paying any fare.

Mr. HENDERSON. Is it a part of the Capital Traction Company system?

Mr. BABCOCK. No.

Mr. HENDERSON. What is it for?

Mr. BABCOCK. It is to make connection with the Glen Echo Railroad. If gentlemen would take time to read the bill, they could see what it is for.

Mr. HENDERSON. I do not see that those who read the bill are able to make it very clear to the committee. [Laughter.]

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

Mr. BABCOCK. Yes.

Mr. HANDY. Does this 600 feet run on a public highway?

Mr. BABCOCK. I believe that it crosses a public highway.

Mr. HANDY. On whose property will it run; is it District of Columbia property now?

Mr. BABCOCK. No; oh, no. I do not think the District of Columbia owns any property out there.

Mr. HANDY. The authorization is to obtain a right of way that would require the railroad to purchase of the owners?

Mr. BABCOCK. Yes; to purchase it. One of the amendments of the House committee was, in relation to crossing highways, that they should protect their tracks, macadamize between the rails and 2 feet outside, and another amendment was offered by the House committee in line with the policy of the committee to protect the public, and to see that the Commissioners of the District have proper supervision over this railway. It also provides for the taxation of any real estate the company may have in the District of Columbia, like depots or other buildings. They are obliged to pay taxes on it, and they are not allowed to collect any fares.

Mr. PAYNE. Does the Senate amendment interfere with the rights of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HENDERSON] to ride over the road?

Mr. BABCOCK. I think it would.

Mr. PAYNE. Then it ought to be defeated. [Laughter.]



Mr. BABCOCK. The gentleman from Pennsylvania suggests that the bill be read again.

Mr. RICHARDSON. If the gentleman really desires to have it read, why, of course it ought to be; but it has been read twice.

Mr. BABCOCK. If the gentleman does not understand the bill, why, let it be read.

The CHAIRMAN. Unanimous consent is asked that the bill be read again. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. HENDERSON. I think you can afford to read a bill three times that proposes to allow every fellow to ride free.

The Clerk again read the bill.

Mr. BABCOCK. I yield ten minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HENDERSON].

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the yielding spirit of the gentleman from Wisconsin. After having heard this bill twice read, I begin to comprehend the situation; but I think the statement in the bill is inaccurate when it says that no fare shall be charged over this extension of 600 feet. As I understand, the road running from Chevy Chase to Glen Echo is building this extension. Is that correct?

Mr. BABCOCK. That is right.

Mr. HENDERSON. Now, if I buy a ticket from Glen Echo to Chevy Chase, that ticket carries me to the terminus of the Glen Echo line, which includes the 600 feet.

Mr. BABCOCK. Yes, sir.

Mr. HENDERSON. And in buying the ticket I pay for my ride on the 600 feet as well as on the other part of the road. So that this statement that there is to be no fare charged is inaccurate. On the other hand, if I get off the Traction Company's road at Chevy Chase and buy a ticket over this liberal line to the end of the route—Cabin John, I believe they call it—I have got to pay my fare over that whole line to Cabin John.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Will the gentleman allow me a moment?

Mr. HENDERSON. I will yield the gentleman the balance of my time if he desires it.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I only want to make an inquiry.

Mr. HENDERSON. Then put your inquiry to the gentleman from Wisconsin in charge of the bill. Do not ask me any questions; I am hunting for light myself.

Mr. RICHARDSON. The gentleman has said that he thinks he would have to pay fare over the road from Glen Echo to its terminus at Chevy Chase, including the 600 feet. Now, I ask him this question: If he should get off at the District line, before reaching Chevy Chase, and then take a ride over those 600 feet in the District of Columbia, does the gentleman think he would be expected to pay for that?

Mr. HENDERSON. I would not be fool enough to get off at the District line. I would ride to the terminus, where I could get into a palatial car of the Traction Company, not into one of the rickety concerns of this Glen Echo road.

Mr. RICHARDSON. The gentleman does not answer my question.

Mr. HENDERSON. I answered the gentleman's question, including several other answers. [Laughter.]

Mr. RICHARDSON. If the gentleman, coming from Glen Echo, should get off at the intersection of the Glen Echo road with the District line, and then should take another car and ride those 600 feet to the terminus, he would not have to pay any fare for that ride. That is what the gentleman from Wisconsin meant.

Mr. HENDERSON. If I got off the cars and on again, I would expect to pay for my second ride as well as for the first.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I was supposing the gentleman would get out of his buggy.

Mr. HENDERSON. I say that this provision about free fares is simply a "blind" to carry through this bill, because this extension of 600 feet would be simply a part of the Glen Echo line, and when you pay your fare from Glen Echo to connect with the Capital Traction Company's line at Chevy Chase you pay for the whole ride on the Glen Echo road, including this 600 feet. There is no use trying to hoodwink us about this matter. If the gentleman from Wisconsin had only read and studied his own bill he would not have stuck a proposition of that kind into the bowels of it.

Mr. BABCOCK. Will the gentleman allow me—

Mr. HENDERSON. I am willing to yield the gentleman the remainder of my ten minutes.

Mr. BABCOCK. I have had this bill read twice for the benefit of the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. HENDERSON. I have had it read once for the benefit of the gentleman from Wisconsin in charge of the bill, and with little effect, I think. [Laughter.] I begin to fear he is confusing the mind of the "Tall Sycamore" from Tennessee, a member of the committee. I think this bill ought to be recommitted, so that it may be comprehended by the committee reporting it.

Mr. BABCOCK. Did not the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. HENDERSON. I said I would yield you back the remain-

der of my time, and I will do so cheerfully; I hope you will make good use of it.

Mr. BABCOCK. I suppose the fact that the gentleman can ride 600 feet on a railroad free of charge is something new to him—something that never occurred to him before.

Mr. HENDERSON. I never had the sensation in all my life. [Laughter.]

Mr. BABCOCK. This bill proposes that any citizen of the District of Columbia may go out there at any time when this road is in operation, get on a car and ride those 600 feet, and come back, without paying any fare at all.

Mr. FISCHER. I would like to ask the gentleman a question. Mr. BABCOCK. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FISCHER. I observe in lines 19 and 20, on page 2, the provision that "no fare shall be charged or collected within the District of Columbia." Would it not be possible for this railroad company to charge and collect fare for this distance when outside the District line? Is not the language so intended?

Mr. BABCOCK. I think if the gentleman from New York will retire to the lobby and sit down and read the bill carefully, he will fully understand it. [Laughter.]

Mr. HENDERSON. He will probably understand it more than he can from the explanations given. [Laughter.]

Mr. FISCHER. I do not suppose the gentleman intends to apply this bill, or the motives of the bill, entirely to the "lobby?" [Laughter.]

Mr. BABCOCK. Oh, no; to the whole District.

Mr. FISCHER. Then I hope the gentleman will explain this provision to the House.

Mr. BABCOCK. What provision?

Mr. FISCHER. The one to which I have referred.

I have said that under the language of this provision of the bill which says that no fares shall be charged in the District of Columbia, it will be possible to charge and collect for that same distance beyond the District, beyond the District line; and the gentleman from Iowa understands the bill as I do. That is to say, that it does not provide that they may not charge this extra amount outside of the District.

Mr. BABCOCK. Does the gentleman desire to offer an amendment to make certain the point he has in mind?

Mr. FISCHER. Certainly I do, at the proper time.

Mr. BABCOCK. Very well; present it.

Mr. CANNON. But the bill has not been read for amendment yet.

Mr. FISCHER. I assume that the chairman will not object to the amendment, or insist on consulting the "lobby," at the proper time. [Laughter.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I would like to ask the gentleman from Wisconsin a question.

Mr. BABCOCK. Certainly.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I merely wish to ask whether this railroad is intended to burn coal or time? [Laughter.]

Mr. BABCOCK. I do not think the committee has investigated the motive power of it.

Mr. HENRY of Mississippi. Or the "motives" of the bill, apparently.

Mr. BABCOCK. The gentleman heard the bill read. It is an electric railway, and electricity is generated by coal or wood. Now, I do not know whether they will use the one or the other in this case.

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. Oh, well, you had better take a vote on the bill. You will talk it to death.

Mr. BABCOCK. I wish to make, Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry. I would like to know whether amendments are in order at this time, or not until it shall be read by paragraphs?

Mr. RICHARDSON. No; this is a Senate amendment. The bill does not have to be read by paragraphs.

Mr. BABCOCK. So I understood.

Then I yield thirty minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. BOTKIN].

Mr. BOTKIN. Mr. Chairman, it occurs to me that the people of this country, as well as the members of this committee, are interested to-day more in another question than this question of street railways. As I have occupied but little of the time of this committee or of the House during this session, I shall be glad to avail myself of the kindness of the gentleman from Wisconsin who has the bill in charge to occupy the attention of the committee for thirty minutes on the question of Cuba.

Mr. Chairman, it is impossible at this late day to add anything new to the discussion of the questions at issue between this Government and Spain. I only desire to record briefly my own convictions, and at the same time voice what I believe to be the sentiments of all patriotic Americans.

In considering the present strained relations between these Governments two distinct problems should be kept in mind, viz, the oppression of Cuban patriots and the destruction of the battle ship *Maine*. The civilized world holds the Spanish Government



responsible for both. Every consideration of humanity requires the United States to issue, without an hour's delay, an imperative command to the oppressors to quit at once and forever the Western Hemisphere, and also to demand of Spain a full and speedy reparation for the loss of our ship and its lamented crew.

From the beginning of the period of Spanish atrocities in Cuba the American people have been wrought up to a high tension of feeling and indignation. During this same period the authorities of this Government have been so dilatory as to exhaust the public patience, to satisfy the most conservative noncombatant, as well as the most craven devotee of a cold-blooded commercialism to be found in this country or in Europe, and, in the judgment of thousands, to humiliate this great Republic in the eyes of Christendom.

Those members of Congress who have criticised the dilatory methods of our Government have been applauded by all the patriotic people of this country. But they have been contemptuously styled "jingoos" by the few who know and care more for the demands of Wall street and the money kings of Europe than for the will of the American people. The latest and most violent effusion of this kind appeared on April 1 in the Hartford (Conn.) Post, a paper owned and presumably controlled by John Addison Porter, private secretary to the President. I quote a few samples of this most vicious attack that has been made upon the American Congress for a generation, simply to show the venom of at least one Spanish sympathizer in this country:

In the whole history of the Congress of the United States that body has never before reached such a depth of degradation as during the present week. Under the guise of a desire to help a people struggling for liberty, it has kept up a constant agitation for some months in favor of intervention by the United States in behalf of the Cuban insurgents. Within the last week, however, it has thrown off its cloak and shown the true character of its conduct. Its motive in agitating the Cuban question has been, not a love of liberty, not sympathy with human suffering, but simply bloodthirstiness of the most savage description. It has been crazy to fight somebody, and Spain happened unfortunately to offer a convenient target.

After a discussion of the *Maine* disaster, in which Congress is condemned without stint for its attitude upon this question, while the Spanish Government is held up as a model of fairness and good faith, this modern apologist for the unspeakable crimes in Cuba says:

It is hard to believe that savages of this sort continue to display themselves in public in this last end of the nineteenth century of Christian civilization!

And why this senseless tirade—this screed so appropriately published on All Fools' Day? Simply that Congress, knowing the record of Spanish cruelties in every country over which her flag has floated for centuries and witnessing the crowning act of her infamies—her very intoxication with the blood of hundreds of thousands of her victims in the Island of Cuba—and moved by the dictates of reason, of justice, of humanity, of Christian civilization, demands that this Government shall terminate these horrors at once, even though it may require the military power to do it. If this constitutes jingoism, then this is a nation of jingoos. If this be savagery, we are savages. If to propose assistance to patriots struggling for independence and freedom from the most fiendish system of oppression and slavery of modern times is bloodthirstiness, we are bloodthirsty.

But this defender of Spanish atrocities threatens us with defeat at the polls. We accept the gage of battle. We are ready to meet him and his few friends, the Spanish bondholders, on the hustings and at the ballot box. The American people propose that Cuba shall be free, and will relegate to eternal oblivion any member of this body who stands in the way of this cause.

In defense of the Administration's dilatory policy, this writer says:

President McKinley, as is known to those who share his counsels, had already laid out his programme, even to the fixing of the final days and dates for each stage, before Congress made the first step toward interfering with its work.

If that is true, and the President knew he should on Monday, April 4, or at the latest on Wednesday, April 6, as was promised the country, send his message to Congress declaring for independence or intervention, or both, why did he not days and weeks ago direct General Lee to remove all Americans from Cuba? This would have prevented the disappointment of, not to say the insult to, the American people by the postponement of the message last week, under the pretext that its promulgation at that time would endanger the lives of Lee and his American associates.

In closing this most un-American editorial, Congress is thus classified:

Benedict Arnold himself was not a viler traitor than these men, and their memory and his should go into history side by side, stamped with the eternal infamy of having made merchandise of their most sacred public trusts.

I hurl the charge of treason back into the teeth of the writer, whoever he is. The Benedict Arnolds of this period are those who, like the author of this insult, would sacrifice national honor, the cause of freedom, and humanity itself upon the altar of a heartless commercialism. It is proper to say that the owner of the paper disclaims all responsibility for the offensive article. In a note published in the Washington Post of April 7 concerning it he says:

So far as the article which has caused criticism is concerned, I did not

write it nor see it until two days after its publication, at which time I promptly sent a telegram to the managing editor of the Post, expressing disavowal and regret at the exaggerated tone of the article, and cautioning the editor to be more careful in the future.

And yet his paper of March 30 and of March 31 contained editorials on the same line of denunciation of Congress, and scarcely less bitter than that which he has felt called upon to apologize for. Further still, I am credibly informed that Mr. Porter, in a personal interview with well-known gentlemen, has admitted that while he did not write the offensive editorial, and that it was not diplomatically prepared, he did inspire its spirit.

In an editorial bitterly criticising Congress, Mr. Porter's paper, in its issue of March 30, said:

Our dispatches to-day show the lines on which the negotiations are speeding. It is asserted from Washington that Spain has consented to the following settlement of the troubles in Cuba:

1. Spain to recognize the independence of Cuba.
2. Cuba to pay Spain \$200,000,000.
3. An armistice to be declared, during which the Spanish forces are to be withdrawn from Havana.
4. The reconcentrados to be fed, supplied with clothing, farming tools, and seeds by the United States and returned to their farms.

"This," says the writer, "is a consummation to be proud of."

On the contrary, it is a policy that will condemn its advocates to a just political oblivion in any and every State in this glorious Union. But it must be confessed that the people fear this to be the policy determined upon by the present Administration and enshrouded in secrecy to this hour.

In this connection the country should know that Congress has been flooded for several days with telegrams from men representing so-called business interests asking us to support the Administration in its Cuban policy, whatever that is; that these telegrams were inspired by messages sent out from Washington; and that one of the most notable of these inspiring messages was one sent by John Addison Porter.

This is simply a part of the game being played by and for the bond syndicates of the world—men who are determined that the unspeakable murder and misery in Cuba shall not be interfered with by this Government until they have perfected their arrangements for the perpetual bond slavery of that people. To show the death grip which the money power has upon the governments of the world, and how they control and use these governments to further their own mercenary interests, I quote from a letter in the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of March 21, 1898, from its regular Washington correspondent:

"There will be no war," the American representative of the Rothschilds said in New York on Friday. He spoke with confidence which knowledge of the influences at work inspired. For two weeks the moneyed interests of the world have been quietly crowding Spain. They have negated her appeals for loans. They have closed the ear of European courts to her advances for alliances.

It remains to be seen whether or not this Government, like those of Europe, is to continue under the domination of the Rothschilds and their agents.

Mr. Chairman, the American people well know that for about three years the most brutal warfare that disgraces the annals of time has been waged by Spain against her Cuban subjects. If our forefathers were justifiable in resisting oppressive taxation without representation, the Cuban patriots are engaged in the most holy struggle for freedom the world has ever witnessed. For three long years they have contended against great odds. Their homes have been destroyed; their old men have been wantonly murdered; mere boys have been shot down for utterances of patriotism; prisoners of war have been butchered; fair young women have been ravished by the inhuman Spanish soldiery; mothers and children and others equally helpless and innocent have been herded together by thousands, without food, clothing, or shelter, to die under the slow torture of starvation. And all this at our very door and under our eye.

We have heard much of the "unspeakable Turk" and his atrocities in fair Armenia. But I demand that our authorities shall consider the "unspeakable Spaniard" and his greater atrocities in Cuba, the gem of the southern sea. For three long years these revolting barbarities have been practiced by Spain. And yet this great Republic, the home of freedom and justice, has made no effort to bring them to a conclusion.

Saul of Tarsus stood by and held the garments of the murderers who stoned St. Stephen to death, thereby consenting to the awful crime. This Government is the modern Saul of Tarsus. From the highest official of this nation, and therefore of the world, has come no word of encouragement and assurance to those patriots in their unequal struggle for liberty. On the contrary, while admitting in message and otherwise the inhumanities of the Spanish people and the unparalleled miseries of the Cubans, this same high official has on different occasions spoken soft and honeyed words to and of the Government of Spain, expressive of high regard and confidential relations.

Mr. Chairman, the sympathy of the American people for the Cuban patriots and their horror and indignation toward the Spanish Government for its unutterable cruelties are not of recent



origin. I desire to point out three facts of history that reflected public sentiment upon this question two years ago:

1. The extended and fervent discussion of Spanish atrocities and of Cuban independence by members of both branches of the Fifty-fourth Congress. There were no party lines. Sherman, of Ohio, and MORGAN, of Alabama, and ALLEN, of Nebraska, were among the leaders in the Senate favoring prompt and decisive action on the part of this Government. HITT, of Illinois, and the leading members of the House of all political faiths were no less emphatic for the Cuban cause. PROCTOR, GALLINGER, THURSTON, and other gentlemen whose statements so recently aroused the indignation of this country have added no material facts concerning Spanish cruelties to those that were given to the country two years ago by members of both Houses of Congress.

These later statements of the case were given, it is true, from personal observation, which adds interest and weight. Is it claimed that conditions are improved since Blanco superceded Butcher Weyler, and that this is a reasonable excuse for recent delays on the part of this Government? I reply that the observations of PROCTOR, GALLINGER, and THURSTON were made under Blanco's reign, and not under Weyler's.

I repeat that the speeches in the two Houses in February and March, 1896, that have not since been surpassed in ability and intensity, reflected the almost universal sentiment of Congress and the country at that time.

2. The resolutions adopted by Congress and the votes by which they were adopted reflected the sentiment of the people through their representatives. On February 5, 1896, Senator MORGAN, of Alabama, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, reported the following concurrent resolution:

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That, in the opinion of Congress, a condition of public war exists between the Government of Spain and the government proclaimed and for some time maintained by force of arms by the people of Cuba; and 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.*

On February 28, 1896, Senator Cameron offered as an addition the following amendment:

*Resolved further, 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.*

Thus amended the resolution passed the Senate on the last-named date by a vote of 64 yeas, 6 nays, 19 not voting.

On March 2, 1896, Mr. HITT, of Illinois, chairman of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, submitted the following resolution as a substitute for the Senate resolution:

*Resolved, That in the opinion of Congress a state of public war exists in Cuba, the parties to which are entitled to belligerent rights, and the United States should observe a strict neutrality between the belligerents.*

*Resolved, That Congress deplores the destruction of life and property caused by the war now waging in that island, and believing that the only permanent solution of the contest equally in the interest of Spain, the people of Cuba, and other nations would be in the establishment of a government by the choice of the people of Cuba, it is the sense of Congress that the Government of the United States should use its good offices and friendly influence to that end.*

*Resolved, That the United States has not intervened in struggles between any European governments and their colonies on this continent; but from the very close relations between the people of the United States and those of Cuba in consequence of its proximity and the extent of the commerce between the two peoples, the present war is entailing such losses upon the people of the United States that Congress is of opinion that the Government of the United States should be prepared to protect the legitimate interests of our citizens, by intervention if necessary.*

This was adopted by a vote of 262 yeas, 17 nays, 76 not voting. The matter went into conference, and on April 6, 1896, the House agreed to the Senate resolution as adopted by that body on February 28. The final vote in the House stands—yeas 247, nays 27, not voting 80. All these votes were free from party bias, and represented the overwhelming sentiment of Congress and of the country on the Cuban question.

3. Lastly, I desire to introduce the platform utterances of the various political parties in their national conventions of 1896; as reflecting the sentiment of the country at that time. The Republican platform says:

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 and being unable to protect the property or lives of resident American citizens or to comply with the treaty obligations, 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.

Mr. BRUCKER. That platform was made to get in on, was it not?

Mr. BOTKIN. Yes; and no party dared go before the country at that time with a milder statement of the Cuban question.

The Democratic platform says:

The Monroe doctrine as originally declared, and as interpreted by our leading Presidents, is a permanent part of the foreign policy of the United States, and must at all times be maintained. We extend our sympathy to the people of Cuba in their heroic struggle for liberty and independence.

The Populist platform says:

We tender to the patriotic people of Cuba our deepest sympathy in their heroic struggle for political freedom and independence, and we believe the time has come when the United States, the great Republic of the world, should recognize that Cuba is, and of right ought to be, a free and independent state.

Thus the three leading parties of the country, representing almost the entire population, are practically a unit in their latest official deliverances upon this most burning question just now before the American people. And yet two years have dragged heavily by since these patriotic utterances were read by a delighted public. They have been two years of blood and carnage; two years of nameless atrocities practiced upon the innocent and helpless portion of the Cuban population; two years of waiting and vacillation on the part of our Government; two years of our quiet consent to these butcheries. And during these awful years two American Presidents have been brought under the grave suspicion of the American people as being under the powerful influence of bond syndicates, and as being controlled more by commercial considerations than by the interests of humanity and the cause of freedom.

The country had a right to believe that the new Administration would, without unnecessary delay, formulate and prosecute a vigorous American policy upon the Spanish-Cuban question. Accordingly, Mr. MORGAN, of Alabama, introduced into the Senate, on the 1st day of April, 1897, the resolution that had passed both Houses by overwhelming majorities—the Senate on February 28, 1896, and the House on April 6, 1896. The final vote was had upon this resolution on May 20, 1897, as follows: Yeas 41, nays 14, not voting 33. Party lines were again ignored, it being a question of patriotism and not of partyism.

During the extraordinary session repeated efforts were made by the minority side of the House to secure a consideration of this resolution, which is confessedly a very mild expression of public sentiment. But some strange spell had fallen upon the majority. Strong men who but one short year before had portrayed upon this floor in glowing colors the awful crimes committed in Cuba by the Spanish armies, and had vehemently advocated Cuban independence, now staggered at belligerency, urged moderation, and pleaded for more time to ascertain the true state of affairs in Cuba. For this purpose the President sent a trusted personal friend as his special agent to make an official investigation, promising, in a semi-official way at least, that should the report of this gentleman corroborate the published statements of the horrible conditions in Cuba, the Administration would, without unnecessary delay, announce and enforce a vigorous policy, such as would meet the approval of Congress and the country.

The people remember that upon Mr. Calhoun's return he reported conditions even worse than had previously been described. Every man on this side of the Chamber and scores on that side were eager to vote for armed intervention and for Cuban independence. But some mysterious influence, potent until this hour, had fallen upon the Speaker of this House and upon his majority that forced them to turn a deaf ear to the entreaties of the minority, to the demands of the country, and to the piteous wails of starving victims of Spanish cruelty.

In the meantime the awful tragedy continued. Under Spanish authority our Chief Executive was maligned, our flag insulted, and American citizens in Cuba were despoiled of liberty and of life. And finally, as if to crown all their other infamies, the Spanish Government, under the guise of friendship, lured to its place of destruction the noble battle ship *Maine*, which, with 266 of as brave seamen as ever sailed under the Stars and Stripes, went to the bottom of the sea through Spanish treachery and diabolism.

The American people know that our ship and men were destroyed in Spanish waters; that the explosion was external; that the submarine mines and torpedoes belonged to Spain and were placed there under Spanish authority; that none but agents of the Spanish Government could have known the exact location of those engines of death, or the combinations by which they could be exploded. With these facts before them, I believe the American people will repudiate that portion of the President's message relating to the report of the court of inquiry on the *Maine* disaster in which he says:

I do not permit myself to doubt that the sense of justice of the Spanish nation will dictate a course of action suggested by honor and the friendly relations of the two governments.

I also believe they will repudiate the policy of the message delivered yesterday.

Mr. Chairman, the opinion held by the American people a year ago that this Government should at once accord belligerent rights to Cuba has grown into an unyielding conviction that had it done so then, thousands of Cubans now dead would be alive; that the country would now be on the road to a happy and prosperous condition; the battle ship *Maine*, the pride of the nation, with her gallant crew, would now be resting peacefully upon the bosom of the deep; the war clouds now pregnant with wrathful storm would



long since have been dispersed and driven from the sky, and the honor of our flag would have been preserved in the eyes of our own citizens and of all the world. [Applause.]

The American people will brook no further delay in dealing with this question. They demand speedy and adequate reparation for the loss of our battle ship and its crew. They demand absolute freedom and independence for the Cuban people. They demand that a people who have poured out rivers of blood for independence and freedom shall neither be required nor permitted to pay in addition thereto a single dollar in cash, or in bond either, as an indemnity or as an annual tribute to the Spanish Government or to any mercenary bond syndicate on earth. That public servant who consents to any other kind of settlement of this question than the unconditional surrender of Cuba to those suffering patriots must settle with the American people at the polls. [Applause.]

In conclusion, permit me to say that on general principles I am opposed to war; but I am ready and eager to support any measure that may be proposed by the Administration looking to the immediate relief of the Cuban patriots and to a just indemnity for the loss of the *Maine* and her lamented crew. War is a deplorable method of settling national disputes, but we deal with a barbarous nation. I long for the incoming of that era, foretold by the old Hebrew prophet three thousand years ago, when the world's swords shall be beaten into plowshares and its spears into pruning hooks; when nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more.

But the opening day of that glorious period has not yet dawned. The Prince of Peace has not yet established His kingdom in all human hearts. Nor will He, in my judgment, until this cruel nation shall have been blotted off the map. I do not believe a government can commit the crimes that Spain has committed in Cuba and escape just and awful retribution. If it is God's order that retributive justice shall be meted out to her through the instrumentality of this Government, I voice the universal sentiment of Kansas and of the country when I say, All hail the task! [Applause.]

Mr. JENKINS. I yield thirty minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. GREENE].

[Mr. GREENE addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. HARTMAN. Mr. Chairman, a few days ago I commenced the reading of a platform for the Republican party in 1900. [Applause and laughter.] There was a slight indisposition on the part of the House to the completion of the reading of that document. Indeed, it was ruled out of order. I could not understand why, for we had a naval appropriation bill under consideration, and my platform dealt with the great Republican ship. It went to the construction of the vessel. It took its history from the port in which it was originally launched clear through to its ultimate destination, and paid especial attention to the great master of the vessel itself. However, as I always bow to the rules of the House, I acquiesced in that decision, and am now prepared to present the few remaining planks of that platform. On that occasion I presented the following:

Mr. Chairman, it will be observed by every gentleman who does me the honor of listening to my remarks that the platform which I am about to present to be adopted by the Republican party at its convention in 1900 is an exact and accurate reflection of Republican sentiment, Republican thought, and Republican purpose, as evidenced by the Republican papers and by the gentlemen who represent that party upon this floor and elsewhere. This is the platform:

"In obedience to the instructions of those who dictate the policies and control the actions of the Republican party, we, their representatives and delegates in national convention assembled, renew our declared allegiance to their interests, our acquiescence in their wishes, and our eternal fidelity to their commands.

"We cordially indorse the Administration of our great leader, MARCUS AURELIUS HANNA, President de facto of the Republic, which has so sacredly kept faith with the trusts and corporations by generously reimbursing them with legislative and executive favors for the enormous sums so liberally and patriotically contributed by them to the Republican party in the campaign of 1896 to 'preserve the honor and integrity of the nation.'

"We specifically condemn the platform of the Republican national conventions of 1888 and 1892 in opposition to 'all combinations of capital organized in trusts or otherwise to control arbitrarily the condition of trade among our citizens.'

"We heartily commend the Republican national convention which met at St. Louis in 1896 in declining to condemn or criticize trusts, and we hereby declare it to be the present and future policy of the Republican party to foster and encourage trusts, to the end that further and greater contributions may be secured with which to enable us to 'purify the ballot' and 'preserve the honor and integrity of the nation.'

"The Republican party is unreservedly for 'sound money.' We said so in 1896, but most of us did not know what we meant by it then. But the bondholders, creditors, and bankers, who know all about the science of money, have told us that we meant the gold standard, greenback retirement, and bank issue and control of paper money. We therefore, recognizing their intellectual and moral superiority, declare our complete and abiding confidence in their wisdom and unselfish patriotism, and cheerfully obey their orders, announce our perpetual loyalty to the plan of the Secretary of the Treasury to 'commit the country more thoroughly to the gold standard,' retire the greenbacks and Treasury notes, and give to the banks the exclusive right to issue or refuse to issue paper money to enable the people to transact their business; and we further solemnly declare that any man who dares question the infallibility or perfection of this financial policy is an 'anarchist,' a 'repudiator,' and personally 'dishonest' and 'corrupt.'

"In unmeasured terms we express our utter detestation and disgust with the Republican national conventions of 1888 and 1892 for the 'wild-eyed,' 'long-haired,' 'anarchistic,' 'Populistic,' 'socialistic,' 'communistic' language contained therein, as follows:

"The Republican party is in favor of the use of both gold and silver as money and condemns the policy of the Democratic Administration in its efforts to demonetize silver.—Platform 1888.

"The American people from tradition and interest favor bimetalism, and the Republican party demands the use of both gold and silver as standard money, with such restrictions and under such provisions, to be determined by legislation, as will secure the maintenance of the parity of values of the two metals, so that the purchasing and debt-paying power of the dollar, whether of silver, gold, or paper, shall be at all times equal.—Platform 1892.

"We would use harsher language in denouncing this blatant nonsense of these two Republican conventions were it not that one William McKinley, who is supposed by some ill-informed people to be President of the United States, was chairman of the platform committee of the convention of 1888 and permanent chairman of the convention of 1892, and we do not desire to seriously embarrass him. We further declare that the Republican party has not changed its platform or faith on the financial question, and anybody that says that it has is a 'liar,' a 'footpad,' and a 'border ruffian.'

"With our faces turned toward Wall street, from whence all blessings flow, for support and sustenance, we solemnly declare that when the Republican convention at Minneapolis asserted that 'the American people, from tradition and interest, favor bimetalism, and the Republican party demands the use of both gold and silver as standard money,' it meant to declare unequivocally for gold alone as 'standard money,' and any man who does not understand it that way is a 'lunatic and ought to be confined in an asylum.'

"We indorse the lofty and patriotic sentiment expressed so eloquently by our distinguished ally, Hon. John M. Palmer, in the campaign of 1896, to the effect that he would rather live in a monarchy than in a republic where the principles of the Chicago platform prevailed."

I will now complete the reading of that platform:

Following the instructions of those who dictate our policies, control our conventions, and manage our Administration, we bow in worshipful adoration at the feet of Grover the Fat—

[Laughter]—

him who gave us wisdom and an honest financial policy, conservatism, and our foreign policy; who taught us the patriotic and unselfish lesson that the rights of property are more sacred than the rights of men; that "money" ought to be "the master; everything else the servant." As an official evidence of our profound reverence for him, we shall write his name on the roll of honor of our party, second only to our other sainted hero, MARCUS AURELIUS HANNA.

[Laughter on the Democratic side.]

We view with serious apprehension the growing disposition of the American people to investigate public questions for themselves. We believe that every true and loyal Republican will confidently leave to our wise, prudent, and magnanimous master, the de facto President, and his philanthropic coadjutors, who furnish the party both its money and its money policy, the entire solution of all problems of State. It is our solemn conviction that the people of the United States have not sufficient intelligence to understand the science of money, and in view of the fact that the great bankers, bondholders, and gold brokers of the world have generously, considerably, and patriotically offered to come to our rescue and manage the finances of the Government, and issue or refuse to issue money with which to conduct the business of our citizens, as in their judgment is advisable, we therefore recommend that their offer be accepted, and that the heartfelt thanks of the American people be extended to them as the saviors "of the nation's honor."

[Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

The propagation of ideas antagonistic to a constantly appreciating money standard, or any investigation which questions the infallibility of the gold standard by professors of economics in our educational institutions is greatly to be deplored.

Every such professor should be given to understand that his salary is dependent upon his teaching the doctrine of the gold standard, "the standard of the most enlightened nations of the earth."

Such professors should be ordered to inculcate into the minds of their pupils the idea that an "honest dollar is a dollar of the highest purchasing power," a "dear dollar," and that a "dear" dollar means low prices for everything measured by or exchanged against that dollar, and that by receiving low prices for what he has to sell the debtor may more easily discharge his debt and the producer of wealth receive more for his products.

These professors must thoroughly understand that men of fabulous wealth who liberally endow our colleges and universities claim and have the right to have taught within their walls the policies and systems through which they acquired their great riches.

The Republican party is in favor of "dear" dollars and plenty of them. "Scarce" dollars are "dear" dollars. Therefore we are unreservedly in favor of "scarce" dollars and plenty of them.

[Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

The Republican party, under the direction of its great commander, while declaring its undying devotion to the personal liberty of the citizen and its determination to accord to the "common people" all rights and privileges with which they may be safely intrusted, hereby announces as a fundamental tenet of its faith that no new States shall be admitted into the Union, except upon the express condition inserted in the act of admission that their Senators and Representatives to the National Congress shall, in addition to the usual oath, "solemnly swear to support the gold standard, greenback retirement, bank issue and control of paper money, all legislation favorable to corporations and trusts, and to vote upon such other measures for the 'preservation of the honor and integrity of the nation' as may come before Congress in the manner directed by our great and good master, MARCUS AURELIUS HANNA, his successors and assigns."

[Laughter on the Democratic side.]

While our great and good commander graciously informs us that we were sorely shocked and grieved at the barbarities perpetrated by the Spanish soldiers against the Cuban patriots in their struggle for liberty, resulting in the butchery or starvation of hundreds of thousands of men, women, and children, yet he gives us the comforting assurance by way of complete exoneration of his Administration for permitting the long continuance of these atrocities, that the victims were nearly all from the poorer classes, and it is doubted if this depletion of their ranks is seriously to be regretted.

[Applause on the Democratic side.]

Our affectionate master further comforts us with the knowledge that by refraining from prohibiting the slaughter and starvation of these thousands



of poverty-stricken wretches he preserved from a severe shock the refined and tender sensibilities of the very best and noblest class of the citizens of the world—the holders of the Spanish bonds.

When we contemplate the serious injury which would be sustained by them in the depreciation of their bonds as the result of intervention, our very souls revolt and we count as naught the destruction of a few hundred thousand lives of penniless wretches and the perpetual enslavement of those who survive.

We therefore congratulate our greatly cherished commander upon the wise, generous, and humane policy applied to the Cuban troubles, which found its warrant in the sacred motto of the party, "Money the master; everything else the servant."

The gathered wisdom of the ages having found secure lodgment in the sacred skulls of our dearly beloved leader and his self-anointed co-saviors "of the country's honor," they have discovered and, through us their humble and obedient servants, now announce to the world the important scientific truth that in their deliberate, enlightened, refined, and lofty judgment there are too many people in the world, especially too many poor people.

Mr. LENTZ. An overproduction.

Mr. HARTMAN (reading)—

While this new application of the theory of overproduction to population is not fully understood by the common people, it has stood the test of some of the gigantic intellects of our economists that have been especially employed and liberally paid to teach the doctrine of the gold standard, and we therefore confidently incorporate it in this platform with the following axiomatic utterances of the party:

1. The overproduction of wealth causes poverty.
2. The reason there is hunger and starvation among the people is that there is too much food produced for them to eat.
3. Men, women, and children are naked and ragged because there are too many clothes for them to wear.
4. The extraordinarily large production of coal and other fuel is the cause of so many people suffering from the biting cold of winter. If there were less produced, everybody would have more to burn.

[Laughter on the Democratic side.]

5. The overproduction of people is responsible for the decreased demand for all things used or consumed by man.

We extend our sincere congratulations to William McKinley for his successful deception of the American people, by promising in his letter of acceptance to "keep in circulation and as good as gold all the silver and paper money which are now included in the currency of the country."

The making of this promise by Candidate McKinley undoubtedly was justified by the exigencies of the occasion, for without it and other cunning, deceptive devices and the liberal and judicious expenditure of vast sums of money to "purify the ballot" and "elevate American manhood," the American people would have indorsed the "dishonest," "anarchistic," "communistic," "socialistic," "Populistic," "un-American," "unpatriotic," "revolutionary," and "unholy" Chicago platform, the principles of which, if adopted, would wrest this Government from the control of our great and good master, MARCUS AURELIUS HANNA, and his fellow-guardians of the "nation's honor," and transfer that power to the common people, who are utterly unfit to be trusted with the grave responsibilities of self-government.

We therefore commend in unqualified terms the making of that promise by Mr. McKinley, and we solemnly declare that the deliberate violation of that promise by the man who made it and our unqualified approval of such violation is complete and irrefutable proof—

First. Of the immaculate integrity of the Republican party; and

Second. That the 6,500,000 citizens who voted against Mr. McKinley at the election of 1896 are, as we have often declared before, "anarchists," "republicanists," "communists," "socialists," "Populists," "agitators," "demagogues," "idiots," "lunatics," "addle-pated fools," "border ruffians," and "common blackguards."

[Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

To the end that perfect propriety and consistency may be maintained, we recommend that the votes of William McKinley in favor of bimetalism, when he was a member of the House of Representatives, and his numerous speeches in support thereof, be obliterated from the public records, and that any citizen of the Republic who hereafter reads, recites, or prints any speech or speeches of the aforesaid McKinley favoring bimetalism shall be banished from the realm.

[Laughter on the Democratic side.]

Realizing as we do that in the earlier history of our party the men who shaped, molded, and declared its opinions were usually rough, uncouth, undignified, illiterate, and unrefined we charitably overlook many of their blunders. Could they have had the benefit of association with the superior refinement, intelligence, and patriotism of Wall street and Lombard street, which now dictate the policies of the Republican party, we are confident that no wild-eyed and ridiculous declarations adverse to the gold standard would have found a place in any platform of that party. But while we can excuse some of their blunders, we believe it to be our duty as the self-constituted guardians of the "honor and integrity of the nation" to specifically repudiate and denounce as "anarchistic," as "un-American," as "unpatriotic," and as "destructive of the confidence in the Government" of the men who possess all the wealth, and consequently all the wisdom of the country, the plank in the Republican platform of 1896 against unwarranted Federal interference with State affairs, and the other plank which vulgarly referred to a decision of the Supreme Court as a "perversion of judicial power."

We find similar sentiments to these in the Chicago platform of 1896 and we unhesitatingly assert that no law-abiding, patriotic citizen can be found in the limits or history of the Republic, so lost to all sense of propriety as to indorse these "un-American" and "revolutionary sentiments." If we could think that Abraham Lincoln, who was elected President upon the platform containing these planks, and who specifically indorsed them in his message to Congress, understood their meaning, we would feel it our solemn duty in pursuance of our decision to regulate the morals, the money, and the men of the country, to condemn him; but he was only a "backwoods statesman," and did not know any better.

[Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

He had not had the advantage of associations with the superior intelligence, integrity, and patriotism which have controlled the Republican party since 1896, and out of consideration for the fact that there is still some sentiment in the country of a lingering respect for his name we will omit a specific denunciation of him and confine ourselves to branding as "anarchistic," "unpatriotic," "treasonable," and as the vapors of a diseased mind his public utterances which follow:

"\* \* \* And more than this, they placed in the platform for my acceptance, and as a law to themselves and to me, the clear and emphatic resolution which I now read:

"Resolved, That the maintenance inviolate of the rights of the States, and

especially the right of each State to order and control its own domestic institutions according to its own judgment exclusively, is essential to that balance of power on which the perfection and endurance of our political fabric depend; and we denounce the lawless invasion, by armed force, of the soil of any State or Territory, no matter under what pretext, as among the gravest of crimes."

"I now reiterate these sentiments, and in doing so I only press upon the public attention the most conclusive evidence of which the case is susceptible that the property, peace, and security of no section are to be in anywise endangered by the now incoming Administration. I add, too, that all the protection which, consistently with the Constitution and the laws, can be given will be cheerfully given to all the States when lawfully demanded, for whatever cause, as cheerfully to one section as to another."

"If a government contracts a debt with a certain amount of money in circulation, and then contracts the volume before the debt is paid, it is the most heinous crime that a government can commit against the people."

"In my present position I could scarcely be justified were I to omit raising a warning voice against this approach of returning despotism."

"It is not needed nor fitting here that a general argument should be made in favor of popular institutions, but there is one point, with its connections, not so hackneyed as most others, to which I ask a brief attention. It is the effort to place capital on an equal footing with, if not above, labor in the structure of government. It is assumed that labor is available only in connection with capital; that nobody labors unless somebody else owning capital somehow by the use of it induces him to labor. This assumed, it is next considered whether it is best that capital shall hire laborers, and thus induce them to work by their own consent, or buy them and drive them to it without their consent. Having proceeded so far, it is naturally concluded that all laborers are either hired laborers or what we call slaves. And further, it is assumed that whoever is once a hired laborer is fixed in that condition for life."

"Now, there is no such relation between capital and labor as assumed, nor is there any such thing as a freeman being fixed for life in the condition of a hired laborer. Both these assumptions are false and all inferences from them are groundless."

"Labor is prior to and independent of capital. Capital is only the fruit of labor, and could never have existed if labor had not first existed. Labor is the superior of capital, and deserves much the higher consideration."

"\* \* \* \* \*  
"No men living are more worthy to be trusted than those who toil up from poverty; none less inclined to take or touch aught which they have not honestly earned. Let them beware of surrendering a political power which they already possess, and which if surrendered will surely be used to close the door of advancement against such as they and to fix new disabilities and burdens upon them till all of liberty shall be lost."—*Message*, December 3, 1861.

However, the Republican party, in pursuance of its purpose to stamp out all such anarchistic utterances as were pronounced and indorsed by Mr. Lincoln, here and now declares that no American citizen has the right to criticize, question, or attempt to have revised, by motion for a rehearing or otherwise, any decision of the Supreme Court of the United States, and any citizen who attempts to criticize or discuss the infallibility of the Supreme Court decisions will be branded by the gold-standard press of the country, which is under the command of the Republican party, as an anarchist, as a footpad, as a socialist, as a communist, as a robber, and as an enemy of his country; and if this does not cause him to desist, then we will invoke the power of the courts to enjoin him.

[Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

We declare as our deliberate judgment that no honest, peaceful, patriotic, law-abiding citizen of the Republic will ever criticize or question the righteousness of a decision of the Supreme Court of the United States.

It is with feelings akin to horror that we read the monstrous Populistic doctrine announced by the Supreme Court of the United States in the *Trans-Missouri Traffic Association* cases. How it can be possible that men so feeble intellectually and so degraded morally could find their way upon the Supreme Bench, there to tamper with and strike down the sacred rights of property, is a proposition almost beyond our stupendous comprehension. Had this decision been rendered by a lot of bear-eyed Populists or addlepated silver lunatics, we should not have been surprised; but, coming from the Supreme Court of the United States, there was no justification for it, and we denounce it and the court that rendered it in unmeasured terms.

We express our entire confidence in and our satisfaction with the great tariff bill of the Republican party, known as the Dingley bill. Through its far-reaching effects, amplified by the efficient aid of the gold standard, the crops of India, Argentina, Switzerland, and France were blighted.

[Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

Eight million of the ignorant inhabitants of India died from starvation, and as a result of this beneficent legislation the American farmer obtained nearly one-half as much for his crop as he would have received under the bimetallic system.

[Laughter on the Democratic side.]

The mysterious but far-reaching effects of this bill were felt in Australia two years before the bill was passed.

[Laughter.]

The very anticipation of its passage caused a drought in the years 1895 and 1896, and as a result thereof 34,000,000 sheep died or were slaughtered because of the shortage of food, which shortage was directly traceable to the anticipated passage of the Dingley bill. Thirty-four million sheep and the wool sheared from them in Australia taken out of the competitive markets of the world, the American sheep grower received a higher price for his product than at any time since the Republican party helped Grover Cleveland repeal the purchasing clause of the Sherman law and bring prosperity to the land. We therefore confidently claim that the Dingley bill and the gold standard are wholly responsible for the increase in the price of wheat and for the increase in the price of wool.

We are not sure that we are entirely gratified at the rise in price of these two articles, for we solemnly promised the American wage-earner that by the election of McKinley and under the gold standard the price of these articles would come down, so that he could buy more of them with the wages paid him for his day's labor. In view of the fact, however, that we also promised the farmers of the United States that the election of McKinley and the gold standard would make the men who bought their products have to pay a higher price for them, we here and now declare our gratification at the rise in the price of wheat and wool caused by the Dingley bill and the gold standard, and respectfully request that this plank in the platform shall not be read by the wage-earners of the country.

[Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

We specifically disavow and disclaim all party responsibility for the following utterances made by the gentleman who now draws the salary of the



Chief Executive of this nation. We do this for the reason that in our solemn, enlightened, patriotic, and sanctified judgment the sentiments therein contained are "anarchistic," "populistic," "socialistic," "communistic," and destructive of the peace of mind of the possessors of wealth, and consequently directly antagonistic to the highest, noblest, and most patriotic class of our citizens. The following is the language condemned. Speaking of Cleveland's policy, Mr. McKinley said:

"During all of his years at the head of the Government he was dishonoring one of our precious metals, one of our own great products, discrediting silver and enhancing the price of gold. He endeavored, even before his inauguration to office, to stop the coinage of silver dollars, and afterwards, and to the end of his Administration, persistently used his power to that end. He was determined to contract the circulating medium and demonetize one of the coins of commerce, limit the volume of money among the people, make money scarce, and therefore dear. He would have increased the value of money and diminished the value of everything else—money the master, everything else the servant. He was not thinking of the 'poor' then. He had left 'his side.' He was not 'standing forth in their defense.' Cheap coats, cheap labor, and dear money; the sponsor and promoter of these professing to stand guard over the poor and lowly. Was there ever more glaring inconsistency or reckless assumption? He believes that poverty is a blessing to be promoted and encouraged, and that a shrinkage in the value of everything but money is a national benediction."—*Speech of William McKinley, Akron, Ohio, 1891.*

It is our deliberate judgment, based upon the opinion of our legal advisers, who have been amply recompensed for their services, that the only constitutional and lawful standard of value is gold; that any attempt to displace that standard and establish a new one is an act of treason to the State, a violation of the sacred honor of the country, and an act of gross repudiation. We recognize that it is true that some irresponsible and unpatriotic citizens in times past have expressed opinions contrary to this. But we know the value of the opinion that we have announced, for our master has bought it and paid for it, and there is but one test of merit in the crucible of our faith—What is the price?

In 1836, one Daniel Webster, a poor poverty-stricken wretch who achieved some little notoriety in the country, gave utterance to this language:

"I am clearly of the opinion that gold and silver, at rates fixed by Congress, constitute the legal standard of value in this country, and that neither Congress nor any State has authority to establish any other standard or to displace this standard."

Everyone who is familiar with the history of Daniel Webster knows that he had no money, and therefore his opinion upon this question is of no value, and any man who quotes it with respect or reverence is a lunatic and a gibbering idiot.

[Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

It is with great regret that we, the Republican party, in this year 1900, in national convention assembled, are called upon to purge the pages of history of so many unpatriotic and senseless utterances of men who at one time stood high in the councils of our party; but solemn duty demands heroic action, and we here and now denounce the following language from the lips of James G. Blaine in 1878, as the irresponsible driving of an imbecile:

"I believe gold and silver coin to be the money of the Constitution. No power was conferred on Congress to declare either metal should not be money. Congress has, in my judgment, no power to demonetize silver any more than to demonetize gold."

[Applause on the Democratic side.]

"I believe the struggle now going on in this country and in other countries for a single gold standard would, if successful, produce disaster in and throughout the commercial world. The destruction of silver as money and the establishment of gold as the sole unit of value must have a ruinous effect on all forms of property except those investments which yield a fixed return in money. These would be enormously enhanced in value, and would gain a disproportionate and therefore unfair advantage over every other species of property. If, as the most reliable statistics affirm, there are nearly seven thousand millions of coin or bullion in the world not very unequally divided between gold and silver, it is impossible to strike silver out of existence as money without results which will prove distressing to millions and utterly disastrous to tens of thousands." (United States Senate, February 7, 1878.)

And we recommend to the Republicans of the United States the obliteration of Mr. Blaine's name from the roll of honor of our party and the substitution in lieu thereof of "our right trusty and well-beloved counselor," John G. Carlisle, who recanted all previous utterances of a similar character, and now, under the inspiration of a liberal salary, is one of our saints, solemnly pledged "to maintain the honor and integrity of the nation."

It was our determined purpose in announcing this code of high principles for the Republican party to specifically repudiate and condemn by name all Republicans who in the past have expressed their opposition to the present policies of the Republican party, which are intended to perpetually maintain the gold standard, favor greenback retirement and bank issue and control of all paper money used by the people, and to foster and sustain trusts. But the task was greater than we anticipated.

We found that their name was legion, and that to carry out that purpose would have involved most of the illustrious names of the party's past history and many of the present. We therefore content ourselves with implicit obedience to the orders of our master and denounce as "un-American," "un-Republican," "unpatriotic," "anarchistic," "populistic," "dishonest," "treasonable to the state," and as a "direct assault upon the national honor" every speech and vote ever uttered or cast by every misguided member of the Republican party against the gold standard or antagonistic to the interests of trusts.

We offer unstinted praise to the managers of the Republican party in the House of Representatives of the Fifty-fifth Congress for their active and efficient opposition to the free-home bill specifically indorsed by the Republican national platform of 1896. The repudiation of the party pledges in this regard were both timely and highly honorable, for the probable rapid growth and development of the Western States through the further extension of the free-home policy carries with it a serious menace to the purposes of the Republican party by giving greater power to those sections of the Union so aptly and appropriately designated by Grover Cleveland, the great financial orator of our party, as "corrupt municipalities" and "undesirable States."

We congratulate our able and cunning master upon the skill with which he has kept our opponents divided. We applaud his wisdom in so artfully expending money as to induce our opponents to slay their leaders one by one as they come to prominence in the ranks of bimetalism, and we laud his determination to keep Democrats, Populists, and Silver Republicans apart so long as there is one man in their ranks who through fear, favor, or avarice can be induced to give the "Judas kiss." And we hail as his best servants those Democrats, Populists, or Silver Republicans who have aided in achieving his highest and holiest purposes by refusing to unite the overwhelming ranks of the opposition against us. We can always defeat the people so long as we can keep the people divided. Let our motto be, "Our disunited opponents are their own executioners."

We extend our heartfelt congratulations to Edward Lauterbach, chairman of the Republican committee of New York, for the patriotic sentiments expressed by him in the campaign of 1896 in the following language:

"You are fighting to-day for just as important a principle as did those brave men in 1861. But it is a bloodless fight. No blood will be shed, at least, not yet; but if they attempt to subvert your Supreme Court, if they should succeed by any chance in foisting upon you those horrible doctrines—*anarchistic, socialistic, and communistic*—which that platform adopted by this Populistic brood contains, we may not abide by that decision."

These inspired words uttered by the distinguished representative of the gold standard and trusts clearly indicate the right of those who advocate the sacred tenets of our faith to refuse to abide by the rule of the majority when such rule is against them, and this sentiment meets with the unqualified approval of our master.

We commend to the youth of the land, as an example worthy of their emulation, the public character and record of our beloved and honored ruler, MARCUS AURELIUS HANNA. We point with pride and gratification to the generous and unstinted expenditure of the campaign funds patriotically and religiously donated by the eleemosynary and charitable institutions of the country, commonly known as trusts, combinations, and other forms of aggregated wealth. We congratulate the servants of the party that they have so righteous and generous a master.

[Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

We unhesitatingly approve the practice so generally employed in the campaign of 1896 to deprive the wage-earners of the country of the right to exercise a free and untrammelled ballot by having notice served upon them that if Mr. McKinley were elected they could come back to work, but that if Mr. Bryan were elected they need not return. We indorse this practice for two reasons: First, we presume that it is in compliance with the oft-repeated declaration of our party that every man should have the right "to cast one free and unrestricted ballot;" second, we know that the wage-earners of the country have not sufficient knowledge to vote intelligently, and in order to keep them from destroying themselves, and at the same time "to preserve the honor and integrity of the nation," we cordially, heartily, and sincerely approve of the practice of intimidation above mentioned in the past and recommend its repetition in the future.

The great heart of the Republican party was made to throb with gratification and with unalloyed joy when it was learned throughout the length and breadth of the land that the national committee, under the management of our most excellent master, were notifying farmers upon whose lands mortgages rested that would soon come due, that if Mr. McKinley were elected their mortgages would be extended, but that if Mr. Bryan should be elected they would be foreclosed. This plan, which operated so effectively to prevent many farmers from voting their own honest convictions, meets with our unqualified approval. It presented to the farmers of the country an argument which it was difficult to withstand.

The agents of the trust companies, who were the emissaries of the national committee, were imbued with the high purpose of guaranteeing to every farmer upon whose place the trust companies held a mortgage the right to vote as he pleased, provided he was pleased to vote as he was told to vote. Otherwise they assured him in the kindest and most Christian spirit that he could only remain on his farm until the mortgage became due.

We indorse this broad, liberal, patriotic, and generous policy toward the mortgaged farmers of the United States, which policy was prompted by the most generous and most virtuous impulses of the human heart, and we recommend a further extension of this highly moral and philanthropic practice in future campaigns.

The experience of the Republican party in the campaign of 1896 and subsequent thereto has demonstrated the wisdom and necessity of placing all power of the party under the supreme control and domination of one strong, pure-minded, and patriotic man. The lodgment of all party power in the person of our dearly beloved master, MARCUS AURELIUS HANNA, was at once an act of childlike confiding simplicity and at the same time an exhibition of the highest order of intellectual and patriotic discrimination. Surrounded at all times as he is by the representatives of the great trusts, the great railroads, and the great banks, and by the agents of the Rothschilds, he at all times has the advantage of the highest order of intelligence, patriotism, morality, and Christian citizenship, which can only be held by the possessors or representatives of great money or property interests. We therefore congratulate the millions of servants of the Republican party that they have transferred their individual sovereignty to the exclusive control of this great and good man.

Our all-wise and all-powerful ruler, MARCUS AURELIUS HANNA, has graciously permitted us to say to the servants of the party that he still retains the most affectionate regard for them, and that he will use his utmost endeavor to again touch the philanthropic hearts of the chiefs of the money centers of the world in the coming campaign to enable him to procure the necessary quantity of noble patriotism for distribution among the people and to assist him in carrying out the work to which his whole life is pledged—of purifying the ballot and rendering sacred the right of American suffrage. Our great master, in furtherance of these highly moral purposes, assures his servants that the fund of \$18,000,000 at his command in 1896 was all that was needed to defray the legitimate expenses of the campaign of education which he waged, and by the judicious expenditure of which he was enabled to "cleanse the morals of the people," "preserve the ballot from pollution," "prevent the corrupt use of money," and otherwise sanctify the cause of an honest dollar.

Our good master has instructed us to send special greeting to those Senators and Representatives of the United States Congress, and to leaders of thought in the Middle and Western States, who have reposed implicit confidence in the party under its present management. He desires us to extend to them his sincere thanks for their unselfish fidelity to the interests of himself and his coadjutors, who are the beneficiaries of the policies of the party.

He recognizes that the allegiance of many Senators and Representatives who have in the past been supporters of bimetalism can only be maintained by their surrender of convictions and principles heretofore dearly cherished and openly proclaimed to their constituents; and he instructs us to assure them of his high appreciation of their heroic devotion to the interests of the trusts and the beneficiaries of the gold standard so cheerfully rendered by them at the expense of the willful violation of the pledges made to the people who sent them to Washington and whose sworn representatives they are supposed to be.

He directs this convention to convey to them his profound approbation of this willful deception of their constituents and to assure them that in his code of morals no act of loftier purpose or more sterling integrity can be found. It is our further inestimable pleasure to assure all such loyal and faithful servants of the gold standard that liberal donations will be cheerfully made from the funds subscribed by the trusts and corporations to secure their retention in public office by the usual "business methods" employed by our sainted leader in his earnest efforts to "purify the ballot" and "preserve the honor and integrity of the nation."

As one startling and convincing proof of the beneficial effects of our sacred gold standard we point with gratification and pride to the fact that it "has



enabled 250,000 people to accumulate 80 per cent of all the wealth of the United States, leaving 20 per cent to be divided between 71,750,000 people."

These results indicate conclusively to any fair-minded citizen the wisdom of the existence of the gold standard and the necessity for its continuance. Its original invention and adoption, if not indeed of divine origin, was certainly in response to that inexorable decree of fate that the many should toil while the few reap the rewards of their efforts. This is as it should be. The blatant and demagogical declaration adopted by the illiterate and uncouth body of men who in 1776 declared that "all men are created equal" has long since been abandoned by the higher classes of our citizenship, and we now obediently acquiesce in the inevitable trend of civilization toward the permanent establishment of the rule of the gold standard and trusts, whereby the common people who are engaged in the vulgar vocation of producing wealth shall understand that the fruits of their labor rightfully belong to the moneyed classes, who are entirely competent to absorb the products of toil and to govern and control the producers of wealth.

The time has come when the great master of the Republican party deems it wise to take his servants into his confidence as to the methods which he will employ in all future campaigns. Henceforth, as in the campaign of 1896 and subsequent one, the unvarying policy of the party shall be, first, to persuade the citizen to support the party. If he refuse to do that, then, second, by all the power of intimidation and coercion so successfully employed in the campaign of 1896 and those which followed it, compel him to support it. If that fail, then, third, to buy him. If that fail, then, fourth, destroy him socially, politically, and financially.

With so simple and effective a rule publicly proclaimed, it is the opinion of our master that the reason, conscience, and patriotism of the citizens will become immediately responsive to the desires of the beneficiaries of trusts and the gold standard, and a great victory for a "free," "unrestricted," and "pure" ballot will have been achieved by our consecrated leader in his relentless efforts to "cleanse the morals of the people," "defend the right of American manhood," "assert the personal freedom of the citizen," and "preserve the honor and integrity of the nation."

The successful achievements which have been attained by the concentration of all party power into the sacred care and keeping of our beloved master justifies us in recommending to the serious consideration of the American people the proposition to surrender the form of republican government adopted in 1789. The fact that the spirit and substance of that Government has been gradually surrendered with such beneficial results to the American people, and particularly to the great moneyed interests and creditor classes, leaves no longer any reason for retaining the empty form.

When our generous master modestly suggested in his telegram of January, 1898, that "God reigns and the Republican party still lives," he but gave utterance to the slumbering but unexpressed opinion in the hearts and minds of the millions of servants of the Republican party, that he alone possessed the wisdom, the power, and the patriotism of that organization. Recognizing this as a self-evident truth and desiring to perpetuate the blessings of his rule, not only for ourselves, but for generations yet unborn, it is our fond hope that at no distant day the farce of republican form of government shall be abandoned, the house of HANNA be established, the rule of royalty inaugurated, and the eternal fitness of things accomplished. When that time comes, the present servants of the Republican party will become the willing slaves of the new monarchy, gladly hailing our great master as their benefactor and openly responding to the duties of loyal subjects by doing appropriate obeisance to MARCUS THE FIRST, and by adopting as the watchwords of their liberties, "Long live the king!"

[Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, I want to see if it is not possible to agree upon a time to take a vote on this bill. I want to ask unanimous consent that debate be closed at a quarter to 5, one half of the time to be controlled by the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. HANDY] and the other half by the District Committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent that debate close at a quarter to 5 o'clock, one half of the time to be controlled by himself and the other half by the gentleman from Delaware. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. JENKINS. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LACEY].

Mr. HANDY. One moment. There is a misunderstanding. Did the gentleman ask that debate be closed at a quarter to 5 o'clock? Make it 5 o'clock. It is impossible to—

Mr. JENKINS. They will extend the time.

Mr. LACEY. Mr. Chairman, I always listen with a great deal of pleasure to my young friend from Montana. I listened with much greater delight to him three years ago when he was warming the cockles of the hearts of the Republicans, and when he was especially talking to our Populist brethren.

Now, for the benefit of my Populist friends, let me just in a nutshell add a line to the speech which he has just made, and I will quote it substantially from his own speech of three years ago. He said then that out in Montana the Populists were very progressive men. That it was proposed seriously by one shining light of the party to cross the centiped with the Berkshire hog in order that each hog should have a hundred hams. That, he said, was part of the Populist plan to create wealth in Montana. Then he said, further, that they made a further proposition—

Mr. SIMPSON. It was when he was a Republican that he said that.

Mr. LACEY. I can not be interrupted.

Mr. HARTMAN. I shall desire to reply.

Mr. LACEY. He also called attention to the fact that the Populists out in Montana were about to cross the honeybee on the lightning bug, so that they could work at night [laughter]; and he then described the magnificent proposition of another Populist there, who was crossing the milkweed with the strawberry, so as to have strawberries and cream upon the same plant. [Renewed laughter.] Now, I only bring out this little interesting reminiscence in order that my friend might, right in this connection,

print it in the RECORD for the general delectation of his Populist constituents in Montana. [Laughter.]

Mr. HARTMAN. Mr. Chairman, I suppose I am entitled to reply. I only ask for three minutes.

Mr. HANDY. I yield the gentleman three minutes.

Mr. HARTMAN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Iowa has called attention to some remarks submitted by me on the 18th day of February, 1896, in the Fifty-fourth Congress. I am grateful to the gentleman for calling my attention to this language in the connection which he does. At this point in my reply to the gentleman I shall print the few lines referred to by him, which were uttered by me at that time. They are as follows:

It is true that the Populist party has had a number of different remedies for the situation, and I am advised that they are about to add three additional planks to their platform. One of them is to make a cross between the lightning bug and the honeybee for the purpose of enabling the bee to work at night. Another one is that of breeding the centiped with the hog for the purpose of having a hundred hams for each animal. And I am also told that they have the further visionary scheme of budding strawberry plants into milkweeds, so that everybody can have strawberries and cream from the same plant.

It is true that at the time and place stated by the gentleman from Iowa the foregoing words were uttered by myself. It may not be uninteresting to the House for me to detail something of the history of that statement. I had been advised that a distinguished citizen of Ohio, at that time a member of the Populist party, Gen. Jacob S. Coxey, had in contemplation the proposal of these planks to the national convention of that party which was to assemble, and did afterwards assemble, in the city of St. Louis. The subsequent history of that convention shows that not only did the convention not adopt this extraordinary code of principles, but instead of such action it promulgated and gave to the country a platform of principles which challenges the admiration of American manhood everywhere.

But the undaunted advocate of these ideas, if indeed he were their advocate, lost no heart in his crusade, but turned his attention in other directions. He was seeking new worlds to conquer. He found the Populist party too conservative to even consider the fantastical ideas which were the subject of my remarks in the Fifty-fourth Congress. He therefore cast about to find some party so utterly devoid of reason as to be willing to accept his theories and their promoter. With an intellectual acumen that none had before accorded to him, he turned to reading the record of the Republican party since 1896, with a view to forming a natural and logical alliance with it. He learned that the Republican party was attempting to make bimetallic posies and gold-standard flowers bloom from the same plant, and he knew of no reason why he could not with equal consistency raise strawberries and cream from the milkweed. [Laughter.]

He discovered that much of the work of the Republican party in the last campaign had been done under the cover of darkness. He naturally thought that there should be thrown on those transactions a little light, and so he thought they ought to have some use for the lightning bug. He ascertained that the Republican party were announcing to the American people that the reason there was so much hunger in the country was that there was too much food with which to feed the starving, and he therefore thought that they would, in pursuance of their ridiculous inconsistency, naturally take to the proposition of breeding the centiped to the hog, with a view to raising a hundred hams to each animal. [Great laughter.] And he was not mistaken.

Moved by these desires, he naturally and logically entered into negotiations with the great master of the Republican party along the line of "business methods" which were so effective in certain portions of the United States in the campaigns of 1896 and 1897. The terms of those negotiations will never be known except to General Coxey and that pure and holy patriot who dispensed the campaign fund of the Republican party in 1896 in the interest of honest elections and to "preserve the honor and integrity of the nation."

The results, however, were apparent to everyone who saw or learned of that great but recent acquisition to the Republican ranks rolling through the State of Ohio in a private car in the interest of the Republican party and for the purpose of dividing the opposition to the election of Mr. HANNA and further perpetuating the policies of the Republican party, and was the final chapter of this brief history, giving the Republican party the honor and making it the possessor of the original inventor of the three great ideas of Coxeyism.

This transfer carried with it the exclusive right to the use of the scheme itself, and therefore MARK HANNA not only became the owner and possessor, for value received, of General Coxey, but also acquired the right to the use of the idea of breeding the honey bee with the lightning bug, so that they could both work at night, and budding of the strawberry plant into the milkweed, so that the Republican party could have strawberries and cream the rest of their days. [Laughter and applause.]



Mr. HANDY. Mr. Chairman, I yield ten minutes to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. LEWIS of Washington. Does the gentleman from Iowa wish any time to reply?

Mr. LACEY. No, Mr. Chairman, unless there is some other plan of miscegenation to be suggested on the other side. [Laughter.]

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, what is the matter under consideration by the committee?

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. DALZELL in the chair). It is Senate bill 934, an act to authorize the Washington and Glen Echo Railway Company to extend its tracks into the District of Columbia.

Mr. MAHON. I think, Mr. Chairman, the bill ought to be read for the information of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is under obligation to recognize the gentleman from Washington [Mr. LEWIS].

Mr. LEWIS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I desire to know if my friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. MAHON] desires some time, and if he has any particular object, I would be glad to make an apportionment of the time yielded to me.

Mr. MAHON. No; I asked what was before the House. I wanted to know upon what subject the gentleman was going to speak.

Mr. LEWIS of Washington. It is not my purpose to address myself to this bill.

Mr. HANDY. General debate is in order, and I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

[Mr. LEWIS of Washington addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. DALZELL in the chair). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LEWIS of Washington. Ask consent that I may be permitted to proceed for five minutes longer.

The CHAIRMAN. The time, as the Chair understands it, is limited.

Mr. HANDY. The time on this side of the House is already disposed of. I should be very glad to give the gentleman the time if I had the privilege of doing so.

Mr. LEWIS of Washington. I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for five minutes.

Mr. HANDY. That would come out of the time of the other side of the House.

Mr. DINGLEY. Does that extend the time for adjournment?

Mr. BABCOCK. It would necessarily extend the time, for an agreement has been made when the vote shall be taken on this bill.

Mr. DINGLEY. The time is fixed for the vote at a quarter before 5?

Mr. BABCOCK. Yes.

Mr. LEWIS of Washington. My time was taken up by my friend from Iowa to some extent, but was promised back again. I hope I will have the extension.

Mr. LACEY. I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman be extended for five minutes.

Several MEMBERS. Regular order.

Mr. HANDY. I am unable personally to yield further time to the gentleman myself.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is made.

Mr. LEWIS of Washington. May I be pardoned, then, Mr. Chairman, at this time, to ask to be permitted to extend my remarks, along this line, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, because of the fact that there is a disinclination to an extension of time?

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I should feel great hesitation at any time to inject a purely academic discussion into the proceedings of this House, but I have before me the announcement that the campaign of education is to be begun by the late Mr. Bryan in my State this week, and I feel that I should like to anticipate it by a day or two. I propose to take the time of the House in a discussion of the gold standard and its effect upon money and wages.

#### GOLD THE NATURAL STANDARD.

The oldest financial transaction of which I can find any account is recorded in the sixteenth verse of the twenty-third chapter of Genesis, where we are told that, nearly four thousand years ago, Abraham, in buying a burial place, weighed to Ephron in payment "400 shekels of silver, current money with the merchant."

Abraham was a stranger and a sojourner in that land and paid his debt in a money of commerce, an actual weight of silver bullion, for it was a thousand years before governments had learned to coin money or fix by law ratios between silver and gold.

But the Bible throws a curious side light upon this transaction, showing that human nature was the same then as now, and that Abraham did as all mankind have since done, took advantage of the customs of the country and paid out his poorest metal money,

for the second verse of the thirteenth chapter tells us that Abraham was very rich in cattle, silver, and gold.

We have no knowledge as to the relative value of the two metals at that time, but the position of the word "gold" in the sentence clearly demonstrates its greater importance, and from that day to this, no matter what the coinage of any nation has prescribed or what change in values may have been attempted by legislation, the world's standard of value has been gold, and gold has been the "1," the unit of value by which all ratios have been fixed.

Not only that, but to this day, whatever the law of any country may declare to be a legal tender, the money of commerce, the money current with the merchant, the money used in adjustment of international balances, is weighed as Abraham weighed his, and quantity and quality alone measure values, without reference to any marks that may be stamped upon it.

A while ago I saw in the Bank of England the judgment day of the coinage of the world.

A half dozen automatic scales were receiving the coins in hoppers, and, sliding down long grooves, each coin rested a moment in a balance.

If light weight, the arm lifted and tossed the coin to the right.

If full weight, the arm dropped and the coin was thrown to the left.

It was justice working automatically.

The intrinsic worth of each piece preserved it as it was or sent it to the melting pot.

Passing down into the vaults of that famous institution, I saw in one room \$20,000,000 of American coin that had been run into gold bars.

They looked like copper ingots.

Each one was tagged with the assayer's certificate of weight and fineness and was ready for sale, as iron or coal or copper would be, by weight.

Last year alone more than thirteen millions of foreign gold coin were received by the mint of the United States, and, without reference to the form and stamp upon them, were melted into bars and valued by their weight and fineness only.

Through all recorded time the intelligent choice of all mankind has made pure gold the final measure of values, even though its tools of exchange may have been, from time to time, cattle, corn, metal, paper, or any other of the many things used as currency which temporary convenience may have suggested.

I do not believe that any people ever advanced far enough in the path of civilization to become familiar with metallic money but that, consciously or unconsciously, its coinage or token system bore some recognized relation to gold as the standard of value.

There certainly is no nation in the world to-day which does not thus recognize it.

Why this is so I need not stop to explain, for natural selection needs no argument to justify itself.

It is enough that it is so and that every advocate of silver or any other standard acknowledges it when he urges the use of anything else as money on any other basis than 1 to 1, or an exact equality with gold.

Mr. SIMPSON. I would like to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. HILL. I prefer not to be interrupted.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. HOPKINS). The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. SIMPSON. I just want to ask—

Mr. HILL. I said I should prefer not to yield, as I have not the time to finish what I wish to say.

Mr. SIMPSON. I wish to ask the gentleman if he does not think that, as this bill which is under consideration is to authorize the Washington and Glen Echo Railroad Company—

Mr. HILL. I prefer not to yield. I appreciate the courtesy which the gentleman manifests.

Mr. SIMPSON. I am glad you do.

The CHAIRMAN. One moment. The Chair trusts that no gentleman will interrupt a member who has the floor after he has signified a desire not to be interrupted.

Mr. SIMPSON. I thought the Chairman was making so much noise with the gavel that the gentleman did not hear me.

The CHAIRMAN. That is not the first error into which the gentleman from Kansas has fallen during this session.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, by the courtesy of the gentleman from Kansas, I will continue.

#### ARTIFICIAL STANDARDS.

Starting, then, with the assumption that the universal measure of value is and always has been gold, the question naturally arises, Why should anything else be used as money, and why should an artificial standard be set up?

And here the second attribute of money appears as a tool of exchange.

As a standard measure of value quality alone is required, and a unit of its kind would suffice for all the world, but as a tool of exchange a convenient number of units are needed, and, strange



as it may seem, the ruder and less developed society is, the greater the number required to effect exchanges.

Hence it is that, as the nations of the earth have one after another passed from barbarism to civilization, they have left behind them the wampum, the cattle, and the slaves; then the iron, the lead, and the copper, and reached out for the precious metals, silver and gold, as better fitting their changed conditions, always striving for the best that was attainable.

During the past hundred years this process of evolution has gone forward more rapidly than ever before, until practically the whole world, and actually all of the commercial world except Mexico, has suspended the free and unlimited coinage of silver as standard money, and either adopted the single gold standard, or a limited bimetalism such as obtains in the United States, where silver is being coined on Government account, but limited in quantity to our ability to maintain its parity with gold.

The reason for this great and sweeping change in the monetary systems of the world is neither mysterious nor strange.

In my opinion it is simply the enormous increase in the production of gold, the universally accepted measure of values, so that it not only promises to be but actually is now in the possession of mankind in sufficient quantity to become under the more highly organized commercial methods the best tool of exchange of which the world now has any knowledge.

Think for a moment what this increase has been.

#### INCREASE OF GOLD SUPPLY.

During the three hundred and fifty years from the discovery of America to the opening of the California mines in 1850 the entire world's product of gold had been but little more than three billions of dollars' worth (\$3,121,830,000), or an annual average of eight and three-quarter millions (\$8,720,200).

It was only just before the beginning of this period that the art of printing had been discovered, and during the greater part of these three and a half centuries the steam engine, the steamship, the railroad, the telegraph, and the telephone were unknown.

None of the means of communication which now bring nations and individuals the world over into daily and hourly touch with each other in their business relations were even thought of.

Checks, notes, drafts, and bills of exchange, by which 90 per cent of the commercial transactions of the nineteenth century have been carried on, had no existence then, and the modern system of banking had not been developed.

Goldsmiths and jewelers were the bankers and brokers of that time, and the actual gold and silver passed from man to man and nation to nation in the settlement of all transactions.

During the same period the world's production of silver was a little over six billions of dollars (\$6,196,504,000), or an annual average of seventeen and one-third millions each year, or about double the product of gold.

Both together added but twenty-six millions per year to the world's stock of money, and even from this must be deducted the amount used in the arts, and it is by no means improbable that this amount was greater in proportion to the population than now, when we have the process of electroplating fully developed.

Is it not easy to understand, in view of these facts, how that both metals were a necessity as money, and that the more abundant was accepted as a measure of value and means of exchange?

With both in use domestic trade was largely barter and international trade was greatly hindered.

#### CHANGE TO GOLD STANDARD BEGUN.

But the gold accumulation of the centuries gradually forced its way into the channels of trade, and in 1798 England stopped the free coinage of silver, and in 1816, in the face of a sharp decline in gold production, adopted the single gold standard, and declared her purpose to thereafter build up her financial system under it.

For forty years she stood alone, but with the best tools of trade in her possession, she could afford to wait, and while she waited she became the leader of commerce and the financial center of the world.

From that day to this the English pound sterling has known no geographical limit, no national boundary lines, but among every people the world around has silently pursued its mission of adding to England's wealth and increasing England's power.

But in 1850 something happened to gold.

Suddenly from the rocks and hills of California and Australia the stores of golden treasure were poured out, and in a single bound the world's average production went from eight to one hundred and twenty-seven millions of dollars, and in the forty-seven years since the aggregate addition to the world's tools of exchange in gold alone has been \$6,101,490,000, as against three billions one hundred millions in the entire three and a half centuries preceding.

Is it any wonder that the nations of the earth have fallen into line and one after another, discarding the costly and cumbrous methods of the past, with a world-wide unanimity have chosen gold as their measure of value and tool of exchange?

To me the wonder is that in these closing days of the nineteenth century a great political party in this progressive Republic should stand before the people upon a theory rejected and thrown aside by all the world within the memory of those now living and, ignoring the addition of over three billions of gold to the world's stock since 1873, should now ask us to go back to the double standard and the unlimited coinage of both metals, and thus put ourselves at the mercy of other nations to plunder us of either at their pleasure.

It would seem as though the frozen sands of the Klondike and the quartz reefs of South Africa would melt with indignation at such a proposition.

This nation will go forward, not backward, in the path of progress, and on that march the rightful place of the United States is in the front rank.

#### THE DOUBLE STANDARD WITH FREE COINAGE IMPOSSIBLE.

A double standard with free coinage of both metals is an impossibility, but the enlarged use of silver as the willing servant of gold is not only possible, but is even demonstrated as an established fact.

Through all recorded time its value has decreased.

History tells us that 4 ounces of silver were once the equal of an ounce of gold.

It was 8 to 1 under Julius Cæsar, 11 to 1 when America was discovered, 15 to 1 when this nation began its coinage, 16 to 1 in 1837, 22 to 1 in 1890, and 40 to 1 in September, 1897.

Its steady course has been downward, unhindered by legislation, influenced in part by its larger production, but far more by the accumulating and annually increasing supply of gold.

The anomaly is in the fact that the lowest price is concurrent with the largest use, for since 1873 there has been an increase in the silver monetary stock of the thirteen principal nations of the world of \$670,900,000, and the bulk of this has been full legal-tender coinage.

In fact, the claim that silver has been demonetized, either in the sense that its monetary function or its legal-tender quality has been taken away, is utterly wrong, for this is true of only a total of \$163,430,480 sold by Germany, Roumania, and Scandinavia, and probably this silver was recoined into subsidiary money.

Whether it was or not, is of no consequence, for it was less than a year's product, and the aggregate legal-tender coinage has increased as shown.

The only quality that it has lost is that of the standard, and that it was never fit for and never would have received but for the insufficient supply of gold.

Neither is it true, as claimed by some, that depriving silver of its function as a standard has materially helped to reduce its value.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Has not silver been deprived of the redemption quality?

Mr. HILL. I will show you that it has not.

No metal with a production in excess of requirement, or of limited production concurrently with another better fitted for monetary purposes, can have one particle of value given to it by a free and unlimited coinage.

Not an ounce of it is taken from the world's market.

The bullion in the coin and the ingot will be precisely the same in price, and the one adapted to and available for the same uses as the other.

A limited coinage, with the value of the coin maintained at parity with gold by governmental credit, does remove that exact quantity from the general stock, and in proportion to such decreased supply will tend to increase the market price.

All experience proves that fact, and the Mexican dollar is the best possible evidence of it to-day.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Connecticut suspend for a moment?

Mr. HILL. I will not, sir, at the request of the gentleman from Kansas. I appreciate courtesy and would be glad to be courteous to those who are courteous to me.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair desires to suggest to the gentleman from Connecticut—

Mr. HILL. I will suspend at the request of the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair wishes to suggest that the gentleman from Kansas rises to a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. SIMPSON. The parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. GROSVENOR. I make the point of order that the gentleman has no right, under the guise of parliamentary inquiry, to stop a gentleman who has the floor from proceeding with his argument. At any interval of business or during the progress of action by the House a parliamentary inquiry is proper, but it is wholly improper and impertinent now.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will not assume that the gentleman from Kansas—the Chair will hear the gentleman.



Mr. SIMPSON. I will state the parliamentary inquiry, and then the gentleman from Ohio will have better knowledge—

Mr. GROSVENOR. "The gentleman from Ohio" understands perfectly the object of this.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I hope this does not come out of my time.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I make the point of order that the gentleman has no right to make a parliamentary inquiry during the remarks of a gentleman who has the floor and is addressing the House.

Mr. SIMPSON. The parliamentary inquiry which I desire to submit is whether it is in order to discuss the gold standard when we have a bill under consideration to authorize the Washington and Glen Echo Railroad Company to gain a right of way and construct tracks into the District of Columbia 600 feet?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair rules that that is not a proper parliamentary inquiry at this time.

Mr. SIMPSON. Then I make the point of order that the gentleman from Connecticut is out of order in discussing the gold standard or any question of that kind on a bill to authorize a street railroad company to acquire a right of way.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut can not be interrupted.

Mr. SIMPSON. Does the Chair overrule my point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Kansas please take his seat? The gentleman from Connecticut will proceed.

Mr. SIMPSON. Now, Mr. Chairman, I ask the Chair, Does he overrule my point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair stated that he declined to entertain the gentleman's inquiry as not being pertinent at this time.

Mr. SIMPSON. But I made the point of order that the gentleman was out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair trusts that the gentleman from Kansas will observe the rules of the House.

Mr. SIMPSON. Will the Chair rule on the point of order? Will he hear me on the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair declines to hear the gentleman.

Mr. SIMPSON. And declines to rule on the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas will please take his seat.

Mr. SIMPSON. Well, I want the Chair to rule on that point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will call upon the officer of the House to have the gentleman take his seat, if he declines to do so.

Mr. SIMPSON. I think the Chair ought to be more courteous than that, and ought to rule on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the Sergeant-at-Arms please have the gentleman take his seat.

The Sergeant-at-Arms appeared with the mace.

Mr. HANDY. I make the point of order that that has to be done in the House and not in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. SIMPSON. You had better take that back. It is nothing but a buzzard, anyway. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut will proceed.

#### TWO CLASSES OF FREE-SILVER ADVOCATES.

Mr. HILL. I fully understand that there are two classes of advocates of the free and unlimited coinage of silver.

*Approximate stock of gold, silver, and uncovered paper money in the principal countries of the world in 1873 and 1897 and changes between those dates, expressed in millions.*

[Compiled from pages 40, 41, and 42 of the Report of the Director of the Mint for 1897.]

Country.	Gold.			Silver.			Uncovered paper.		
	1873.	1897.	Increase.	1873.	1897.	Increase.	1873.	1897.	Increase.
Great Britain	160	534	424	95	121.7	26.7	59.8	112.1	52.3
France	450	772	322	500	443.9	*56.1	385.3	119.2	*286.1
Germany	100.2	654.5	494.3	306.2	212.8	*93.4	90.8	123.8	33
Russia	149.1	588.9	437.8	18.6	74.2	55.6	618.4	467.2	*151.2
Italy	20	96.9	76.9	23	45.4	22.4	87.8	161	73.2
Belgium	25	35	10	15	57	42	35.1	72.5	37.4
Netherlands	12	21.9	9.9	37.3	56.1	18.8	15.3	37.9	22.6
Austria-Hungary	35	173.5	143.5	40	63.7	23.7	265.8	177.6	*88.2
Australasia	50	132.1	82.1	8	7	4		22.5	22.5
Denmark	4.1	15.4	11.3	7.5	5.4	*2.1	6.5	6.4	*.1
Sweden	1.8	10.6	8.8	4.3	4.9	.6	6	19	13
Norway	7.6	7.5	*.1	1.6	2	.4	2.3	3.8	1.5
United States	135	606.3	561.3	6.2	634.5	628.3	749.4	397	*952.4
Total	1,209.8	3,791.6	2,581.8	1,057.7	1,728.6	670.9	2,322.5	1,720	*602.5

Net increase, \$2,650,200,000.

\* Decrease.

I would especially call attention to the footings, which show that these nations in 1897 had \$2,581,800,000 of gold and \$670,900,000 of silver more than they had in 1873, while the uncovered paper money—the demand obligations of these nations—shows a decrease of \$602,500,000, making a net increase of currency in twenty-three years of \$2,650,200,000.

One class believes, and believes honestly, that by an unlimited demand working upon a limited supply, additional value will be given, which will bring it to an equality with gold.

While I am willing to concede their honesty of purpose, I must totally disagree with their conclusions.

I heard once of a man who, on retiring for the night, found the blankets too short to properly cover his person, with the result that he suffered all night long from cold feet.

The next night, with the enthusiasm born of a new idea, he cut a strip from the upper end of the blanket and pinned it to the lower end and then retired in the firm belief that his troubles were all over.

He was doubtless honest, but had poor judgment.

I would remind these gentlemen who would legislate value into silver of the old conundrum which I used to hear when I was a boy: "If you call a dog's tail a leg, how many legs would a dog have?" and, to save them any waste of gray matter in guessing it, will state that the answer was, "Four; for calling the tail a leg does not make it one."

The second class is made up of those who do not believe that silver can acquire added value from legislation, but who desire free coinage purely as an inflation scheme.

As an illustration of that class, I cite the last Democratic candidate for the Presidency, who some time ago, in a speech in Brooklyn, said: "We do not want to change the ratio. It is not because we produce silver that we want 16 to 1, but because we own property and owe debts."

It is further illustrated by the action of forty-two United States Senators who, when a short time ago the question of paying the Government bonds in silver was under consideration, voted down the Nelson amendment, which declared that—

It is the duty of the Government of the United States, under existing laws, to maintain the parity of its gold and silver money, so that a dollar of the one metal shall for all monetary purposes always be the equal in value to a dollar of the other metal.

And who made a still more specific declaration of their views and purposes by defeating the Caffery amendment, which provided that—

If at the time of payment of the principal and interest on the bonds herein mentioned the market value of silver is not on a par with gold at the ratio of 16 to 1, the principal of said bonds shall be paid in gold or silver at the option of the creditor.

For such declarations and for the principle or lack of principle on which they are based I have neither sympathy nor respect, nor do I believe that any man or party acting in accordance therewith will ever receive the indorsement of the honest people of this country. [Applause on the Republican side.]

#### VOLUME OF MONEY AND PRICES.

The recent manifestoes issued jointly by the chairmen of the Democratic, the Populist, and the Silver-mine parties declare in effect that the adoption of the gold standard by the principal nations of the world has largely reduced the volume of money, and that as a result prices have declined, development has been checked, and wages have been reduced.

As an unanswerable argument against this, I submit the following table showing the approximate stock of gold, silver, and uncovered paper money in the principal countries of the world in 1873 and in 1897, with the changes between these dates:

But not only is it true that the actual monetary stock of the world has been largely increased, but it is also true that this increase has outstripped the increase of population.

Take as an example our own country.

In 1878 we had per capita \$3.24 of gold as against \$9.55 now, 0.15 of silver as against \$3.70 now, and \$17.97 of paper as against



\$5.45 now, making a total per capita of all forms of money of \$21.36 in 1873 against \$23.70 now.

England has increased her per capita from \$9.90 to \$20.65, Germany from \$13.59 to \$18.95, Belgium from \$14.44 to \$25.70, Italy from \$4.88 to \$9.69, the Netherlands from \$16.56 to \$23.65, Sweden from \$2.75 to \$8.90, Denmark from \$10.05 to \$11.83, Australasia from \$20.38 to \$32.32, and Norway from \$6.39 to \$6.65, while Russia has decreased 61 cents, Austria 16 cents, and France \$2.31.

But not only do these figures show conclusively that there has been no shrinkage in the volume of money, but it is found that the actual increase far exceeds the entire world's production of silver, less the amount used in the arts since 1873.

I am well aware that in response to this showing of the increase of the world's volume of money the advocate of free coinage will still claim that such increase is not in what he calls "money of final redemption."

Mr. SHAFROTH. Not measured by the amount of business.

Mr. HILL. I am coming to that feature right now.

While I deny that there is any such thing as a particular money of final redemption in our system where we have four kinds of legal tender with the right of exchange of one for the other indiscriminately under the parity clause of the act of 1893, yet I am willing to concede that what is meant is "standard" money and will test this claim on that basis only.

In 1873, under the double standard, the United States had:

[See Mint Report, 1897, page 42.]

Gold .....	\$135,000,000
Silver .....	6,150,000
Total specie .....	141,150,000
Paper .....	749,445,610

Taking silver and gold together, the money of final redemption was 18.83 per cent of the money to be redeemed.

In 1897 the United States had:

[See Mint Report, 1897, page 37.]

Gold .....	\$996,300,000
Silver .....	634,500,000
Paper .....	731,772,151
Silver and paper .....	1,366,272,151

So that in gold alone the money of final redemption is now 50.96 per cent of the money to be redeemed.

Mr. SHAFROTH. You count silver as redemption money?

Mr. HILL. No; I am taking your view of the case.

And though counting silver and paper as subject to redemption in standard money, yet we are nearly three times as well prepared for this as we were in 1873, with both metals in use for that purpose.

Again, the loans and discounts of State banks in 1860 were \$706,333,272.22; specie held (gold and silver), \$82,638,510.09.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Right there, if you will allow me a question.

Mr. HILL. I would if I had time; but I have not now time enough for myself.

There is no better way of testing this question of business requirements than from loans and discounts.

Loans and discounts of national banks February 18, 1898, were \$2,138,078,280.43; gold held, \$222,855,516.77. So that it appears that, according to the population at each period, the gold held in 1898 was \$3.06 per capita, and the specie—gold and silver—held in 1860 was \$2.69 per capita.

Not only that, but where, in 1860, the specie holdings of banks were 11.6 per cent of the loans and discounts, in February, 1898, notwithstanding an enormous expansion of the credit system and the use of other legal tender as bank reserves, the gold alone was 10.42 per cent of the loans and discounts.

I have shown—

First. That the actual volume of money has enormously increased under the gold standard.

Second. That this increase has exceeded the increase of population.

Third. That gold alone, or the money of ultimate redemption, now is nearly threefold more abundant compared with other money than gold and silver together were in 1873.

Fourth. That gold alone is as capable now of carrying the credit system of the country as gold and silver were in 1860.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I want to call your attention to the amount of business—

Mr. HILL. I will talk it over with you when the House adjourns. I can not yield to the gentleman.

In view of these facts, what becomes of this triplet proposition that the shrinkage in the volume of the world's money has reduced prices and checked development?

The truth is, and it is coming to be more and more accepted, that it is the quality rather than the quantity of money that influences prices, conditions of supply and demand being unchanged, and that the quantitative theory ignores rapidity of circulation, improved facilities of exchange, and the modern use of credit instruments.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order.

Mr. HILL. I decline to yield.

Mr. SIMPSON. I would like to have order. I can not hear what the gentleman is saying about this bill. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will please be in order.

Mr. SIMPSON. I want to know about this railroad, Mr. Chairman, and there is so much confusion I can not hear.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will be in order.

#### BANK CREDITS IGNORED.

Mr. HILL. I am quite sure that in considering the subject of the volume of money our free-silver friends forget the bank credits of this and other countries, which amount to more than \$16,000,000,000 (\$16,051,137,349), consisting of capital, surplus, circulation, and deposits of commercial banks and banks of issue only, all savings banks being excluded both here and abroad.

This enormous sum is to all intents and purposes available as money and performs all of the functions of a tool of exchange.

As against the \$23.70 per capita of money here, there is a banking power of \$72.61; in Great Britain, \$110.66; Australasia, \$136; Switzerland, \$86.71; Denmark, \$67.64; Canada, \$57.10; Sweden, \$46.95; Straits Settlements, \$39.60; Netherlands, \$19.22; France, \$24.23; Belgium, \$19.15; Austria, \$13.68; Germany, \$8.94; Italy, \$8.76; Russia, \$6.33; Mexico, \$3.88; Turkey, \$1.12; Japan, \$6.88. (Compiled from the Report of the Comptroller of the Currency for 1897, pages 594, 595, 596.)

Add the deposits of savings banks to the rating of the United States and it will carry us to over a hundred dollars per capita (\$102.52).

This is a factor in the financial problem that must be reckoned with.

Compared with the volume of money, it exceeds it fourfold here and fivefold in Great Britain.

It is a structure built up from the bed rock of confidence in a fixed and unchanging unit of value—gold.

Undermine this, cut this in two by legislation for fiat money, and "the subsequent proceedings will interest us no more," for there will not be enough left to worry over. [Loud applause on the Republican side.]

#### THE REPUBLICAN PARTY AND THE WAGE-EARNER.

There is one claim in this recent manifesto which I confess is a surprise to me.

For the past three years we have been told again and again that in order to meet the competition of the silver-standard nations we must adopt the same policy and pay our labor in depreciated money, and the rapidly increasing dangers of oriental competition have been sounded in our ears as something which could not be overcome by a protective tariff and which would yield to no treatment but the heroic one of free silver coinage.

I had begun to breathe freer and to think that perhaps the danger was over when Japan and India adopted the gold standard and thus voluntarily surrendered all of the advantages of low wages paid in cheap money which they formerly possessed, but I never expected to see our Democratic and silver-mine party friends face squarely about and charge the reduced wages of the past four years, which it was one of their main objects to perpetuate, to the present financial policy of this nation.

For forty years the pride and boast of the Republican party has been that American labor has been the best-paid labor in all the world, and, since the resumption of specie payment in 1879, paid in the best money of the world.

The very inception of that party was as an organized protest against human slavery, and it poured out its blood and treasure in 1861 that labor might be free, for it knew that when the lower stratum was lifted all would rise.

In the providence of God and amid the storm of war slavery died, and from that day this nation marched on and up, till, in 1892, a single day's wages would bring to the home of the American workman more of the comfort and luxuries of life than mankind had ever dreamed of for like service since the fall of Adam; and then, intoxicated by our success and fooled by the very men who now preach the gospel of free silver and fiat money, we opened wide the doors of this great nation to the unrestricted competition of other lands, and in a single day lost all the fruits of a struggle which had lasted thirty years.

But four years of hardship and privation have not blotted from the memory of the toilers of this nation the achievements of the past; and while I can not speak for other portions of the land, I do believe that this fall, as in 1893, the workmen of New England will march in solid column to the polls to sustain that party which has stood by them.

Mr. Chairman, out of all the misery and wretchedness of that useless sacrifice of four years of American progress one scene comes back to me which I can never forget.

In the town of Torrington, the banner Republican town of my State, a few days after the splendid political victory of '94, a jubilee was being held. The whole town was ablaze with bonfires and illuminations.



As the procession passed down the street between the separate cottages of American workmen we came to one house lighted from garret to cellar and decorated in every conceivable spot with American flags.

It was the home of a mechanic who, strange to say, had always before voted the Democratic ticket.

The front door stood wide open, and in the bright light which streamed forth the mother stood watching the passing crowd.

Halfway between the door and the street a large box had been placed, and standing on it was a little girl dressed in white and waving the flag as the procession passed.

It was a beautiful sight, but what attracted my attention most was this inscription on the front of the box at her feet:

Papa is in the parade; mamma and I are happy.

It was only the expression of a thought of a child, but it told the glad story that hope had come to them again.

Mr. Chairman, the working men and women of New England are looking forward to the day when the full old-time prosperity shall come again, when every man shall be at work and every child shall be at school and every mother shall be at home singing the song of happiness and content.

When that time does come and protection wages are fully restored, I want them paid in gold or its full equivalent, as they have been for twenty years.

You planters in the South and miners in the West may vote for fiat money and free silver if you will. I want the shining gold, with the highest possible purchasing power, for New England workmen.

#### WAGES IN THE UNITED STATES.

Two years ago the Secretary of State sent instructions to our consular officers all over the world to report, among other things, the effect of the then existing currency systems in the countries where they were stationed upon the rates of labor.

Every word of this testimony is from Democratic sources, for they were all appointees of the party then in power.

It is an unanswerable argument from our political opponents in favor of the single gold standard as the one system which will best conserve the welfare of the American workman and establish and maintain a permanent prosperity within our borders.

At the very beginning of these quotations I will place a table showing the relative wages in gold in all occupations in the United States from 1840 to 1891.

The time covered includes every system of finance which the nation has had—first, the double standard nominally; second, the irredeemable paper money of the war time, and third, from resumption in 1879 to 1891.

It is taken from the Senate Finance Committee Report on Prices, Wages, and Transportation, printed in 1893.

It shows two things. First, a slow but steady advance before the war, a sharp decline, but gradual recovery during the paper-money period, and a uniformly upward tendency thereafter.

There are no statistics since 1892, and I am glad of it, for they would have been neither satisfactory nor creditable to the American people for the four years succeeding.

#### HUMAN LABOR THE BEST MEASURE OF GOLD.

The second point to which I would call attention is, that human labor is the most uniform and most reliable in supply of anything which the Lord has put on this planet.

The chinch bug, the weevil and the potato bug, frost, drought, and storm may all affect the product of the field.

The area of cultivation may be extended or decreased.

Invention, improved machinery, new mines discovered, oil fields exhausted, all these things serve to increase or decrease the products of our farms and shops, and in these modern days the "gold bug" must take all the blame, but human labor in this table measures gold and proves beyond dispute the stability of the existing standard and the wisdom of its continuance.

Relative wages in gold in all occupations, 1840 to 1891, grouped by different methods.

Year.	Simple average.	Average according to importance.	Year.	Simple average.	Average according to importance.
1840.....	87.7	82.5	1854.....	95.8	95.8
1841.....	88	79.9	1855.....	98	97.5
1842.....	87.1	84.1	1856.....	99.2	98
1843.....	86.6	83	1857.....	99.9	99.2
1844.....	86.5	83.2	1858.....	98.5	97.9
1845.....	86.8	85.7	1859.....	99.1	97.7
1846.....	89.3	89.1	1860.....	100	100
1847.....	90.8	91.3	1861.....	100.8	100.7
1848.....	91.4	91.6	1862.....	100.4	101.2
1849.....	92.5	90.5	1863.....	76.2	81.9
1850.....	92.7	90.9	1864.....	80.8	86.2
1851.....	90.4	91.1	1865.....	66.2	68.7
1852.....	90.8	91.8	1866.....	108.8	111.1
1853.....	91.8	93.2	1867.....	117.1	121.8

Relative wages in gold in all occupations, 1840 to 1891, etc.—Continued.

Year.	Sample average.	Average according to importance.	Year.	Sample average.	Average according to importance.
1868.....	114.9	119.1	1880.....	141.5	143
1869.....	119.5	123.5	1881.....	146.5	150.7
1870.....	133.7	136.9	1882.....	149.9	152.9
1871.....	147.8	150.3	1883.....	152.7	159.2
1872.....	152.2	153.2	1884.....	152.7	155.1
1873.....	148.3	147.4	1885.....	150.7	155.9
1874.....	145	145.9	1886.....	150.9	155.8
1875.....	140.8	140.4	1887.....	153.7	156.6
1876.....	135.2	134.2	1888.....	155.4	157.9
1877.....	136.4	135.4	1889.....	156.7	162.9
1878.....	140.5	139	1890.....	158.9	168.2
1879.....	139.9	139.4	1891.....	160.7	168.6

With this table before him, how any man can claim that there has been any appreciation in the value of gold since 1866 is something I can not understand.

#### CONSULAR REPORTS ON WAGES.

The reports to follow will generally cover the ten years previous to 1896, and refer to Europe and North America only.

##### England.—Single gold standard.

The opinion seems rather to be that industry may be impeded by a bad system of money, and great social mischief and confusion produced; but a good monetary system can do no more than let the various forces of industry work unchecked. It is held also that the English monetary system is of this sort. There is no doubt about the standard money; there is an abundant and even indefinite amount of currency for all payments and transactions; credit is vastly developed. But the system has been in existence for generations the same as now, and there could not be any noticeable stimulus due to a monetary cause between the dates mentioned, as there has been no change in the system in the interval.

Rates of wages in the principal occupations were somewhat higher than in 1886, except in agriculture.

The record of changes in wages now made by the labor department from year to year shows that the general wage level changes very slowly.

##### Canada.—Single gold standard.

In the census taken in 1891, the average wages paid in manufacturing and mechanical industries are shown. These industries were classified as follows: Industries having an annual output of \$25,000 and more:

Wages per employee, 1881.....	\$206.20
Wages per employee, 1891.....	346.60

Increase in ten years.....	50.40
Percentage increase.....	18.3

Industries having an annual output exceeding \$500 and less than \$25,000:

Wages per employee, 1881.....	216.68
Wages per employee, 1891.....	244.24

Increase in ten years.....	27.56
Percentage increase.....	12.07

Belgium.—Double standard, but no coinage under it for twenty years.

The rates of wages were practically the same in 1883. Since that date wages have not undergone any sensible variation.

##### Netherlands.—Double standard, but mints open to gold only.

A slight advance in wages.

##### France.—Double standard, but mints open to gold only.

For the last fifteen years wages, both for skilled and unskilled labor, have slowly but regularly increased in France.

##### Germany.—Single gold standard.

A general advance. In Rhenish Westphalia textile industries wages increased from about \$143 per capita in 1886 to about \$163 in 1895.

Day labor shows a general slight advance.

In many trades the advance is marked from 1886 to 1892.

Rates of wages of the workmen in shops of railroads under Government control.

Year.	Laborers, not including officials.	Annual wages paid or expenses incurred for laborers.		Average wages paid per head.	
		Marks.	United States currency.	Marks.	United States currency.
1884-85.....	47,048	42,838,066	\$10,199,539.15	910.50	\$216.78
1885-86.....	47,402	43,306,825	10,811,148.80	913.60	217.52
1894-95.....	58,145	59,630,899	14,197,833.09	1,025.50	244.16

Austria.—Gold standard since 1892; formerly silver; free coinage abolished in 1878.

During the period embraced between the years 1886 and 1896 manufacturing industries have been stimulated, owing, it is considered, to the development and improvement of foreign trade. Wages have likewise increased during the above period, as will be seen by the annexed table. The expressed opinion of the leading manufacturers seems to be that the increase in wages is due to political reasons rather than to any changes in the currency. To meet the demand of the labor party for a legal working day of eight hours, a compromise was effected by increasing the rate of wages and making the working day ten hours.

##### Switzerland.—Double standard; mints open to gold only.

It is universally known and recognized that the wages for all classes of labor have very appreciably increased within the last ten years and the condition of the laboring man greatly improved. This, however, is attributed



almost exclusively to the better organization of labor, their unions enabling them to demand higher wages.

**Italy.**—Double standard; mints open to gold only.

According to statistics got together and published by the director-general of agriculture, there has been a marked increase in the wages of agricultural laborers. But owing to the minimum wages originally earned in this labor, the increase seemed greater than it has been in fact, if the normal condition of living be considered. A general increase is to be noted, however, and especially in those industries in which inventions have made improvements, yet even this branch has its exceptions, as in the case of silk spinning. At the same time the prices of products in general use have gone down and the hours of labor have generally been lessened.

**Mexico.**—Nominally, double standard; actually, silver.

As regards wages paid in Mexico, it has been found impossible to obtain any accurate statistics as to the rate which was paid ten years ago. The Government statistics at that time were not very accurate; but from all the obtainable information, derived from hearing the facts and views of well-informed persons cognizant of the conditions existing then and now, it can safely be stated that as regards skilled labor there has been a slight increase, both in the amount paid and in the demand, while as regards unskilled labor the conditions may be said to be substantially the same.

The amount of wages paid varies throughout the Republic, being higher in some sections than in others, and in certain mining districts lower than they were ten to fifteen years ago. This is generally owing to local causes. As a matter of course, owing to the construction and management of 7,000 miles of railroads, the introduction of electricity, and the placing of new and improved machinery in many of the mines and in some of the agricultural districts, there has been an increase in the number of skilled laborers and some increase in the demand for the same; but it is true that, with the great mass of the Mexican laborers, there has been but little if any change in the amount of wages paid.

As might naturally be expected, there are some instances where laborers receive more than ten years ago, but these are the exceptions. There are also many instances where less is received. The daily wage paid to the farm laborer hired by the day does not exceed 30 cents per day, taking into account the whole laboring agricultural population. There are instances where the day laborer receives 50 cents per day; but again there are also instances where he only receives 15 to 20 cents. The secretary of the treasury of Mexico estimates the daily wages of farm laborers at 25 cents.

**British Honduras.**—Gold standard since 1894; formerly silver.

The laboring man has been materially benefited, beyond the shadow of a doubt, and well he knows it, as against his silver wages, as prior to the gold standard his pay was, in silver, from \$10 to \$14 a month, and what he had to buy and pay for out of his wages was increased proportionately as silver decreased commercially. Now (at the date of writing) he gets paid in gold what he then got in silver, and what he now buys is not subject to the fluctuation of silver. The price of labor ranged pretty evenly from 1886 up to October, 1894. There may have been some little difference in wages during that period, but not of any moment.

[From the report of the governor.]

The laboring classes, the backbone of the colony, have largely benefited as regards wages, the dollars now earned equaling the number formerly received by them in sols. Savings-bank deposits have increased. Land and house property, whether in town or country, has increased 100 per cent in value, commanding now in gold the same amount received formerly in the money it replaced.

**Nicaragua.**—Silver standard.

There are few manufacturing industries in Nicaragua, and the existing currency has done nothing to stimulate them. The people prefer agricultural pursuits to manufacturing enterprises. The wages of the working classes occupied in all kinds of labor range from 40 cents to \$1.50 silver (18.8 cents to 70¢ cents gold) per day for unskilled or skilled labor. Clerks and the higher classes of laborers receive from \$2 to \$6 (94 cents to \$2.82 gold) per day.

**Costa Rica.**—Nominally, double standard; actually, silver.

In 1886 prices of labor may be considered to have been one-third less than they are to-day—in Costa Rican currency.

Wages (peons), 1886, \$1; 1896, \$1.50.

The increase of wages, measured in gold, since 1886 is apparent only. Peons receive now less gold than they did in 1886.

**Denmark.**—Gold standard.

I have talked with the director-general of foreign affairs and others on the practical effect of the currency on manufacturing and the wages of labor, etc., and have learned in a general way that, though Denmark is not largely a manufacturing country, industrial enterprise is generally increasing, and the wages of labor have increased here, as they have, happily, throughout Europe; but whether this increase is attributable to the currency—with which the people generally seem satisfied, though there is a large party here which favors a double standard of gold and silver—is a matter of conjecture and argument.

Consul Ryder, in 1884, made an exhaustive report specifying the wages of laborers in many lines of industry. I have been informed that wages have advanced, on an average, about 10 per cent since that time.

**Portugal.**—Gold standard, but specie payments suspended in 1891.

Since the suspension of specie payments there has been certainly some increase in the manufacturing industries, but not sufficiently marked to attract attention. The average rate of wages paid for labor, skilled and unskilled, has remained about the same as it was when the country was on a specie basis.

In a general way, it can only be said that while labor, both skilled and unskilled, has remained at substantially the same wage, the prices of agricultural products, clothing, groceries, boots and shoes, hardware, drugs, etc., have increased about 25 per cent, which is about the premium of gold.

**Russia.**—Silver standard at time of this report; since changed to single gold standard.

As to the growth of manufactures, it has long been stimulated by a protective tariff as well as by the ability of the manufacturers to pay their workmen approximately the old scale of wages in the cheaper money of the present system [then referring to silver].

An inquiry into wages does not show that the workmen participate appreciably in the benefits bestowed upon these industries. Official statistics showing the condition of agriculture are lacking, except as respects the rates and course of wages in agricultural pursuits, which will be shown in a later part of this report. It suffices to state here, where the general effect is being considered, that I have not read or heard a word favorable to the condition of

agriculture; that the universal testimony is of extreme depression, and the wages of the agricultural laborers, as shown by the official table referred to, have had, in the main, a downward tendency.

**Spain.**—Double standard; mint open to gold only.

All information received from as reliable sources as individual observers can be indicate two things: First, that so far as unskilled labor is concerned, wages have remained stationary; second, that though among skilled laborers for the same amount of skill wages have remained stationary, yet owing to some of the more recent industrial enterprises undertaken in Spain, requiring greater expertness or specialism, the average of wages for skilled laborers, a considerable number of whom are foreigners, has been raised.

During the last ten years, among the higher class of employees in the service of the railways, the wages or salaries have been raised to some extent, as has been done with Government employees, but any connection between this rise and the shrinkage in the value of Spanish currency has been absolutely disclaimed.

**Sweden.**—Gold standard. From tables given by the American minister a general advance is shown for past ten years.

**Norway.**—Gold standard.

The existing currency established by law of June 4, 1873, has not had any practical and direct influence on the manufacturing industries and the wages of labor. The latter have increased during the last decade in this country as elsewhere, which will be seen from the subjoined tables taken from the official statistics, but probably from reasons different from the introduction of the gold unit. The last statistics published by the central statistical bureau of Norway do not embrace any later year than 1890, which is compared with the statistics of 1885. But it may be safely said that since the former year the wages of labor have steadily increased, though I am unable to state the actual rates.

No comment upon these quotations is necessary, for the fact is clearly established that under the gold standard business conditions have been settled and a general advance of wages has occurred both in Europe and America; that not only have higher wages been paid, but they have been paid in money of the greatest purchasing power, and that if any decline in wages is found, it is in silver standard countries.

THE GOLD STANDARD THE WORLD'S CHOICE.

Mr. Chairman, within the limit of the century now drawing to a close 855,000,000 of the population of the globe have voluntarily abandoned the free coinage of silver and chosen gold as their standard measure of value.

They comprise the skill, the genius, the intelligence, the culture, the enterprise, the progress, and the wealth of the world.

To every one of the other countries, belated stragglers on the march of time, or not yet emerged from barbarism, we are sending missionaries to-day to lead them up to civilization and a higher life.

The advocate of free silver coinage may turn to such a source for wisdom and counsel on financial methods if he will, but this great Republic will not follow him, for its people have been taught by their own experience that a currency solidly based on gold has not only built up the nation in the days of peace, but is its best defense in time of war.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FOWLER of New Jersey. I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman may be extended until he finishes his remarks.

Mr. HANDY. That simply cuts off the time of other gentlemen.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is made.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. GIBSON having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. PLATT, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed joint resolution (S. R. 143) authorizing the use of a part of the appropriation heretofore made for the relief of the destitute citizens of the United States in the Island of Cuba for the aid of such citizens, refugees, and others who have reached our shores; in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. PRUDEN, one of his secretaries, informed the House that the President had approved and signed bills and joint resolutions of the following titles:

On April 9, 1898:

H. Res. 178. Joint resolution granting permission for the erection of a monument or statue in Washington City, D. C., in honor of the late Albert Pike.

On April 11, 1898:

H. R. 1034. An act granting a pension to William H. Byrum;  
H. R. 7008. An act granting pension to R. G. English;  
H. R. 6931. An act granting a pension to James B. Rawlins;  
H. R. 4526. An act granting a pension to Mary Vockey;  
H. R. 5083. An act granting a pension to Thomas Lane;  
H. R. 3661. An act granting a pension to Charles L. Stephens;  
H. R. 2349. An act granting a pension to Mrs. Weltha Post-Leggett;  
H. R. 3915. An act granting a pension to Delia Elizabeth Woodward;



H. R. 2295. An act granting a pension to Mary J. Hart;  
 H. R. 7827. An act granting a pension to Elizabeth M. Tummy;  
 H. R. 2272. An act granting an increase of pension to John N. Bruce;  
 H. R. 771. An act granting an increase of pension to Bernard Dunn;  
 H. R. 2375. An act granting an increase of pension to Isaac B. Vail;  
 H. R. 3798. An act granting an increase of pension to Milton Iserman;  
 H. R. 2199. An act granting an increase of pension to Henry F. Rice;  
 H. R. 4624. An act granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Herd;  
 H. R. 2924. An act granting an increase of pension to R. A. Browning;  
 H. R. 3212. An act granting an increase of pension to Barbara Miller;  
 H. R. 3184. An act granting an increase of pension to James H. Blakeman;  
 H. R. 1831. An act granting an increase of pension to Elisha M. Luckett;  
 H. R. 345. An act granting an increase of pension to George D. Cook;  
 H. R. 1806. An act increasing the pension of William Warner;  
 H. R. 1802. An act increasing the pension of Mary E. Wallick;  
 H. R. 2802. An act increasing the pension of Francis M. Bruner;  
 H. R. 290. An act to increase the pension of William H. Webster;  
 H. R. 1957. An act to increase the pension of William P. Cooper;  
 H. R. 4116. An act to increase the pension of Charles C. Short;  
 H. R. 4399. An act for increase of pension of Alexander E. Ingraham;  
 H. R. 3160. An act to place on the pension roll the name of Minerva Sample;  
 H. R. 2970. An act to permit an increase of the pension of John A. Anderson;  
 H. R. 6908. An act to authorize the Shreveport Bridge and Terminal Company to construct and maintain a bridge across Red River, in the State of Louisiana, at or near Shreveport;  
 H. R. 5489. An act extending the right of commutation to certain homestead settlers on lands in Oklahoma Territory opened to settlement under the provisions of the act entitled "An act to ratify and confirm the agreement with the Kickapoo Indians in Oklahoma Territory, and to make appropriations for carrying the same into effect;" and  
 H. R. 5030. An act to authorize the construction of a bridge across St. Francis River, in the State of Arkansas.

#### WASHINGTON AND GLEN ECHO RAILROAD COMPANY.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. JENKINS. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. STOKES].

Mr. HILL. I respectfully ask leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut asks unanimous consent to print the balance of his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, much time has been spent, and profitably spent, during this session in discussion of the relative cotton manufacturing interests of the South and of the North. The superiority of the advantages of the South in respect to cotton manufacturing has been conclusively demonstrated by several gentlemen. But the argument of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GRIGGS] is in my judgment to be credited with particular merit for its unanswerable arraignment of the national labor law agitation.

The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALKER] has admitted the advantages possessed by the South in this respect, and with a magnanimity of spirit and nobility of sentiment rarely surpassed upon this floor or elsewhere—has bid us godspeed and largest prosperity. I am not here to disparage the cotton-manufacturing interests of the South or of the North. I am here to aid cotton-manufacturing interests everywhere in every proper way.

#### LET THE COTTON GROWERS BE HEARD.

But, Mr. Chairman, what I am more concerned about is the cotton-growing interests of the South. The one industry is prosperous to an unusual degree. The other is languishing to an unusual degree. The cry of distress is in the land of the cotton growers of the South, just as it is in the cotton-manufacturing towns of New England. Last fall and winter the most active interest was exhibited all over the South. There were township meetings, county meetings, State meetings, and interstate meetings.

In these meetings met men who had toiled for a year, who had been frugal, prudent, industrious. Yet, in spite of industry, fru-

gality, and prudence; yes, in spite of the copious bounty of Providence, they found themselves empty-handed in the presence of the abundance they had created under the blessing of heaven. They met to consider the problem of 5-cent cotton and seek a solution.

Exhaustive examination was made by the State cotton growers' convention, which met in the capital of my State in November. Causes and remedies were discussed and sent up to the interstate convention in Atlanta December 14. Here again the whole question was reviewed by a representative body of as earnest men as ever grappled with a great and grave problem.

Their findings were transmitted to the American Cotton Growers' Protective Association, which met in Memphis December 21. This body reviewed the work of the preceding conventions and promulgated its findings. I have copies of all those findings here, but will not consume the time of the House in reading them.

#### REMEDIES SUGGESTED.

Suffice it to say that the findings of all these bodies agreed in the main. Briefly stated, the remedies suggested comprised (1) a reduction of the product of raw cotton, in deference to the prevalent impression in "best business" circles that there is an over-production of cotton; (2) increase of all food crops; (3) diversification of crops; (4) curtailment of credit system; (5) reform of the currency system; (6) abolition of gambling in cotton and all agricultural products.

All these remedies, save the last two, relate to the individual and collective action of the cotton growers themselves, and they have inaugurated the proper steps to make them effective. The last two are beyond the reach of individual effort. They are beyond the reach of State legislation. They can be reached only by national legislation. Having done all in their power to accomplish by organization or State legislation, they come to Congress for relief.

The financial question is effectually tied up here now. There is but one avenue for relief left open for Congressional action at this time—the abolition of gambling in cotton—and to that phase of the matter I shall therefore confine myself.

Mr. Chairman, I attended two of those cotton growers' conventions, and I wish to say that I have never attended meetings pervaded by a more intense and sincere desire to arrive at the true solution. In response to the wishes of these bodies, I introduced a bill which is now pending in the Committee on Agriculture. Several other bills are pending, emanating from different sections of the cotton belt.

#### HAVE A RIGHT TO BE HEARD.

Since my bill was introduced, Mr. Chairman, I have received thousands of letters, many of them pathetic in their appeals to Congress, indorsing its tenor and urging its passage. From my district alone I have, by actual count, received 1,091 petitions, containing 5,135 individual signatures. I have had petitions from other districts and other States, urging me to press this measure upon the attention of Congress. These people have a right to be heard here. They shall be heard. The responsibility shall be fixed where it belongs. [Applause.]

While, for the sake of brevity, I shall confine myself to dealing in "cotton futures," I state broadly that every condition and conclusion and consequence, applicable to gambling in cotton, will apply to similar operations in the great staple cereals which are made subjects of "future" dealings. I wish to state also that in this discussion I shall not go outside of the official reports of testimony taken before several committees of Congress.

#### THE CASE STATED.

Mr. Chairman, the man who should advisedly bargain away in the beginning of the year, at a clearly ascertained loss to himself, a whole year's product of toil and privation, would everywhere be adjudged a fool in the assizes of common sense. Still the man would simply have done what he had a right to do with his own.

But when that man presumes, unasked, to bargain away the year's product of another in advance, even if at no cost to that other, the natural and proper feeling would be one of resentment toward him as an impertinent meddler.

If, however, it became clear that this meddler bargained the year's product of another in advance, not once, not twice, but bargained it and sold it time and again at an appreciable cost to the producer, I think it quite likely that violent remedies—probably the toe of a boot—would be applied to the intruder, and a self-respecting public opinion would applaud the vigor of the remedy if not the remedy itself.

That is essentially the relation of the "future" operator to the producer of cotton and other agricultural staples, and that is the proposition that I shall first address myself to. The quality of the act is not one whit changed by reason of its wider application or broader scope. If the act is vicious in its narrower scope, in its operation upon the individual producer, it can not be less vicious, certainly, when operating upon the interests of thousands and millions of producers.



## IS THE OPTION DEALER A MEDDLER?

It should be sufficient answer to such inquiry that through all the six thousand years and more of the world's history down to 1872, the world had gotten along without the services of the option dealer, and had gotten along fairly well. Not that we should reject or condemn all innovations, or any innovation, because it is innovation; but the fact that he is an innovation, and apparently an injurious meddler, fixes upon the option dealer the burden of proof, to show a valid excuse, if he may, for his continued toleration by a long-suffering people. He owes his birth to a decade of debauch of public conscience during and subsequent to a period of public war and consequent public plunder. The continued toleration of his superfluous and officious presence is due to the grip acquired upon the public throat during the stupor incident to that mammoth debauch.

But how and why did the option dealer come upon the scene in the first instance? Did he come at the solicitation of the producer? No. Did the consumer ask his intervention? No. Whom does he represent? What are his methods? What useful function does he fulfill?

Hear what the Senate committee, presided over by that able jurist, the late Senator George, of Mississippi, says about it. The most elaborate examination was made and fullest testimony from the ablest representatives of the exchanges and others, pro and con, was obtained. That testimony is printed as a public document, together with findings of the committee upon the facts.

Here is what the committee says as to the option system:

In the first place, let it be noted that only in and through and under the regulations of the two cotton exchanges in New York and New Orleans can this business be transacted. The Cotton Exchange in New York is a corporation under the laws of that State. It is composed of less than 500 members, and the number can not be increased beyond that. The initiation fee is \$10,000, and the new members are elected by the old. No man can deal directly in futures unless he is a member.

The corporation has absolute power over the dealings. All disputes or controversies are settled by a court established by the corporation itself, in what is called arbitration proceedings. Neither party is allowed to call in a Federal or State court. It fixes the grades of all cotton, designates the warehouses in which it shall be stored, fixes the fees and charges for storage, weighing, and all other work done in relation to cotton. It fixes the quotations of prices which are to be published to the world, and these quotations are thus fixed under its rules for months for which there are no actual sales.

It and its members have such wealth that it is claimed, in a published letter of one of the principal members made in response to argument made on the floor of this body, that the exchange can absolutely dominate and fix prices, as against all others, by flooding the market with offers of an unlimited supply of futures when at other places prices are, in its opinion, too high, and thus break the market; and, on the other hand, when it deems prices too low at other places, may immediately buy all that can be offered.

The New Orleans Cotton Exchange, though located in the largest spot cotton market this side the Atlantic, is a mere annex to and a subordinate of the New York Cotton Exchange, and so need not be described further than by saying if it had the will to do good it has not the power.

Such are the agencies and localities of these dealings, and they are the sole agencies and places for transacting this business.

That recital of cold fact is the strongest possible arraignment of the dealings and the dealers.

I have examined the testimony page by page—nearly 2,000 pages of it, taken first and last by committees of Congress—and I have compared it with the charter, constitution, by-laws, and rules of the cotton exchange, and in my judgment that indictment is a true bill against the dealings and the dealers upon the cotton exchange.

## AN OVERSHADOWING MENACE.

Mr. Chairman, note the admission:

The exchange can absolutely dominate and fix prices, as against all others, by flooding the market with offers of an unlimited supply of futures when at other places prices are, in its opinion, too high, and thus break the market; and, on the other hand, when it deems prices too low at other places, may immediately buy all that can be offered.

That alone presents a condition which Congress should deal with.

When would a gambler think prices too high? When would he think prices too low? The bare possession of such power over a product is an overshadowing menace to prices whether that power were actively exercised or not. Not many industries could sit silent under that overshadowing menace and live.

## WILL THAT POWER BE EXERCISED?

Having the power to make or break prices, Mr. Chairman, will the exchange use that power? Ah, ask me whether the water will continue to flow to the sea; as well ask whether the apple thrown into the air will return to the earth. So long as human passion for power, human avarice, human greed, live in the human breast, so surely will the possession of power insure the exercise of that power. Not only will it be exercised, not only is it exercised in its fullest sweep, but note how carefully the exchanges have hedged that power in against all possible interference by the producer and the spinner.

Not only is this absolute power over prices exercised to the farthest limit of its tremendous sweep—the unanswerable proof of its exercise appears in the unbroken policy of depressed prices in the fall and higher prices in the spring. By unlimited offerings in advance of October, November, December, and January futures

the prices of contracts for those months are forced down, as already shown. The spot cotton market follows the contract market.

During those months the bulk of the crop passes out of the hands of the producer. It has to be so. Few of them are independent; and under the method of the exchange fewer are independent to-day than were so ten years ago. Their obligations must be met. Then, when the bulk of the crop has passed out of the producers' possession, by reversing their tactics the price is raised. This is notorious. It has been burned into the memory of cotton producers every year since the exchange intruded its superfluous presence.

## A SELF-CONTINUING MEDDLER.

This body of option dealers is not only a self-constituted but a self-continuing meddler—not only self-constituted and self-continuing, but so limited in membership as to make the cotton exchange the closest corporation on the face of the earth. Membership is so costly, too, that it becomes a close corporation of fabulous wealth.

Rules are so rigid and penalties so severe that the few master spirits practically wield the whole force of this mighty engine in whatever direction the individual or collective interests of the leaders may lie. And from the verdict of this self-constituted, self-continuing, close corporation, as between its members, no court of justice, Federal or State, can be invoked.

## A MONSTER MONOPOLY.

None save the members can deal directly in futures on the exchange. Thus the 454 members of the New York Cotton Exchange are enabled to draw a tribute from every other section of the country and levy a tax upon one of its most important industries. Its rules are so framed as practically to shut the spinner or buyer of actual cotton out of the exchange, even through the medium of a member of that close corporation. This is accomplished through a form of contract which permits the seller of a future contract to deliver any one of thirty-odd grades, and allows the buyer no option as to what grade he shall accept.

The buyer can not contract for any specific grade. He must take anything tendered, from "good ordinary" to "fair." It goes without saying that the spinner, when he buys, wants specific grades, and he must get what he wants for the purposes of his particular line of goods.

Again, the form of contract does not admit of purchase or sale of less than 100 bales. This practically shuts out nine-tenths of the producers of cotton from even the poor chance of protecting themselves through the medium of a member of the exchange.

Probably less than one-tenth of the producers of cotton raise as much as 100 bales. And so it turns out, just as was expected and intended, no doubt, that the two parties principally concerned with actual cotton—the producer and the spinner—are entirely excluded as factors on the exchange.

## FIXES THE PRICE ABSOLUTELY.

Hence it comes finally and incontestably to this result: The only two parties directly interested in real cotton being shut out, the exchange is left in the exclusive control of the speculative trader. As already seen, the exchange fixes the price absolutely. The spinner buys his cotton throughout the interior markets directly from the producer; but he buys strictly according to exchange quotations.

If a bear raid on the exchange results in a fall of 10 points or any number of points, the fall is immediately reflected in the office of every spinner, and he promptly wires his country buyer, reducing the limit by just so much. This is a matter that comes within the personal observation and experience of every cotton grower every season, and many times in every season. At first glance it might appear singular that the spinner does not kick at his exclusion from the exchange as a factor in determining the price.

The other party principally concerned has been protesting for years and appealing to Congress for relief; but the buyer of actual cotton has not been heard from. The explanation is easy. The spinner thinks his interest lies in the direction of buying cotton as cheap as possible, and the effect of the exchange methods has been to enable him to buy his raw material cheaper from year to year than he thinks he otherwise would.

This is a silent but eloquent indictment of the exchange system that can not be condoned or overcome. Does any sane man believe that the tremendous financial interests engaged in spinning cotton would have been silent this long had they thought the exchange operated against them? Would they not have been knocking at the doors of Congress with unremitting insistence if they had not thought the exchange was furthering their interests?

## RAISES AS WELL AS LOWERS PRICES.

It is admitted by the advocates of the system that prices may be temporarily lowered independent of supply and demand, but it is argued as an offset that they are quite as frequently raised above the normal level of supply and demand. Ah, Mr. Chairman, there is the rub. What right have these people to interfere at



all? Is it not clear that they hurt the consumer in the one case as surely as they hurt the producer in the other? The admission and the plea complete the circuit of condemnation from their own mouths. What compensation or comfort is it to us who are forced to sell to-day on a "bear" market, to know that yesterday or tomorrow or next week the "bulls" will be in control? Every seller implies a buyer, does it? Therein lies the culminating iniquity of the thing. They may sell an unlimited quantity; they do sell it; then they move heaven and earth to beat down the price in order that they may buy back their contracts at a profit to themselves—and the price of spot cotton goes down, down with even pace.

No, Mr. Chairman, the people of America, both producers and consumers, are entitled to a free, untrammelled market. Nothing short of that will satisfy them.

#### PRICES PROGRESSIVELY LOWER.

But we are not left solely to induction or inference. By consulting the table of surplus and prices appended, it is demonstrated that the general trend of prices has been toward a lower level. Not only so, but the price has moved up and down independent of supply and demand. The surplus is used as a basis of comparison here, because, in my judgment, it expresses more accurately the relation between actual supply and actual demand. Here are a few striking contradictions to the law of supply and demand as revealed by these tables.

Of the crop of 1871-72 there remained at the end of the season four months' supply of cotton. The average price was 21.88 cents. At the end of the season of 1887-88 only three weeks' supply of cotton remained on hand. Had the new crop been delayed four weeks the mills must have stopped running. Yet the price was only 5.66 cents. The general decline in all values during this period, due to vicious financial legislation, was about 33½ per cent. Deducting what should be due to the financial factor, we would still have the difference between 14½ cents and 5½ cents to be accounted for by supply and demand. This law would require the higher price with the smaller supply. But the fact is just the reverse.

Note this point carefully—with a surplus equal to four months' supply, the price was 21.88 cents. With a surplus equal to only three weeks' supply the price was forced down to 5½ cents. That is the law of supply and demand, is it? Certainly it is not the law of supply and demand for real cotton. Starting from this same point of time—1871-72—with four months' supply and the price 21.88 cents, compare 1891-92. In the latter year there were less than three months' supply, yet the price was run down to 4.18 cents. If we had to reckon with the financial factor alone, the price of cotton the latter year should have been not less than 12 cents.

At the end of the season of 1889-90, the surplus on hand had increased to five weeks' supply. Did the price decrease correspondingly? Not a bit of it. That is what should have happened if the law of demand and supply had not been interfered with. On the contrary, however, the price, instead of decreasing, increased to 6.18 cents.

Take the current year, if you please. Reckon out the effect of the financial factor; reckon out the effect of the probable surplus; reckon out every other legitimate factor—and what should the price be to-day? Reckoning out all these disturbing factors under well-ascertained laws of economics, cotton should be bringing at least 8½ cents. What is it really bringing? From 5 to 5½ cents. The difference between the actual price and the price as it should be, reckoning out all the factors except the gambling factor, and you must have the effect of the gambling factor. It can't be otherwise. This difference is 3½ cents. If this reasoning be correct (and I challenge refutation), it must be that the farmer is getting 3 to 3½ cents less for cotton to-day by reason of the gambling in cotton futures. How long will the American cotton grower stand it? Only so long as he will organize and demand a remedy.

The tables inserted below are compiled from the statistics of Allison & Co., cotton experts, and contain abundant evidence of the same sort.

#### NOT DUE TO FOREIGN COMPETITION.

Ah, but they tell us the downward tendency of prices is due to increased competition of other countries that raise cotton more cheaply than we can. The principal trouble with this explanation consists in its stating as a fact what is not a fact. In 1872 the United States produced 55 per cent of the cotton of the world; in 1895 we produced 84½ per cent.

See table appended showing relative cotton production of the United States and other countries from 1865 to 1895.

#### NOT SO WITH TOBACCO AND WOOL.

In striking contrast with the condition of these products which are subject to option dealings is the range of prices on tobacco, wool, and other products which do not figure on the exchange boards.

The prices of wool are subject to fluctuation from tariff laws and seasons; yet the highest average price of coarse wool since 1878 is 34 cents; the lowest is 29 cents.

The highest average price of tobacco since 1878 is 9.9 cents; the lowest is 7.7 cents. The prices of these commodities being exempt from the officious interference of the exchange gamblers, show nothing like the fluctuations that have confounded the cotton and grain growers, nor do they show the progressive downward trend that threatens the cotton and grain growers with destruction.

#### WHO FOOTS THE BILLS?

In almost every other industry the initial step in arriving at the selling price of a product is the cost of production, including cost of raw material, labor, insurance, storage, etc. Add to this the cost of transportation to a given point and you obtain the selling price at that point. By the ingenious operations of the cotton exchange and of the grain exchanges this rule is precisely reversed.

In normal conditions all the charges for insurance, commissions, storage, and freight would be carried with the first cost and paid by the consumer. The selling price of cotton, however, being fixed on the New York Cotton Exchange absolutely and exclusively, months in advance, before the product has passed the initial stage of production, without any regard for the cost of production, all the expense is adroitly shifted upon the producer.

This is the way of it: The price fixed by the New York exchange is the price in New York, and that is the standard absolutely followed by spinners, purchasers of actual cotton, as we have already seen. The price in New York being fixed, naturally and necessarily the price at any given interior market is obtained by deducting the cost of transportation, insurance, storage, and commission. Thus the natural and universal course of commerce is nullified, pushed aside, reversed, and the entire cost of handling is saddled upon the back of the producer.

If demonstration were necessary, it could be easily furnished. But it is not necessary to prove that which is admitted by the leading exponent of the system. At page 137 of the hearings before the Hatch committee in the Fifty-second Congress, Mr. Bloss, vice-president of the New York Cotton Exchange, was finally pinned down, after a good deal of sparring, to answering this question: Whether ultimately all these commissions for the wind sales did not come out of the crop? The answer of Mr. Bloss was, "Yes; they are obliged to." And these commissions range from 2 to 12½ cents per bale.

Thus by a system of gratuitous and officious, not to say criminal, interference the entire cost of handling, instead of being carried in the final cost to the consumer or divided between consumer and producer, is shifted wholly upon the producer.

Not only so. This officious intermeddler, by means of ingeniously devised rules, retains absolute control of every item of cost. He fixes the grades and the prices. He prescribes charges for storage and at what warehouses storage shall be permitted. He fixes the rules and the rates of pay for inspection, weighing, and, in short, every detail of every item of cost. Then he sums it all up and saddles it upon the producer. The same is true in every particular of the staple grain-growing industry.

Mr. Chairman, the patience of the American farmer surpasses that of the proverbial Job. It passes belief, if he has fully appreciated his wrongs and his burdens. Imagine the pig-iron interests subjected to such! Would they not be promptly heard here? What interest or industry would be so patient?

Why, Mr. Chairman, the great railroad systems of this country, which maintain costly lobbies here about this Capitol and who yearly pull the leg of the Government to the tune of \$35,000,000 for service that they would charge less than \$5,000,000 for if performed for any of the big corporations—these railroads are here raising a big howl for relief. They want it bad and want it right away. Relief? From what? Is some big exchange selling contracts for future transportation at ruinous rates to the railroads? Not at all. What then?

Why, Mr. Chairman, a few little pesky ticket brokers are corrupting public morals and tempting the cupidity of dishonest railroad employees by buying and selling actual transportation contracts uttered and sold by the railroads themselves, for which the railroads already have the money. It is claimed that forgery and false impersonation occur, but are the railroads the sole sufferers from forgery? Why should they have special legislation to protect them from perjury and forgery and false impersonation? What have they done, what great service to the Government, that they should be taken better care of than other people?

If we are to judge of the future by the past, the puny little ticket broker will be wiped out by this House in order that this great moral institution, the railroad, may go forward upon its high moral mission. But the people of nine States who grow cotton, and of the Western States, growing grain, will watch with interest the action of the Congress on that bill to remove an obstacle out of the way of railroad business.



The growers of cotton and growers of grain have been clamoring here for years. There are several bills pending in committees of this House. Every consideration of good morals hypocritically put forward by the railroads to forward their bill, applies in fact a thousandfold to the infamous interference of the exchanges with the cotton and grain growers' interests.

Has not the cotton exchange disturbed the orderly conduct of the business of my people? Has it not cut down their profits? Has it not inflamed the gambling instinct in men, until, infatuated by gains or maddened by losses, they have run the whole gamut of crime, ending with the culminating crime of all—a crashing bullet into a crazed brain by a dishonored hand?

In the name of morals, in the name of fair dealing, in the name of common honesty, the farmers demand this relief. [Applause.]

#### FRAUD OR GAMBLING—WHICH?

But, Mr. Chairman, it is claimed that these contracts are bona fide; that deliveries may be demanded. The conclusive answer to this is that deliveries are not made, and delivery is not contemplated. As an absolute demonstration of this, compare receipts at New York and New Orleans, respectively, with the operations in futures at those points.

In 1896 the total receipts at New York were 168,000 bales. The sales of "futures" footed up 56,000,000 bales. At New Orleans the same year total receipts were 864,000 bales, and the sales of futures amounted to 15,498,700 bales. The entire crop of that year was only 7,147,000 bales, 4,627,000 of which were exported and 2,505,000 used by domestic mills.

#### CAN NOT BE DONE.

What do these figures mean? Fifty-six and a half million bales sold against a total receipt of 168,000 in New York! Seventy million bales of recorded contracts (and the Omniscient only knows how many were not recorded) sold against total receipts of less than 1,000,000! How could deliveries of 70,000,000 bales be made with 1,000,000?

It is gigantic fraud or gigantic gambling—gambling beside which the wildest orgies of Monte Carlo are tame. This can mean only one of two things. Either the 69,000,000 bales sold in excess of receipts were gambling contracts pure and simple, or else those receipts were sold over and over again sixty-nine times. Looking at it another way, the whole crop was sold by these intermeddlers in advance, and sold ten times over. For what? For the fun of the thing? Hardly. What for, then? Every time a bale of cotton was sold there was a commission to the broker of from 2 to 12½ cents.

There is the milk in the cocoanut. I am inclined to think, too, that insurance charges, storage charges, inspection and weighing charges, are also carried in each transaction, though, of course, none of them are paid by the broker, and they go to swell his part of the "swag." And mark you, under their method, the expense, whatever it is, comes out of the crop; that is, out of the producer. This is admitted again and again by exchange experts, more or less unwillingly. It needs no proof. It is too plain for argument. Somebody has to pay. It must come out of somebody. Out of whom? Under the system it comes inevitably out of the producer.

Mr. Chairman, if these are gambling contracts, it goes without saying they ought to be suppressed. If they are fraudulent multiplications of wind sales for the purpose of multiplying commissions and other charges, they are an insufferable incubus upon legitimate trade.

#### WHO ARE BUSINESS MEN?

But they tell us, Mr. Chairman, this system has become so interlocked with the whole commerce of real cotton, interstate and foreign, that the destruction of the system would disorganize and demoralize the business interests of the country. What business interests, Mr. Chairman? Away with this arrogant and unwarranted assumption that the gambling interests are the only, or even the best, business interests in this country.

Are not the farmers business men? Is not their business disorganized and demoralized by the intermeddling operations of the exchanges? Are they not entitled to some protection? Why, according to these people, the men who professionally gamble in a \$800,000,000 crop are the "best business" men, while the men who make that crop, who create that value, are not. Arrogance! Rot!

#### SCOTCH THIS SNAKE.

Finally, it is urged by the advocates of the system that if we legislate them out of existence on this side the Atlantic it will result in transferring the entire trading in futures to the other side.

They darkly hint that we should surely be fleeced in that event. There is absolutely nothing in the history of these human sharks on the New York Cotton Exchange to inspire us with confidence in their fostering care over the cotton growers. Our observation is that gamblers on both sides the water are very much the same. If I am to be sandbagged and robbed, I fail to see any comfort to me in the nationality of the robber who does the job. It is quite clear to me, however, that if the seventy-odd million bales of

wind cotton sold in this country could be eliminated there would undoubtedly be that much less burden upon the actual business in actual cotton. We scotch the snake we can not kill.

#### HAS CONGRESS JURISDICTION?

This seems too elementary for argument. Beyond question the commodities affected by the exchange operations are articles of interstate commerce to a very large extent, and nearly three-fifths of them being exported, relate to foreign commerce. The exchanges assume to fix prices for these products, which are subjects of interstate commerce. They assume to interfere with and regulate interstate and foreign commerce, which, under the Federal Constitution, is the exclusive prerogative of Congress. These intermeddling exchanges arrogate and are exercising a power that is denied to a sovereign State.

But it is not necessary to invoke the interstate-commerce feature of these transactions to determine the right of Congress to interpose.

The Congress has taken cognizance of this matter. Twice such legislation has passed the House, and the legitimacy of such action has been sustained by some of the ablest jurists within and without the Halls of Congress. The moral aspects alone would warrant the interference of Congress.

#### WHAT ACTION?

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the difficulties surrounding this phase of the question. I do not hesitate to say, however, that in my judgment any one of the several bills now pending would accomplish the end in view. Naturally I prefer the one introduced by myself, which at some future time I hope to discuss in detail before the House.

As a matter of interest and suggestion, however, I ask leave to print herewith extracts from our consular reports, showing what steps have been taken in some foreign countries to emancipate their agricultural producers from the shackles of this gratuitous and crushing intermeddler. Shall America, with a larger proportion of farming interests and farming population than any European nation, refuse to care for those interests? I trust not. I believe not.

#### APPENDIX.

##### EXHIBIT A.

Comparison of sales of spots and futures for eight years at New York and New Orleans, with the total crop and exports.

Year.	New York.		New Orleans.	
	Futures.	Spots.	Futures.	Spots.
	<i>Bales.</i>	<i>Bales.</i>	<i>Bales.</i>	<i>Bales.</i>
1890 .....	21,107,600	271,000	6,782,000	1,084,000
1891 .....	24,433,700	147,000	8,555,300	1,155,000
1892 .....	34,359,800	180,000	12,131,400	1,228,000
1893 .....	53,273,500	189,000	16,516,700	866,000
1894 .....	37,858,300	204,000	12,770,500	927,000
1895 .....	39,377,200	112,000	14,723,400	1,129,000
1896 .....	56,451,000	168,000	15,498,700	864,000
1897 .....	36,113,000	270,000	9,251,700	1,064,000

  

Year.	Total crop.	Exports.	Home consumption.	
			Northern mills.	Southern mills.
	<i>Bales.</i>	<i>Bales.</i>	<i>Bales.</i>	<i>Bales.</i>
1890 .....	7,297,000	4,906,000	1,780,000	545,000
1891 .....	8,674,000	5,791,000	2,027,000	613,000
1892 .....	9,018,000	5,858,000	2,172,000	684,000
1893 .....	6,664,000	4,390,000	1,652,000	723,000
1894 .....	7,532,000	5,232,000	1,580,000	711,000
1895 .....	9,837,000	6,726,000	2,019,000	852,000
1896 .....	7,147,000	4,627,000	1,605,000	900,000
1897 .....	8,706,000	5,979,000	1,793,000	999,000

##### EXHIBIT B.

Cotton crop, 1842 to 1893—Stock end of season, and number of weeks' consumption and range of prices.

[In thousands of bales.]

Year.	Stock on hand.			Range of prices.		
	United States.	Europe.		Average.	Lowest.	Highest.
		Total.	Number of weeks' consumption.			
1842-43 .....	94	1,230	34	Cents. 8.99	Cents. 8.12	Cents. 10.39
1843-44 .....	160	1,325	33.1	10.27	9.14	11.92
1844-45 .....	94	1,349	27.7	8.54	8.12	8.87
1845-46 .....	107	923	19.4	8.91	3.36	10.63



Cotton crop, 1842 to 1893—Stock end of season, etc.—Continued.

[In thousands of bales.]

Year.	Stock on hand.			Range of prices.		
	United States.	Europe.		Average.	Lowest.	Highest.
		Total.	Number of weeks' consumption.			
1846-47	215	639	17.4	13.09	11.67	14.73
1847-48	171	820	20.3	8.69	7.35	11.67
1848-49	155	995	20.5	8.89	7.11	11.17
1849-50	168	729	14.8	13.76	12.42	15.47
1850-51	128	752	14.8	13.05	9.38	15.73
1851-52	91	769	13.1	10.43	9.38	11.93
1852-53	135	1,144	19.4	11.92	11.62	12.69
1853-54	135	1,112	19.3	11.37	10.27	12.18
1854-55	143	690	10.9	11.42	10.15	13.44
1855-56	64	796	11.5	12.18	11.17	12.93
1856-57	49	527	7.5	15.83	12.93	18.78
1857-58	103	643	10.2	14.49	12.81	18.78
1858-59	149	751	10.5	14.27	13.70	14.98
1859-60	228	1,244	15.1	13.42	11.67	14.96
1860-61	83	1,019	12.1	15.55	13.20	20.54
1861-62	(a)	368	9.6	31.77	20.54	51.26
1862-63	(a)	250	6	46.77	42.63	56.33
1863-64	(a)	563	11.2	57.61	53.80	64.45
1864-65	(a)	347	5.9	41.49	27.41	55.83
1865-66	282	1,143	15.2	35.59	24.87	50.75
1866-67	80	1,062	13.5	23.09	18.27	31.07
1867-68	38	614	6.8	24.40	14.96	28.13
1868-69	12	553	6.6	24.60	21.32	28.42
1869-70	60	749	8.8	22.29	15.73	25.62
1870-71	105	760	7.1	17.40	15.23	19.79
1871-72	55	1,486	15.7	21.88	19.53	23.97
1872-73	91	1,220	11.6	19.59	18.27	21.32
1873-74	108	1,274	11.9	17.30	16.61	19.02
1874-75	68	1,226	11.3	15.98	14.58	16.99
1875-76	120	1,168	10.8	13.44	12.14	14.96
1876-77	120	1,001	9.6	13.20	12.18	14.84
1877-78	43	656	6.5	13.22	12.18	13.95
1878-79	50	480	5	12.71	10.66	14.84
1879-80	137	677	6.5	14.33	13.70	15.47
1880-81	212	978	8.3	13.44	11.79	15.08
1881-82	124	771	6.3	13.95	13.05	14.96
1882-83	237	936	7.3	11.92	11.29	14.45
1883-84	112	1,008	8.1	12.59	11.92	13.32
1884-85	132	772	6.7	11.91	11.24	12.69
1885-86	178	615	5	5.25	4.75	5.62
1886-87	84	812	6.2	5.50	5.19	6
1887-88	182	446	3.3	5.56	5.18	6
1888-89	59	527	3.9	5.93	5.43	6.81
1889-90	62	709	5	6.18	5.62	6.75
1890-91	231	1,024	7	5.06	4.50	5.81
1891-92	427	1,627	11.9	4.18	3.66	5

a No data, owing to the war.

## EXHIBIT C.

Prices of tobacco, 1878 to 1896.

Year ending June 30—	Tobacco leaf, per pound.	Year ending June 30—	Tobacco leaf, per pound.
1878	Cents. 8.7	1888	Cents. 8.3
1879	7.8	1889	8.8
1880	7.7	1890	8.6
1881	8.3	1891	8.7
1882	8.5	1892	8.4
1883	8.3	1893	9.0
1884	9.1	1894	8.5
1885	9.9	1895	8.7
1886	9.6	1896	8.5
1887	8.7		

## EXHIBIT CC.

Prices of fleece wool (fine, medium, and coarse), 1883 to 1892.

Year.	January.			April.		
	Fine.	Medium.	Coarse.	Fine.	Medium.	Coarse.
	Cents.	Cents.	Cents.	Cents.	Cents.	Cents.
1883	40	43	33	44	44	37
1884	40	40	34	38	38	34
1885	34	33	29	32	32	28
1886	35	36	32	33	34	30
1887	33	38	34	33	37	33
1888	31	35	33	31	33	34
1889	34	38	33	33	37	31
1890	33	37	29	32	36	29
1891	33	37	31	32	37	31
1892	30	35	31	29	34	31

Prices of fleece wool (fine, medium, and coarse), 1883 to 1892—Continued.

Year.	July.			October.		
	Fine.	Medium.	Coarse.	Fine.	Medium.	Coarse.
	Cents.	Cents.	Cents.	Cents.	Cents.	Cents.
1883	39	41	33	39	40	34
1884	35	34	30	35	34	30
1885	32	31	28	33	35	32
1886	33	33	29	35	38	24
1887	34	37	34	32	36	32
1888	29	33	31	31	34	31
1889	35	39	32	33	37	31
1890	33	37	29	33	37	31
1891	31	35	29	31	35	30
1892	28	34	30	29	33	29

## EXHIBIT D.

GERMAN LAW AGAINST EXCHANGE SPECULATION.

[Consular Report No. 194, page 447.]

Germany, under the pressure of the Agrarian party, has undertaken what other nations have been desirous of doing, viz, to check speculation on the exchanges, not alone in stocks, but also in food products, principally grain.

(1) No exchange can be established without the consent of the Government, which, through a commissioner, will exercise a continued supervision over its actions and dealings.

(2) A court of honor is created which may exclude persons from the exchange after due trial. Parties who have been judicially declared bankrupt will be excluded for at least six months, and permanently if the bankruptcy was fraudulent.

(3) When the listing of stocks or bonds is applied for at the exchange, a committee will make a thorough investigation of all circumstances affecting their security and desirability, and will then decide whether they can be admitted. Before this is done a prospectus must be published giving all particulars of such securities. Stocks will not be admitted until one year after the entry of the firm name in the commercial register nor before the publication of the balance sheet for the first business year. All parties who have signed the prospectus are legally liable for the correctness of the statements in the same and must make good any loss or damage to the takers of such securities resulting from false, misleading, or omitted statements in the prospectus. Besides, they are liable to be criminally prosecuted if the circumstances warrant such proceedings.

(4) All dealings in futures or on term at the exchange are prohibited, unless the parties to the transaction are entered in the so-called exchange register. The original entry in this register costs 150 marks (\$35.70), and an annual fee of 25 marks (\$5.95) is exacted to keep the entry alive. The register is public, and can be inspected by any person. The entries are at once published in the Imperial Gazette (Reichsanzeiger) and the local official papers, at the expense of the parties, and a compilation of all names will be published once a year in the Imperial Gazette. The persons omitting to have their names entered in the exchange register have no legal claims against each other by reason of term transactions. Such claims are considered in the light of gambling debts.

(5) The term business of dealing in futures in grain and mill products or stocks of mining and manufacturing establishments on the exchange is entirely forbidden.

(6) Whoever habitually, or for selfish purposes, induces inexperienced persons to speculate on the exchange in such articles as are outside of their sphere of business will be punished by imprisonment and a money fine of 15,000 marks (\$3,570).

(7) With the exception of the paragraph referring to the exchange registers, which became operative in November 1, 1890, this law went into effect on January 1, 1897. (For full text of the German statute see Consular Report No. 193, page 296.)

## EXHIBIT E.

GRAIN EXCHANGE BROKERS OF RUSSIA.

[Consular Report No. 95, page 600.]

There are fifteen brokers at the grain exchange of St. Petersburg, who are elected by the Grain Exchange Society, and confirmed by the department of trade and manufactures. Of these one is appointed by the exchange committee as a chief broker. The number of the brokers can be increased or decreased by the action of the Grain Exchange Society, with the confirmation of minister of finance. A person wishing to be an exchange broker must file a petition with the grain exchange committee with the following proofs: (1) That he is a Russian subject; (2) that he is not less than 25 years old; (3) that he is a member of the grain exchange; and (4) in case he went through a bankruptcy, to present a certificate that his bankruptcy was acknowledged by the commercial court as justified, i. e., caused by unforeseen misfortune.

The persons elected for exchange brokers are examined by an exchange committee as to their qualifications. The committee then sends all the documents presented and their own conclusions to the department of trade and manufactures. An exchange broker enters upon the duties of his office after his confirmation by the department of trade and manufactures, after taking the oath of his office; but if within thirty days of his qualification, he should fail to present to the committee of the Grain Exchange Society all the documents and books necessary for his duty as broker prescribed by law, his place is declared vacant and given to the next one.

A vacancy occurring in the course of a year is filled, with permission of the department of trade and manufactures, by election held in the general assembly of the Grain Exchange Society. The brokers are appointed for an indefinite period. They must provide themselves with a commercial certificate of second guild; and although they have to pay for the same and all other fees established, they can not engage in any other business outside of that of broker. They must be acquainted with all the rules and regulations concerning commerce and with the prices and qualities of goods. In the discharge of their duties, the following rules must be observed:

(1) Brokers are not allowed to act as commercial attorneys, trustees, or clerks.

(2) They are prohibited from forming associations among themselves or performing the official duties of another, except with the permission of the trustees. They can cooperate for a united mediatorship in carrying out separate orders.

(3) They must attend to their duties personally, and are not allowed to conclude any bargain through an assistant.



(4) They are bound to keep secret all orders, negotiations, and contracts concluded through their agency, except in such cases where it is allowed by their trustees or by the character of the bargain itself.

(5) The brokers in their certificates to parties must designate the bargains in poods (weights) and copecks (values). They issue also brokers' certificates for either sale or purchase of goods, according to orders received by letter or telegram from members of the exchange living in other cities or towns, but they must send such certificates for signatures of the parties.

The brokers must be present at the exchange during business hours and wear a badge with the inscription, "Exchange broker." Each grain-exchange broker receives every year from the department of trade and manufactures a book under seal, in which he must record all bargains made according to the certificate issued by him, with all the particulars and details on the day they were made, and not later than the following morning.

The department of trade and manufactures gives such book only when the broker produces a certificate that he has paid the guild duties for the year, and when he has received the book he must present it to the court of exchequer to have it stamped with revenue stamps. These books and the brokers' certificates issued must be kept in strict conformity with the commercial statute. All bargains being considered secret, the brokers can issue copies of the certificates only to parties interested, and if called on by the courts he is not obliged to produce his book, but a copy under seal is sufficient. At the end of each year, not later than January 20, or when discharged or at the death of a broker, the book is delivered and kept in the safe of the archives in the department of trade and manufactures.

The duty of the chief broker is to see that all the rules and regulations are observed by the exchange brokers; to collect from them information concerning the prices of goods sold and bought at the exchange; to see that all forms under the supervision of the exchange committee are carried out and bulletins published, for the correctness of which he is responsible.

In case of neglect of duty or nonqualification of any broker, the committee of the Grain Exchange Society has the right to ask the minister of finance for the discharge of such broker without petition.

The compensation of the brokers or the brokerage due from the buyer and seller is fixed at the following rate: For the first 10,000 rubles, one-half of 1 per cent, and for amounts above 10,000 rubles, one-fourth of 1 per cent from each party. The brokers are permitted to make reductions of their own accord, if they so desire.

JOHN KAREL, *Consul-General.*

Mr. JENKINS. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman have leave to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

There was no objection.

Mr. HANDY. I yield ten minutes of my time to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. OTEY], and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. JENKINS] yields him ten minutes, making twenty minutes.

Mr. JENKINS. That is correct.

Mr. OTEY. Mr. Chairman, I shall endeavor to confine my remarks to the bill now before the House, as no one has referred to it so far. [Laughter.] And so, in considering this railroad bill, I desire to say that this House is practically without any detailed official information which in my opinion enables it at this moment to act promptly and discreetly, decisively and patriotically, on the Cuban question. [Laughter.]

This essential information will not be given us until the Committee on Foreign Affairs sees fit to do so.

In the meantime, Mr. Chairman, that side of the Chamber—the majority of this body—will, in my opinion, do absolutely nothing. [Applause.] What I will do when all the facts are before us—what course I will pursue when we are possessed of the knowledge now in possession of the Foreign Affairs Committee, I can not now say. But I do not believe that there is a member of this body who, when the supreme hour comes, will shirk his duty to his country—aye, to his God. [Applause.]

But, Mr. Chairman, the question then will be, What is his duty? [Laughter.]

In his novel, *The Fair God*, Gen. Lew Wallace, a gallant Federal officer, puts into the mouth of Itzell, the Tezcucan warrior, the following words, as he addressed Montezuma:

I intend my words to be respectful, mighty King. A common wisdom teaches us to respect the brave man and dread the coward. \* \* \* A throne may be laid amid hymns and prayers, but to endure it must rest on the allegiance of love.

The scene witnessed on this floor a few days ago, when with unprecedented unanimity this body voted \$50,000,000 as an emergency fund, was, to my mind, one that touched the American heart as no other scene has in the last third of a century; and with that fresh in my memory, and in view of the grave and solemn responsibility which we must very soon meet, it is, I hope, not out of place in me to speak, from a Virginian standpoint, as a Southern man, as a former rebel soldier, and to raise my voice in commendation of the brave, to ignore the coward, and to manifest my great joy at the testimony already given by this body that the foundation of our great Republic rests on the allegiance of love. [Loud applause.]

Mr. Chairman—

The drying up a single tear has more  
Of honest fame, than shedding seas of gore.

And I am sure there is not a patriot on this floor who would not prefer peace to war.

In the language of Tennyson, we would all prefer to extend our dominion of peace—

'Till the war drum throb'd no longer, and the battle flags were furled  
In the parliament of man, the federation of the world.

But, Mr. Chairman, events have been crowded upon us, and I fear that we have exhausted all demands on patriotic patience and forbearance, on justice and on humanity. It appears to me that

the time for diplomacy has passed, and that the time for action, as grave and as serious as it is, is upon us [applause], Mr. Chairman.

War is a cruel monster. It is the desolator and destroyer of homes and happiness. Its course is marked by the silent sentinels of devastation, standing amid the sighs of widows and the tears of orphans.

The splendor of our nation may dazzle us, but we have only to look back upon the ruins of Babylon, Carthage, and Rome to show us that war corrupts, enervates, and destroys nations, while peace is the great conservator of power, of happiness, of civil and religious liberty.

My voice and my pen have been for peace, and I am still for peace, if war can be averted with honor. [Applause.]

War is a mad game, at which the rich will play to profit by it. It enriches the few and bleeds the millions. We have forty-five stars, representing forty-five States, each an empire within itself, and within our borders there are others asking to be added to this glorious constellation and appealing in vain, while some look with eagerness to adding the lone star of Cuba.

We have the greatest and most continuous and most unsevered empire of civilized, enlightened, and progressive people on earth, and the real development of our resources has hardly yet begun.

Four-fifths of our arable land are not yet under cultivation and a still larger proportion of our mineral wealth is undeveloped, and there is no limit to our manufactures except the needs of the world. We are untrammelled by the enervating effect of a large standing army.

There is room in one State (Texas) for over 50,000,000 of people, and so far from population being then as dense as it is to-day in England, there would be sufficient fertile land on which to raise all the cotton used in the world and to supply the entire food product necessary for the United States of America. Our streams penetrate all sections of our land, laden with our domestic commerce, giving more miles of navigation than the whole of Europe. We have more railroads than the balance of the world combined, and if projected on a single track would reach from here to the moon.

We of the South know something of the ravages of war; our brethren of the North do not know, for they have never experienced it. And if war come, we of the South know that we have nothing to gain in a commercial way—we have everything to lose. Every man taken from our producing capacity will lessen our material advancement. A generation has passed away since our great struggle, and yet we of the South have not yet recovered from its blighting effects. Our Southland, which to-day should be blossoming like a rose, is yet in the midst of suffering.

No people have ever manifested such manhood and courage in adversity, no people have ever had to fight uphill as they have, and none have ever merited triumph more; and now, as light begins to penetrate the long night of our discomfiture, we ought to hesitate to go to war as long as peace, with honor, is possible. Our martial fervor will be no less emphatic, our patriotic zeal will be no less pronounced, if war must come.

But we will face it as we have always done, yet knowing that it means more taxes, more oppression, more pensions, more privileged classes, more misery and less happiness, more concentration of power in the hands of the few—all for what? To preserve untarnished the honor of our country, to avenge the death of our citizens. [Applause.] Mr. Chairman, the destruction of the battle ship *Maine* has

Deposited upon the silent shore  
Of memory images and precious thoughts  
That shall not die, and can not be destroyed.

The diplomacy of Spain will now perhaps be in vain. In the future (if war must come) it will be your joy to recall, and your children and your children's children will be proud to read in the history of their country, that you met the issue as Americans. It will be the pride of posterity to know that you promoted and protected the honor of their great country. It will honor you for the step which perhaps you are soon to take. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I may be pardoned for some reflections and observation which may interest the young men who are to fight the battles of our country. The proud and awful names of Grant and Lee may well be coupled together, having been left to us as lights for after times. A third of a century ago, in this very month, after a prolonged and bloody civil strife, we of the South laid down our arms. To have doubted our courage, endurance, prowess, self-abnegation, would have been to belittle these very virtues in the gallant soldiers who overcame us.

Greatness consists in the achievement of great deeds, and who will deny that our brothers in blue achieved them? To underestimate them would be to underrate ourselves. A victory won without struggle is won without merit; then so much the greater honor to the victor who must struggle to accomplish it. No greater tribute can be paid to the military renown of the Northern generals than the admission of great military qualities of those who surrendered to them.



To say that Lee, Jackson, and Stewart were great military leaders and had no superiors adds luster to the American name, and but sheds greater splendor on the renown of Grant, Sherman, and Thomas. To admit that Pickett's charge at Gettysburg was equaled by no charge of modern times, but adds glory to the brave men that withstood and repulsed it. [Applause.]

History records no such defense as that of Fort Sumter, which only adds fame to the navy that reduced it. [Applause.]

Miltiades, freedom's best and bravest friend, was the greatest of generals, and yet he did not disparage the courage and the fame of Datis and his Persian army. Had he done so he would have dimmed his own luster and lessened the splendor of his great achievements and deprived his gallant men of the immortal name justly earned by them on the field of Marathon over two thousand years ago.

If you treat the military renown of Cornwallis and Burgoyne with contempt, you sully the glory of Washington. Wellington would be shorn of his laurels but for the admitted greatness of Napoleon. General Grant might have received the surrender of a million Chinese and it would not have added one-thousandth part of the luster to his name as did the surrender of Robert E. Lee at Appomattox. [Applause.] While St. Helena is a blot on the name and fame of Wellington, Appomattox is the brightest gem in the crown of U. S. Grant. [Applause.]

His great achievement was equaled only by his magnanimity. He spoke of us before the surrender at Appomattox as we are now spoken of by all men. When at Vicksburg, he wrote General Pemberton:

Men who have shown so much endurance and courage as those under your command in Vicksburg will challenge the respect of any adversary.

He knew them as it was expressed by Charles Francis Adams when he was minister to England, as related by my friend Mr. LACEY of Iowa, in an address made last May, at the encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic at Des Moines. After the first battle of Manassas, Mr. Adams was at a reception when the news of the Confederate victory was first announced. A courtier said tauntingly to Mr. Adams: "These Confederates fight well, at any rate." "Yes," said Mr. Adams, "of course they do, sir; they are my countrymen." [Applause.] Gen. U. S. Grant felt and recognized this. After the fall of Richmond he declined to enter it in triumph or even without pomp and parade, and when asked to do so said:

No, I do not care to go. These people feel too keenly already the injury of war, and I do not intend, even by my presence, to seem to them as one who finds pleasure in viewing the wreck of their beloved capital and country.

So, too, when he was at Atlanta and was asked to ride over the fields that marked his triumphs, he said:

I can not bear to go and view these fields where so many heroes on both sides have fallen.

Mr. Speaker, this honored American said, "Let us have peace," and my voice would echo his words to-day if there was such a thing with honor. The clouds of prejudice necessarily engendered by our civil strife have now happily given way to the bright sunshine of magnanimity and good feeling.

In view of the impending war, it is, I hope, not asking too much that I may

Wet with unseen tears  
Those graves of memory where sleep

those of glorious deeds who fought in 1861-1865, in order that those who are to follow on other fields may be stimulated to emulate their example.

In doing so I shall refer to some records which can not be equalled for heroism and matchless courage and may prove a useful lesson to our young men who to-day are stirred with commendable martial fervor and laudable patriotic zeal.

I want our young men to study the history of the four years, 1861 to 1865. Without being invidious, I shall call attention to some examples of heroism which may be useful lessons to them in this day and generation. History records no such loss as is recorded of the Twenty-sixth North Carolina at Gettysburg of 87 per cent, and the First Minnesota on the same field of 82 per cent, and it is simply one of the many pages emblazoned with American valor, audacity, and courage. [Applause.] When we see the First Texas holding its position at Antietam with a loss of 82 per cent, and the First Massachusetts standing firm under a loss of 68 per cent, no man can doubt how the sons of these men will stand together now.

When the One hundred and first New York at Manassas, in changing its position in good order, sustained a loss of 74 per cent, and the Twenty-first Georgia followed the movement with a depletion of 76 per cent; when at Shiloh the Ninth Illinois was immovable under a fire that placed 63 per cent of its men hors de combat, while only a few hundred feet in its front stood the Sixth Mississippi, sustaining a loss of 70 per cent; when the One hundred and fifty-first Pennsylvania inflicted a loss of 708 on the Twenty-first North Carolina, itself sustaining a loss of 355 of its own men, no one can doubt that immortality is written on the name of the American soldier. No one will doubt that to-day, joined together in the same cause under the same flag, the sons of those who fought

for as well as of those who fought against the Stars and Stripes in 1861-1865 will be invincible, whether on land or sea, and Spain would do well to beware of them. [Loud applause.]

Mr. Chairman, your son or your grandson will read or perhaps has read of when you participated in the bloody charge at Cold Harbor; or the heroism you displayed at the bloody angle at Spottsylvania; or how you scaled the rocky cliffs of Lookout Mountain. And yet on the same page he will read how another grandfather (for his mother, perhaps, was the daughter of a rebel like myself) was in the forefront of Pickett's charge at Gettysburg, at which the whole world stood spellbound in admiration; or perhaps he was one of those who made the name of the American soldier immortal by his participation in the defense of Fort Sumter. Will the grandson think less of his grandfather that wore the gray than of the one that wore the blue? [Applause.] Some of you may have daughters who perhaps have married the sons of a gallant rebel (and I like the name rebel, for I was one myself). [Laughter.]

Should the son of the veteran of the First Minnesota marry the daughter of the veteran of the First Texas, or vice versa, their children would boast that they had a grandfather in each regiment, both renowned for their fighting qualities, the one having lost 82 per cent at Gettysburg, and the other 82 per cent at Antietam. The grandson of a veteran of the One hundred and first New York will ever be proud that his paternal grandfather belonged to that splendid regiment, while he would look with equal pride on the page of history that recorded the gallant deeds of the Twenty-first Georgia, in which, perchance, his maternal grandfather fought, each regiment having lost 76 out of every 100 of their men on the historic field of Manassas.

I think it a useful lesson to call attention to these things. Let us look at the losses here tabulated, and then ask if it does not make every American heart throb with pride, and whether these figures of themselves do not give assurance of the invincibility of the American soldier of to-day. Here are a few instances of losses in Confederate and Federal regiments during the war:

#### FEDERAL.

Name of regiment.	Battle.	Loss.
		Per cent.
First Minnesota.....	Gettysburg.....	82
One hundred and forty-first Pennsylvania.....	do.....	76
One hundred and first New York.....	Manassas.....	74
Twenty-fifth Massachusetts.....	Cold Harbor.....	70
Thirty-sixth Wisconsin.....	Bethesda Church.....	69
Eighth Vermont.....	Cedar Creek.....	68
Twenty-fourth Michigan.....	Gettysburg.....	64
First New Hampshire.....	Fredericksburg.....	64

#### CONFEDERATE.

Name of regiment.	Battle.	Loss.
		Per cent.
Twenty-sixth North Carolina.....	Gettysburg.....	87
Twenty-first Georgia.....	Manassas.....	76
Twenty-sixth North Carolina.....	Gettysburg.....	72
Sixth Mississippi.....	Shiloh.....	71
Eighth Tennessee.....	Stone River.....	68
Palmetto Sharpshooters, South Carolina.....	Glendale.....	68
First Alabama Battalion.....	Chickamauga.....	65
First Texas.....	Antietam.....	82

Posterity will be gladdened when they read that the sons of such heroes joined together to sustain the honor and dignity of their great nation. And to-day as we look at the flag of our common country, and as we recognize that the honor of the nation is threatened, the sons of the boys who wore the blue and those of the boys who wore the gray will salute it and join us as we say to that flag, in the language of Ruth:

Whither thou goest we will go; where thou lodgest we will lodge; thy people shall be our people, and thy God shall be our God. Where thou diest we will die and there will we be buried.

[Long and continued applause.]

Mr. OTEY. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia? The Chair hears none.

Mr. HANDY. Mr. Chairman, owing to the interruptions of the speakers, the time has been cut short, and I ask unanimous consent that the vote be taken at ten minutes of 5, instead of quarter of 5.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Delaware? The Chair hears none.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, what is the request?

The CHAIRMAN. That the vote be taken at ten minutes of 5, instead of quarter of 5.

Mr. PAYNE. In view of the fact that objection was made to the extension of the time of the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL], I think I shall object.



Mr. HANDY. What is the gentleman's objection?

Mr. PAYNE. You objected to the extension of the time of the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. HANDY. I beg the gentleman's pardon. I made no objection. The interruptions were taken out of his time. He had the full thirty minutes, and that is where it affects us. Now, this request is only to take the vote five minutes later.

Mr. PAYNE. The gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL] was cut off because the gentleman from Delaware objected.

Mr. HANDY. Oh, no; the RECORD will not show that.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is made.

Mr. HANDY. Was not the time extended, Mr. Chairman, before the objection was made by the gentleman from New York?

The CHAIRMAN. Perhaps the announcement was made, but the gentleman from New York, as soon as he learned what the request was, made the objection, and the Chair felt it was his duty to recognize the objection.

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama (to Mr. HANDY). Can not you ask now for an extension, and perhaps the gentleman from New York will withdraw his objection.

Mr. HANDY. Well, Mr. Chairman, I yield seventeen minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LENTZ].

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is informed that the gentleman has only thirteen minutes remaining.

Mr. HANDY. Well, I will yield all my time, which is surely fourteen minutes by the clock, to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. LENTZ. Mr. Chairman, I desire to correct a mistake that was made here on last Thursday when the statement was made by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] that John J. McCook was a very bad man and was undertaking the negotiation of four hundred millions of bonds of Cuba, and was against the Administration, and so on, and so on. Now, I read in the Washington Post of the 9th a statement made by Treasurer Rubens, of the Cuban junta, that John J. McCook had no connection whatever with the junta, nor had he negotiated any Cuban bonds. He also denied the sale or issue of four hundred millions of bonds, and further stated that only \$100,000 of Cuban bonds had been negotiated, and those were sold at 40 cents on the dollar.

Let me call the attention of this House and the country to a startling statement that appeared on the first page of the Washington Post, an Administration paper, in its issue of Sunday morning, the 10th instant:

MINISTER POLO INFORMED—A MIDNIGHT CONFERENCE AT THE HOME OF SENATOR ELKINS.

The President spent last evening discussing with his personal friends the latest development in the Spanish situation. Among those present during the consultation was John J. McCook, of New York, who is largely interested in the Cuban bond and purchase proposition, and who spent several hours in the President's company.

Another visitor was Senator ELKINS, who was summoned to the White House, and who left a dinner party at his own house to be with the President.

After leaving the White House, where the Woodford dispatch was discussed, Senator ELKINS returned to his residence, and was shortly afterwards joined there by Señor Polo y Bernabe, the Spanish minister. Senator ELKINS and his visitor remained in close consultation until nearly midnight.

From this it appears that this same wicked McCook seems to have a closer connection with this Administration than the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] who abused McCook and pretended to speak for the Administration last Thursday.

I read again from the Washington Post of Sunday morning, which announced the policy of the Administration to be presented to us on Monday morning in the President's message, and I will read from the message a little later on and in connection with all this that part of the Post's article showing its close connection with the Administration. It says:

The Post can officially announce this morning that the receipt of the information regarding the armistice will not change the President's policy. This fact was stated positively at the White House last night. The message will be transmitted to Congress to-morrow. It will recommend immediate armed intervention.

There were rumors last night that the President would change his message in view of the new developments. The Post has the highest authority—there could be none higher, in fact—for asserting that these rumors affecting the President's stability of purpose and patriotic desire have no foundation in fact.

For this reason no credence is placed in the assertion that the President is willing to accept the Spanish armistice coupled with the much-discussed purchase scheme, or that he has any other idea in view than the withdrawal of the Spanish flag from the Island of Cuba.

It is true that the semi-official press dispatches from Madrid have all the time insisted that the absolute and complete independence of the Cuban people has never been demanded by the United States of Spain, but these announcements, emanating from Spanish sources, have placed the President in a false and embarrassing position. It is again asserted in the Post, and with ample authority, that the withdrawal of Spain from the island is the main issue upon which the President's policy is based, and he will be satisfied with nothing less.

The Post can officially announce this morning that the receipt of the news regarding the armistice will not change the President's policy. It will recommend immediate armed intervention.

But the Administration took another change overnight. It had an interview with Senator ELKINS and John J. McCook, and at midnight "Senator ELKINS and the Spanish minister were in close consultation;" and then on Monday morning we have a message which omits all reference to "immediate armed intervention."

I have been accused of attacking the President of the United States. I never made a remark about his personality or about him individually, but as President of the United States. I affirm now, as I have repeatedly affirmed, that he has no policy. He does not know now what he wants to do. He does not know how to do what ought to be done in this case. I propose to show him how, before I finish, by reading from a resolution of the largest Grand Army post in the State of New Jersey, which has mapped out the policy that this country ought to pursue. They know what the people of this country want and what the people of this country demand.

We are told by those highest in authority on Sunday morning that we shall have a demand for immediate intervention; and then comes this message on Monday saying:

Yesterday official information was received by me that the latest decree of the Queen Regent of Spain directs General Blanco, in order to prepare and facilitate peace, to proclaim a suspension of hostilities.

Now they say that hostilities have been suspended; and in the same message the President says:

In view of these facts—

Which he had recited—

I ask Congress to authorize and empower the President to take measures to secure a full and final termination of hostilities between the Government of Spain and the people of Cuba and to secure in the island—

What? The independence of the Cuban patriots? No—

Secure in the island—

What? Does the President propose immediate intervention? No—

Secure in the island the establishment of a stable government.

A Spanish government. "A stable government" is not the language that was used in the St. Louis platform in 1896. Criticising the Democratic Administration, the Republican party drafted in 1896 a platform at St. Louis declaring—

The Government of Spain having lost control of Cuba and being unable to protect the property or lives of resident American citizens or to comply with its treaty obligations, 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.

Why have you changed your mind in a day and a night? A midnight interview cuts off "immediate intervention." A midnight interview destroys the proposition of independence; and no suggestion of Cuban freedom is found in your President's message of yesterday, although two years have elapsed since you made that criticism on the Cleveland Administration.

"A stable government!" What do you propose now? "Let this Congress give to the President the Army and the Navy," he says, "and I will go over there and force the Cuban patriots, force the Cuban heroes, to submit to a stable government at the hands of Spain, because the Queen Regent has already advised the Administration that she has ordered a suspension of hostilities."

She can not order a suspension as against the insurgents. She has not among all her bull fighters and bullies manhood enough to order a suspension of hostilities on the insurgents' side. This Administration, with all its vacillating policy, which was criticised by the Chicago Tribune, an Administration paper, asks us to put the Army and the Navy in its hands to go over and punish the Cubans after three years of the most heroic fight for liberty that any people ever made on the face of the earth. I say it is an outrage—it is a stench in the nostrils of every decent American—to ask that the Army and the Navy be put into the hands of anybody to subordinate the men who have for three years fought for their liberty. We shall see whether the majority side of this House can be lined up and whipped into such a policy as that.

The resolutions of the Lincoln Post, at Newark, voice the sentiment of the American people. These resolutions were prepared by Dr. Grenville M. Weeks, the last surviving surgeon of the original Monitor, and passed, as I said before, by the largest Grand Army post in the State of New Jersey. Copies of the resolutions were sent to every member of this House, from which I read the following:

To the Congress and President of the United States:

Be it hereby resolved by Lincoln Post No. 11, Department of New Jersey, Grand Army of the Republic, that as the first step toward stopping further destruction of defenseless noncombatant patriots, women and children, by their present enforced death by starvation, Congress and the President of the United States be, and are herewith, further urged and encouraged, as they already have been by the unanimous voice of our State legislature, to give the patriot Cubans our nation's recognition of their independence at the earliest possible moment.

[Applause.]

There is a second resolution which I shall read. These resolutions embody all that statesmanship and diplomacy could suggest at this hour. They ought to have been indorsed and adopted by this House the next day after the Maine was destroyed:

Resolved, That we see therein no necessary occasion for war between this country and Spain, but only the giving of a long-deserved recognition of Cuba as an independent nation, with whom we would then have rights of trade that Spain thereafter has no more right to forbid than she has to forbid our trade with France or England.



And in a further resolution in substance saying:

If Spain does undertake to interfere with us, then comes the cause of war.

The Chicago Tribune, from which I proposed to read a moment ago, says:

The country has waited through two years of Cleveland and over one of McKinley to see an end put to Spanish misrule and Spanish atrocities in Cuba. During that long period the United States has helped Spain by endeavoring to deprive the insurgents of supplies, and has been abused by Spain for not doing more. The newspaper reports of the horrible sufferings of the Cuban pacificos, sneered at by Spanish sympathizers in and out of Congress, have been confirmed by Senators PROCTOR, GALLINGER, and THURSTON, all strong Administration Senators. A quarter of a million helpless, innocent Cubans have been slowly starved to death while this Government was spending millions to prevent Cubans in this country from sending arms and ammunition to the insurgents.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LENTZ. I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to proceed for five minutes longer.

Mr. JENKINS. We would have no objection on our side of the House if it be conceded that ten minutes additional be allowed to this side.

Mr. HANDY. We will be very glad to do that.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the request for unanimous consent to allow five minutes additional time to the gentleman from Ohio and ten minutes to the other side. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LENTZ. Mr. Chairman, the same article says, continuing:

The policy of action speaks for itself. It requires no explanation. The policy of long-continued and incomprehensible delay requires explanation, especially when there are indications that it may be adhered to still longer.

I say that if the House had declared the independence of Cuba—had declared for Cuban independence—a year ago it would have been even late then, indeed, in doing its duty. I say that every hour we procrastinate, every hour that we postpone that recognition, we are adding to the murder not only of Cuban patriots, but ultimately to the murder of American patriots as well. [Applause.]

We heard a gentleman on the other side of the House say, during this discussion, that the rainy season is coming on in Cuba, and that we ought "to be slow in going to war at this time!" Mr. Chairman, I have never heard anybody say that we ought not to go to war because we are afraid of rain. [Laughter.] The time has come when we ought to take a decisive step, and the time has come, in view of conditions now existing, when we may stop talking of supporting the Administration. "The king can do no wrong" is an old saying. This old adage may serve the purpose of a cringing and cowardly people. It was invented in the early days of history and was a part of the traditions that have come down to us from the Dark Ages. It is reeking with brutality, and has no part in the traditions of a free country and among a free people.

This is a free country, and with the 447 Senators and Congressmen, representatives of a great people, we are better able to decide questions as to the policy of this Government in view of the facts before us, and are better fitted to advise the President, than are those who go at midnight, behind closed doors, to point out the views of the plutocrats and submit them as the voice of the people. This is a Government yet "by the people and for the people," and it will remain so. [Applause.]

And I predict this, that these 266 American brothers shall not forever rest unavenged in the soil of a tyrant. Our American manhood—the youth of this country—will not rest until that matter has been adjusted to their satisfaction, and to the honor of this country. They will be aroused by the language of poets and philosophers, and a popular sentiment will override the hesitating and faltering policy of the money power.

Lee Fairchild's words, published lately in the Washington Times, will put new life in the youth of this country. Young men will begin to feel and think in sympathy with the stricken hearts of the mothers, the widows, and the sisters of this land who have been bereft of loved ones by this horror in Havana Harbor, when they hear his noble words:

We have a thousand guns; what did we make them for,  
If not in times like these to speak the speech of war?  
Let's fight, or quit our brag, and take our banter back;  
Paint white our ships again, and paint our White House black.

[Prolonged applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Chairman, sometimes misstatement is so gross that it reaches the dignity of falsehood, and falsehood so gross that it becomes mendacity, and mendacity so foul that it becomes scoundrelism.

I say that the President of the United States has never said that he desires the use of the Army and the Navy at the hands of Congress in order to establish Spanish supremacy on the Island of Cuba. [Applause.] It is not true. There is no man who can, with an honest heart and with an honest purpose, read this message of the President and arrive at any conclusion of that character.

The President's whole argument leads up to the proposition that

the conduct of Spain on that island during fifty years of misrule, fifty years of outrage, fifty years of tyranny, has brought about a condition that is now intolerable and insupportable and must cease. That is the language of the President of the United States. [Applause.] He asks the use of the Army and the Navy to put an end to that intolerable and insufferable condition. [Applause on the Republican side.] That is the argument of the President.

Mr. LENTZ. Does he not argue against according belligerent rights to the Cubans?

Mr. HEPBURN. I decline to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LENTZ. I should think you would.

Mr. HEPBURN. The President has made this argument. Every sentence in that message to this House teaches us that that is his purpose, and yet gentlemen say, in view of all the language that he has used and all of the argument that he has made and all of the recital of infamous and despotic conduct that he has called to our attention, that it is the purpose of the President to become the ally of the Spaniards. I say there is no word in that message that justifies any honorable man in making a declaration of that kind upon this floor. We are going there to fight Spain. We are going there, if we go, to establish a stable and a permanent government. What does that mean?

Here we have had fifty years of Spanish government, not stable, not permanent except in the villainy of its outrages. That character of outrage and villainy which has become insufferable, the President says, should be suffered no longer. It has created such an emergency as compels us to violate the otherwise friendly relations that we ought to have and go to the extreme of war in bringing an end to these insufferable conditions produced through the acts of Spain. And yet the gentleman dares to stand here and say that the message advocates the use of the Army and the Navy, the placing of the whole military power of the country in the hands of the President, in order that he may go to Cuba to perpetuate that which he reprobates, and to continue that which he says is now unendurable.

Mr. BALL. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HEPBURN. I decline to yield. I can not yield a part of my ten minutes. The gentleman says that we are going there, or that the President desires to go there, for the purpose of maintaining the Spanish Government. Not so. The President says he wants that there should be upon that island the blessings of stable and permanent government. All of the traditions of our nation, all of the insistings of our statesmen have been upon the line that upon this continent there should be republican form of government alone. Is it necessary that in every message the President should reiterate that fact? That is the settled policy of this nation, to secure wherever it may aid that form of government—republican government. He wants a stable and permanent republican government. Does that mean Spanish rule? Has any man the right to make that argument?

Mr. LENTZ. Does he say republican government?

Mr. HEPBURN. No, he does not say that, but he supposed that you knew something about the history of this country. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. LENTZ. I do.

Mr. MAGUIRE. And we know something about the history of this Administration.

Mr. HEPBURN. He supposed that you knew something about the aspirations of American statesmen; that you knew something about the declaration that over and over and over again had been reiterated by every branch of this Government with reference to the character of government that should be formed on this hemisphere. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Now I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR].

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Chairman, I shall not reply to the speech made by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LENTZ]. I wish to say that I avail myself of the first opportunity that I have had to say that, misled by a series of publications, one of which the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LENTZ] read in his speech of last Thursday, I located Mr. John J. McCook at a particular point of this transaction which he disclaims all connection with. At the proper time I will put into the RECORD a complete explanation of the whole of that matter.

I am going to refer now to only one thing that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LENTZ] has said on this particular occasion, and I do not do it for the purpose of elaborating a speech upon this occasion. The time is coming when gentlemen will have a full opportunity to assail the President of the United States, to send their bitterness and their opposition across the water to our enemies. The gentleman shall have a full opportunity to abuse his own constituents at home for any conservative expressions which they may have made through the telegraph or the mail, and he shall have that opportunity unaffected by any answer of mine. I wish here simply to say that the President of the United States has asked of Congress the power to use the Army and the Navy for the purpose of establishing in the Island of Cuba an independent government.

Mr. LENTZ. Why did he not say so?



Mr. GROSVENOR. Will my friend from Ohio try for a minute to keep his mouth shut?

Mr. CANNON. Oh, that is impossible. [Applause and laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. GROSVENOR. I state that the President of the United States has asked for the use of the Army and Navy to establish on the Island of Cuba an independent government, and has said so in the plainest kind of English language. [Cries of "Where?" on the Democratic side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I will show you "where." Hold on.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Kentucky. I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman may be extended five minutes.

Mr. SIMPSON. Regular order!

Mr. JENKINS. I move that the committee do now rise.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Oh, let me finish my sentence.

Mr. BALL. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio have five minutes.

Mr. JENKINS. They have objected.

The question was taken on the motion that the committee rise; and the Chairman announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. LEWIS of Washington. I move that the gentleman have five minutes.

Several MEMBERS. Division!

Mr. LEWIS of Washington. I move that the gentleman have five minutes.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 20, noes 119.

So the motion that the committee rise was rejected.

Mr. LEWIS of Washington. I move that the gentleman from Ohio be permitted to address the committee for five minutes—ten minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Unanimous consent is asked that the gentleman from Ohio be permitted to continue his remarks for ten minutes.

Mr. HANDY. And ten minutes on this side to reply.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Five minutes. I only want five minutes.

Mr. HANDY. And five minutes on this side to reply.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I shall not object to that.

Mr. DALZELL. Yes, there is; I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington, that the gentleman from Ohio shall have five minutes?

Mr. DALZELL. I object to five minutes more on that side. If the gentleman from Ohio proceeds for five minutes now, we will have had twenty minutes on this side and there will have been thirty minutes consumed on the other side.

Mr. SIMPSON. Unless there is five minutes granted on this side, I shall have to object.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I hope that my ending shall not be cut off in such a way as to make me stultify myself.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington that the gentleman from Ohio be permitted to have five minutes?

Mr. SIMPSON. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. LEWIS of Washington. There is no objection, provided the amendment of the gentleman from Delaware be put to the House—

Mr. BARTLETT. Regular order!

Mr. GROSVENOR. I would like—

Mr. BARTLETT. I call for the regular order.

Mr. BABCOCK. I desire to submit the following request: That the time be extended ten minutes, five minutes to be used by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] and five minutes to be controlled by the gentleman from Delaware.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent that ten minutes' additional time for general debate be granted, five minutes to be given to the gentleman from Ohio and five minutes to be controlled by the gentleman from Delaware.

Mr. DALZELL. I object.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Do not do that; it will put me in a very awkward position; and I am surprised that the gentleman from Pennsylvania does any such unfriendly thing.

Mr. BARTLETT. Regular order, Mr. Chairman!

Mr. GROSVENOR. A parliamentary inquiry. What is the condition of the bill pending before the House?

Mr. DALZELL. The objection is withdrawn, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for five minutes, and the gentleman from Delaware will control five minutes.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Now, Mr. Chairman, after a great deal of tribulation, I am going to give to gentlemen on the other side a demonstration of every statement which I made. Now, if you will turn to page 3703 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, you will find this language used by the President, and I will leave it to the most acute analytical mind on the other side to say if that

is not a proposition to establish on the Island of Cuba a government independent of Spain:

In view of these facts and of these considerations, I ask the Congress to authorize and empower the President to take measures to secure a full and final termination of hostilities between the Government of Spain and the people of Cuba, and to secure in the island the establishment of a stable government, capable of maintaining order and observing its international obligations.

Mr. BRUCKER. Is it not a fact that Canada has a stable government under the British flag?

Mr. GROSVENOR. There is so much confusion I can not hear the gentleman's question.

What benefit do I get out of five minutes time if I am to be run over by everybody who thinks he knows something and thinks he is thinking about it? It is an outrage upon every man. Right at the moment a connected idea is attempted to be communicated somebody comes in and bellows in the ear of the speaker something that he can not understand and does not want to understand, either.

Now, I ask any gentleman on the other side to tell me how a government on an island or any country controlled by a foreign country as Cuba is now can have a government capable of discharging its "international obligations?" What are international obligations? Do colonies have international obligations? Did the President understand that there can be a colonial condition in Cuba by which there would be international obligations from that Government?

What representation have we from the Dominion Government? What representation do we send to the Dominion Government? What international power does the Dominion act confer under any kingly power on earth of an international nature? What international act does Canada do? What international act has any of the West India Islands ever done? What representative of this Government goes to Jamaica, Puerto Rico, or any island except those independent, as Haiti.

The very language of the President, as understood by every intelligent man and men of thought, is that the object and purpose of using force is to establish a government with international obligations and with the power to discharge those international obligations. So the whole appeal of the gentleman from Ohio is like the picture of a "painted ship upon a painted ocean." [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. Chairman, I do not care to reply to the gentleman from Ohio. He may not be satisfied with the situation as he left it last Thursday. I am. He may not be satisfied with all he has heard in regard to that matter. I am; and I am content to leave the matter exactly as I left it last Thursday night.

Mr. Chairman, the time is coming very rapidly—it will be here, I trust, to-morrow—when, under the guidance of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, this House will take action; and I will suggest to the gentlemen on the other side that there will be a degree of patriotism, a degree of unanimity of purpose, a degree of oneness in action that will surprise the gentleman when he looks over the vote that will be taken here to-morrow. [Great applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. HANDY. I now yield so much of my time as remains to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BAILEY].

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, it is somewhat remarkable that a President of the United States should send to Congress a message upon one of the most important and one of the most exciting questions that has engaged the attention of the country for many years, and that he should conclude with a recommendation so ambiguous as to become the subject of controversy about its meaning.

The President of the United States in other portions of his message shows that he is a master of clear and excellent English, and yet when he reaches that portion of his message which, above all others, ought to have been distinct and unequivocal, he taxes the ingenuity of his friend from Ohio to make it clear to the House and to the country what he meant to say. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

If the President desired authority to use the Army and Navy of the United States to establish an independent government in the Island of Cuba, why did he not ask for it in so many words? [Applause.] I am not willing to believe that he has deliberately veiled his meaning from this House and from the country. I believe—and in saying it I do him higher credit than his personal and political friends—that he meant exactly what he said, and said exactly what he meant. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Was it not as easy to say "an independent government" as it was to say "a stable government?" Only one word was required to describe either kind, and when the President used the word "stable" he must have meant it, and when he did not use the word "independent" we must assume that he did not mean it. [Applause on the Democratic side.] A stable government and an independent government may be vastly different. Nobody doubts that the Government of Canada is stable, but everybody knows



that it is not independent. I do not doubt that Spain, with our help, can establish a stable government upon the Island of Cuba. I do not doubt that they can make peace there if we will help them; but they must first make it a solitude and then call it peace.

But, Mr. Chairman, in another portion of this message the President has not left us to doubt or conjecture his meaning. He says there are two kinds of intervention. One is an intervention in favor of one of the parties to the conflict, and the other is a neutral intervention, compelling both of them to keep the peace, and he proposes the latter. If Congress gives him the authority which he asks, to send an army and a navy to Cuba, then when his command reaches there and calls upon the people to be at peace, the Spanish general will reply: "We are at peace; our arms are stacked, and if anybody is disturbing the peace of this island, it is the insurgents under General Gomez."

The President's representative will then be compelled to say to the insurgent forces: "Stack your arms; go back to your homes and give up this heroic struggle which you have maintained for three long years against famine and fire and sword." If the insurgents refuse to obey, then the commander whom the President sends to Cuba must issue his order to fire upon those struggling patriots. Mark my words, a President who orders an American army to fire upon those Cuban soldiers will be odious, and his children after him will be odious, so long as the memory of his deed shall last. [Loud applause.]

Mr. HEPBURN. In view of the fact, is it conceivable— [Loud cries of "Regular order!"]

Several MEMBERS. Let us hear the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN].

Mr. HEPBURN. I say, in view of the infamy [cries of "Regular order!"] which would follow that act, is it conceivable that the President of the United States would desire to do it?

Mr. JENKINS. I move that the committee rise.

Mr. BAILEY. I should like to hear the observation of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN].

The motion of Mr. JENKINS was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HOPKINS reported that the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union had had under consideration the disagreement of the Senate to the House amendments to Senate bill No. 924, and had come to no resolution thereon.

#### SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, Senate joint resolution of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to its appropriate committee as indicated below:

Joint resolution (S. R. 143) authorizing the use of a part of the appropriation heretofore made for the relief of the destitute citizens of the United States in the Island of Cuba for the aid of such citizens, refugees, and others who have reached our shores—to the Committee on Appropriations.

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. BABCOCK. I move that the House now adjourn.

Mr. MAGUIRE. Will the gentleman withhold that motion a moment?

Mr. BABCOCK. Very well.

Mr. MAGUIRE. I desire to ask that Mr. Fairchild, who addressed the House yesterday, and was limited to ten minutes, be permitted to print his entire argument in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California [Mr. MAGUIRE] asks unanimous consent that Mr. Fairchild, contestant in the case of Fairchild vs. Ward, be allowed to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

Mr. PAYNE. I object.

Mr. BABCOCK. I renew the motion to adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions of the following titles were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several Calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. JENKINS, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 8063) to amend "An act for the preservation of the public peace and protection of property in the District of Columbia," approved July 29, 1892, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1050); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. STEWART of New Jersey, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 8881) to establish a life-saving station on the western side of the harbor of Gloucester, Mass., reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1055); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 5522) to establish a life-saving station at Charlevoix, Mich., reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1056); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HOOKER, from the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 4332) to amend an act "Making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes," approved June 3, 1896, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1060); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the concurrent resolution of the House (House Con. Res. No. 26) authorizing the Secretary of War to submit plans for the improvement of Aransas Pass Harbor, State of Texas, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1031); which said resolution and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the concurrent resolution of the House (House Con. Res. No. 18) directing the Secretary of War to submit estimate of cost of widening and deepening Deep Creek, Virginia, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1062); which said resolution and report were referred to the House Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the joint resolution of the House (H. Res. 169) providing for estimate of cost of certain improvements of Portsmouth Harbor, New Hampshire, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1063); which said resolution 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. JENKINS, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 414) for the relief of Mathilda Akerblom Molin, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1048); 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. 6460) for the relief of Galen C. Green, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1049); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BOTKIN, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 6625) for the relief of George B. Stone, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1051); 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. 4977) granting a pension to Mary Hannah Clark, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1052); 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 House (H. R. 8090) for the relief of the widow of the late Henry W. Peter, late contract surgeon of the United States Army, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1053); 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 House (H. R. 5762) granting a pension to Joel W. Gibson, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1054); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BELKNAP, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 6162) removing the charge of desertion from the record of Robert V. Hancock, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1057); 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. 6718) for the relief of Samuel Racey, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1058); 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. 4253) granting an honorable discharge to Thomas West, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1059); 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 Senate (S. 1473) granting a pension to Oscar A. Palmer, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1064); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

#### CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Invalid Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 8395) to place the name of William Gross on the pension roll; and the same was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

#### 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. LATIMER: A bill (H. R. 9814) to abolish the office of the justice of the peace within and for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HICKS: A bill (H. R. 9815) appointing commissioners to revise the statutes relating to patents, trade and other marks, and trade and commercial names—to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. VANDIVER (by request): A bill (H. R. 9816) to construct a bridge over Current River, in Ripley County, Mo.—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. WHEELER of Alabama: A bill (H. R. 9817) to provide for the organization of volunteer reserves to the land and naval forces of the United States of America—to the Committee on the Militia.

By Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH: A joint resolution (H. Res. 231) directing the President to intervene at once to secure peace and order in Cuba—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GIBSON: A joint resolution (H. Res. 232) to terminate hostilities in and secure the independence of the Island of Cuba—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

#### 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. DOVENER: A bill (H. R. 9818) for the relief of Elizabeth Muhleman, widow, and the heirs at law of Samuel A. Muhleman, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FOSS: A bill (H. R. 9819) to increase the pension of Maurice F. Ellsworth—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9820) to remove the charge of desertion now standing against John O'Keefe—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. HINRICHSEN: A bill (H. R. 9821) for the relief of Edward Leahy, late a member Company B, Thirty-sixth Illinois Infantry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9822) for the relief of Patrick Murphy, alias Henry P. Murphy, alias William Hayes, late member Company C, Twenty-eighth Illinois Infantry, and Company A, First Mississippi Mounted Rifles—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9823) for the relief of William J. Patterson, late a member of Company B, Forty-second Indiana Infantry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9824) for the relief of Henry Harmon, late a member of Company A, Twenty-sixth Missouri Infantry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9825) for the relief of Mary Thornbaugh—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9826) to place the name of Harry Hooper, imbecile son of Nathan M. Hooper, late member of Company F, One hundred and thirty-seventh Illinois Infantry, on the pension roll—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9827) for the relief of William Moore, late a member of Company F, Fourteenth Regiment Illinois Infantry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9828) for the relief of Luther Cline, late a member of Company G, Seventy-seventh Ohio Volunteers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9829) for the relief of Isaac Allen, alias William Simpson, late a member of Company I, Eleventh Ohio Cavalry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MILLER: A bill (H. R. 9830) for the relief of the trustees of the Baptist Church, of Guyandotte, W. Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. RUSSELL: A bill (H. R. 9831) granting a pension to Harriett S. Cady—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9832) granting a pension to Augusta Troland—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SPRAGUE: A bill (H. R. 9833) to place the name of

Nellie M. Guild upon the pension roll—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. UPDEGRAFF: A bill (H. R. 9834) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Frank Averill—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. VANDIVER: A bill (H. R. 9835) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Margaret Rose—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WALKER of Virginia: A bill (H. R. 9836) for the relief of the estate of Joseph L. Essex, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WHEELER of Alabama: A bill (H. R. 9837) for the relief of Thomas H. Walton—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9838) for the relief of J. J. Little—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. ACHESON: Resolution of Success Lodge, No. 275, Knights of Pythias, of Reynoldston, 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.

By Mr. ALDRICH: Two petitions of citizens of Anniston, Ala., favoring the passage of the anti-scalping bill—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine: Petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Guilford, Me., 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 the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Guilford, Me., 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. BURTON: Petition of O. Stafford and other citizens of Cleveland, Ohio, favoring the anti-scalping bill—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, resolution of a mass meeting of Scandinavian-American citizens of Cleveland, Ohio, in favor of forcible intervention in behalf of Cuba—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CLARKE of New Hampshire: Petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Hinsdale, N. H., 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. CONNOLLY: Petitions of T. M. Harris and 20 citizens of Lincoln, Ill., and Frank W. Tracy and 40 citizens of Springfield, Ill., in favor of the passage of the so-called anti-scalpers bill—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CRUMPACKER: Petitions of Anson Wolcott and others, of Wolcott, Ind.; Rev. H. C. Wickemeyer and others, of Michigan City, and Christ. Kimmel and others, of Crisman, Ind., favoring the passage of the so-called anti-scalping ticket bill—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DORR: Petition of the heirs of Henry Sanger, deceased, late of Fayette County, W. Va., praying that his war claim be referred to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of the heirs of W. M. Dempsey, deceased, late of Fayette County, W. Va., requesting reference of his claim to the Court of Claims under act of March 3, 1883—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. DOVENER: Petitions of the Third Presbyterian Congregation of Wheeling, W. Va., favoring the passage of bills providing that cigarettes imported in original packages on entering any State shall become subject to its laws, to forbid interstate transmission of lottery messages, and to raise the age of protection for girls to 18 years in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Third Presbyterian Congregation of Wheeling, W. Va., 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. ELLIS: Petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of East Portland, Oreg., and Methodist Episcopal Church of Mount Tabor, Oreg., 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 Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of East Portland, Oreg., 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.

Also, petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of East Portland, Oreg., for the passage of a bill to forbid the sale of alcoholic liquors within 200 feet of a church, school, or charitable institution—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

Also, petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of East Portland, Oreg., 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—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. FOSS: Affidavit of Maurice F. Ellsworth to accompany House bill granting him a pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill to relieve John J. O'Keefe of the charge of desertion—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. GROUT: Petitions of the Congregational Church, Methodist Episcopal Church, and the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Mrs. E. L. Corwin, president, all of Chelsea, Vt., in favor of the bill which forbids the sale of alcoholic liquors in Government buildings—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

Also, petitions of the Methodist Episcopal Church, W. E. Allen, pastor; Congregational Church, B. B. Sherman, pastor, and Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Chelsea, Vt., 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.

Also, petitions of the Congregational Church, Methodist Episcopal Church, and Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Chelsea, Vt., 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 the interstate transmission of lottery messages by telegraph—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HINRICHSSEN: Papers to accompany House bill relating to the record of William Simpson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KETCHAM: Petitions of Freedom Plains Lodge, No. 191, Independent Order of Good Templars, of Freedom Plains, N. Y., and the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Lagrange, Dutchess County, N. Y., 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, petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Lagrange, N. Y., and Freedom Plains Lodge, No. 191, Independent Order of Good Templars, of Freedom Plains, N. Y., 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. KULP: Resolutions of the Board of Trade of Shamokin, Pa., favoring the passage of House bill No. 8066, relating to appropriations for a national exposition at the city of Philadelphia—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the National Wholesale Lumber Dealers' Association, favoring currency reform based on the gold standard—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, resolutions of the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York; also resolutions of the New York Board of Transportation, the Trades League of Philadelphia, Pa., and the Scientific Institution, of Boston, Mass., sustaining the President in the crisis between the United States and Spain—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolutions passed by the Oxford Club, of Philadelphia, Pa., urging that instant steps be taken to maintain the honor of the nation—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of the St. James Evangelical Lutheran Church, of Turbotville, Pa., in favor of 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, petition of the St. James Evangelical Lutheran Church, of Turbotville, Pa., 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, petition of the St. James Evangelical Lutheran Church, of Turbotville, Pa., for the passage of bills to prohibit the interstate transmission of gambling matter by telegraph and to protect State anti-cigarette laws—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, papers to accompany House bill No. 8991, to correct the military record of Capt. Augustus H. Rush, of Berwick, Pa.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LATIMER: Paper to accompany House bill No. 9814, relating to municipal courts—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. LEWIS of Washington: Petition of the Central Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Tacoma, Wash., 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 Judiciary.

Also, petition of Dauntless Lodge, No. 93, Independent Order of Good Templars, of Tacoma, Wash., for the passage of a bill to prohibit the interstate transmission of gambling matter by telegraph—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of 59 citizens of Tacoma, Wash., favoring 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 Epworth Methodist Episcopal Church, Central Christian Church, and Dauntless Lodge, all of Tacoma, Wash., and two petitions signed by numerous citizens of Tacoma, 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.

Also, petition of citizens of Porter, Wash., in favor of restricting the sale of liquor in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. LLOYD: Petition of 33 citizens of Kahoka, Mo., favoring the passage of the anti-scalping bill—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McALEER: Resolution of the Trades League of Philadelphia, Pa., asking the cooperation of Congress with the President to avert war—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McCALL: Petition of the Elysium Club, of Boston, Mass., commending the policy adopted by President McKinley in his endeavors to maintain peace with honor—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McCLELLAN: Four petitions of citizens of New York City, favoring the anti-scalping bill—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MAHON: Petitions of the Young Men's Christian Association, Sunday school, and Young People's Society of Christian Endeavor of the Reformed Church; Epworth League and Sunday school of the Methodist Episcopal Church, all of Selinsgrove, Pa., 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 Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petitions of certain churches and other religious societies in Selinsgrove, Pa., in favor of a bill prohibiting the sale of intoxicating liquors in all Government buildings—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. MEYER of Louisiana: Twenty petitions of A. B. Kennedy and others, J. E. Sharp and others, John Snyder and others, A. B. Ayres and others, Frank Ellis and others, C. A. Kriper and others, H. A. Andrews and others, John Behund and others, H. J. Leshner and others, M. H. Humphrey and others, Willis K. Hackett and others, H. McFerroo and others, G. P. Wilson and others, V. E. De Long and others, W. W. Williamson and others, George F. Keinberger and others, H. C. Manning and others, H. A. Branda and others, A. L. Keiffer and others, B. J. Adams and others, John Bartlett and others, all citizens of the State of Louisiana, in opposition to the so-called anti-scalping bill or any similar measure—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MILLER: Resolution of Parkersburg Division, No. 369, Order of Railway Conductors, of Parkersburg, W. Va., favoring the anti-scalping bill—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, evidence in support of House bill for the relief of the trustees of the Baptist Church of Guyandotte, W. Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. PAYNE: Petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Five Corners, N. Y., in favor of the passage of bills to forbid interstate transmission of lottery messages by telegraph, to raise the age of protection for girls to 18 years, and to protect State anti-cigarette laws—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Five Corners, N. Y., in favor of a bill prohibiting the sale of intoxicating liquors in all Government buildings—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. POWERS: Petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Women's Home and Foreign Missionary Society, and Methodist Episcopal Church, of Underhill, Vt., favoring the passage of bills 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 interstate transmission of lottery messages by telegraph—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Women's Home and Foreign Missionary



Society of Underhill, Vt., in favor of a bill prohibiting the sale of intoxicating liquors in all Government buildings—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. PRINCE: Resolutions of the Tri-City Veteran Shiloh Association, of Davenport, Iowa, protesting against the passage of a bill pending in Congress for the erection of a monument in honor of the memory of the late Albert Pike—to the Committee on the Library.

Also, petition of the First Methodist Episcopal Church of Rock Island, Ill., in favor of a bill prohibiting the sale of intoxicating liquors in all Government buildings—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. RUSSELL: Paper to accompany House bill granting a pension to Augusta Troland, of Norwich, Conn.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHAFROTH: Resolutions adopted at a mass meeting of miners and citizens of the Pine Creek mining district, Apex, Colo., favoring vigorous action in the settlement of the Cuban question and tendering their services to the Government in case war is declared—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of the Christian Endeavor Society of Wray, Colo., 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 Christian Endeavor Society of Wray, Colo., 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. SAMUEL W. SMITH: Three petitions of farmers and produce dealers of the State of Michigan, asking for a specific duty of not less than from 6 to 8 cents per bushel on ruta-bagas—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SPERRY: Petitions of the Congregational, Baptist, and Methodist churches of Moodus, 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.

Also, petitions of the Baptist, Methodist, and Congregational churches of Moodus, Conn., to forbid the sale of intoxicating beverages in Government buildings—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. STARK: Petitions of the Methodist Episcopal churches of Tamora and Utica, Nebr., praying for the enactment of legislation to forbid the transmission of lottery messages by telegraph and to protect State anti-cigarette laws—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petitions of the Methodist Episcopal churches of Tamora and Utica, Nebr., in favor of the passage of the Broderick 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 Methodist Episcopal churches of Tamora and Utica, Nebr., favoring the bill which forbids the sale of alcoholic liquors in Government buildings—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. STEWART of Wisconsin: Petitions of the Wisconsin State Federation of Labor and the local unions of the city of Madison, Wis., in favor of (1) the eight-hour law; (2) Senate bill No. 35, relative to use of writ of injunction; (3) Senate bill No. 95; (4) against convict-labor competition—to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. CHARLES W. STONE: Resolution of Warren Lodge, No. 481, Knights of Pythias, of Warren, 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, resolutions of the Central Pennsylvania Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, in favor of the passage of the anti-scalping bill—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STRODE of Nebraska: Petitions of the Equal Suffrage Club of Table Rock, Nebr., 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, petition of the Equal Suffrage Club of Table Rock, Nebr., praying for the enactment of legislation prohibiting in the District of Columbia and the Territories kinetoscope reproductions of pugilistic encounters and also the interstate transportation of materials of the same—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Equal Suffrage Club of Table Rock, Nebr., for the enactment of a Sunday-rest law for the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of the Equal Suffrage Club of Table Rock, Nebr., 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 Equal Suffrage Club of Table Rock, Nebr., praying for the enactment of legislation to substitute voluntary arbitration for railway strikes—to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. SUTHERLAND: Papers to accompany House bill No. 3997, for the relief of Elizabeth V. Wright, widow of Samuel Wright, late of the Third Maryland Infantry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance unions of Bloomington, Nebr., and Verona, Nebr., 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 Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Verona, Nebr., consisting of 31 members, to forbid the transmission of lottery messages by telegraph—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UPDEGRAFF: Petition of J. S. Bradley, Ed. N. Waterbury, and 33 other citizens of Charles City, Iowa, in favor of the passage of the anti-scalping bill—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Pennsylvania: Argument of the Philadelphia Commercial Museum, in support of House bill No. 8066, relating to appropriations to aid in the holding of a national exposition of American products and manufactures in Philadelphia—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, resolutions of the Board of Trade and Transportation of New York; also, resolutions of the Chamber of Commerce of New York, commending the policy of the President in his effort to exhaust every reasonable means to maintain peace with honor, and appealing to the representatives in Congress to cooperate with and sustain the President—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolution of the Pennsylvania Division of the Travelers' Protective Association, and resolution of the Pennsylvania Society for the Advancement of the Deaf, of Germantown, Philadelphia, Pa., in favor of the anti-scalping bill—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. YOUNG of Pennsylvania: Petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of West Philadelphia, Pa., for the passage of a bill which forbids the sale of alcoholic liquors in Government buildings—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

## SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, April 13, 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.

### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 3457) to authorize the construction of a bridge over the Black River, at or near Pocahontas, Ark.

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

A bill (H. R. 7748) to provide a survey of Elk River, in Tennessee and Alabama; and

A bill (H. R. 8569) providing for the construction of a bridge across the Yalobusha River, between Leflore and Carroll counties, in the State of Mississippi.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution of the Senate to print 20,000 copies of the message of the President of the United States on the relations of the United States to Spain and the message transmitting the consular reports relating to the condition of the reconcentrados in Cuba.

### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. QUAY presented a petition of Colonel John B. Clark Post, No. 162, Grand Army of the Republic, of Allegheny, Pa., praying Congress to enact as a war measure an income-tax law; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance unions of Ercildown, Brookfield, and Pleasant Mount; of the congregations of the Church of Christ of Canton; the Jefferson United Presbyterian Church, of Baxter; the Evangelical Lutheran Church of Williamsburg; the Presbyterian Church of Williamsburg; the First Baptist Church of Philipsburg; the Trinity Methodist Episcopal Church, of Philipsburg; the St. James Evangelical Lutheran Church, of Turbutville, and the Methodist Episcopal Church of Canton, and of the Young People's Christian Endeavor Union of Baxter, all in the State of Pennsylvania, praying